

Timeline

Date	Action
December 16, 2020 (Regular Board Meeting)	<p>Presentation on the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and Board approval on next steps</p> <p>Click here to view the board presentation</p> <p>Click here to view the recording of the Board Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestream Views: 84 • Recorded Meeting Views: 133 (as of week after board meeting)
January 20, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<p>Board adopted Resolution 21-03 of intent to initiate transition from at-large to by-trustee area elections beginning with the 2022 governing board election</p> <p>Click here to view the recording of the Board Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestream Views: 106 • Recorded Meeting Views: 143 (as of 1 week after board meeting)
July 14, 2021	<p>Launched a survey to the Natomas community to gather initial input on this transition. The questions were a combination of multiple choice and short answer questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 173 surveys were submitted, and 83.5% of NUSD stakeholders who responded stated that Trustee areas are of medium importance to very important. 57.3% stated that this is important or very important. <p>Click here to view the survey questions.</p> <p>Click here to review the feedback from this survey.</p>
July 21, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<p>Present timeline for transition to by-trustee area elections</p> <p>Click here to view the board presentation Click here to view the recording of the Board Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestream Views: 57

- Recorded Meeting Views: 21 (as of 1 week after board meeting)

July 26, 2021

Launched a second community survey to gather input about the possibility of NUSD seeking a waiver from the State Board of Education.

[Click here](#) to view the survey questions

- 2,419 responses were received, and 78.7% of responses indicated they wanted the district to seek a waiver, as opposed to having a special election.

Note: After this survey concluded the passage of Senate Bill 442 removed this requirement

August 4, 2021
(Regular Board Meeting)

- Demographer presents on map development process, criteria, etc.
- Pre-map public hearing #1

[Click here](#) to view the board presentation

[Click here](#) to view the recording of the Board Meeting

Note: No eComments were submitted for this item

- Livestream Views: 31
- Recorded Meeting Views: 19 (as of 1 week after board meeting)

August 5 – August 31, 2021 District meets with key stakeholders

- **Associations – CSEA & NTA** – August 16, 2021
- **Charter Leaders** – August 16, 2021
- **District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC)** – August 19, 2021 at 4:00 p.m.
 - Zoom Link: [no longer active]
- **Community Advisory Council (CAC)** – August 23, 2021 at 3:30 p.m.
 - Zoom Link: [no longer active]
- **Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council** – August 25, 2021

- **Natomas Chamber of Commerce** – August 25, 2021 at 12:00 p.m.

- Zoom Link: [no longer active]

- **Natomas Schools Foundation** – August 25, 2021 at 12:00 p.m.

- Zoom Link: [no longer active]

[Click here](#) to view the presentation in english.

[Click here](#) to view the presentation in spanish.

Estimate – Late August 2021	Federal census data received by the State of California
------------------------------------	---

**September 1, 2021
(Regular Board Meeting)**

Note: a continuance of the September 1, 2021 board meeting was held on September 14, 2021

- Pre-map public hearing #2

[Click here](#) to view the board presentation

[Click here](#) to view the eComments submitted for this public hearing

[Click here](#) to view the recording of the Board meeting

- Livestream Views: 61
- Recorded Meeting views: 815 (as of 1 week after board meeting)

September 23, 2021	Launched a third community survey to gather additional input prior to the map hearings
---------------------------	--

[Click here](#) to view the survey questions

[Click here](#) to review the feedback from this survey

**October 13, 2021
(Regular Board Meeting)**

[Click here](#) to view the presentation on stakeholder engagement & update on census data

[Click here](#) to view the recording of the Board meeting

Note: No eComments were submitted for this item

- Livestream Views: 215
- Recorded Meeting views: 46 (as of 1 week after board meeting)

Week of October 18**Population Density Maps**

In preparation for the draft maps that will be posted publicly sometime on Wednesday, October 20, please [click here](#) to view population density maps provided by the demographer. These are not maps that identify possible Trustee areas, this is additional information provided by the demographer. **Draft Maps Available For Viewing**
On October 20, 2021 draft maps became available for viewing, and were discussed during the 'Map Consideration' Public Hearing at the October 27 board meeting.

**October 27, 2021
(Regular Board Meeting)**

- Demographer presents / reviews proposed maps 'Map Consideration' public hearing #1
 - [Click here](#) to view the proposed draft map scenarios that were considered at this public hearing (posted October 20, 2021)

[Click here](#) to view the board presentation

[Click here](#) to view the eComments submitted for this public hearing

[Click here](#) to view the recording of the Board Meeting

[Click here](#) to view documentation on our outreach efforts

[Click here](#) to view estimated apartment populations for each draft map scenarios A-E

[Click here](#) to view a general heat map that shows the general locations of our Punjabi speaking students

[Click here](#) to view estimated housing growth numbers in Natomas over the next 10 years.

- Livestream Views: 211
- Recorded Meeting views: 54 (as of 1 week after board meeting)

November 4, 2021

Launched a fourth community survey to gather input on six draft map scenarios (maps A – F) prior to the second 'map consideration' public hearing on Monday, November 8.

Survey was made available in [English](#), [Spanish](#), or [Punjabi](#)

[Click here](#) for the survey questions

[Click here](#) to review the survey responses

- Received 653 responses (please see the Nov. 8 board presentation below to view the survey results)

November 8, 2021
(Special Board Meeting at Natomas High School)

- Present / review proposed maps 'Map Consideration' public hearing #2
 - [Click here](#) to view the proposed draft map scenarios that were considered at this public hearing (posted by November 1, 2021)

[Click here](#) to view the board presentation

[Click here](#) to view the eComments submitted for this public hearing

[Click here](#) to view the recording of the Special Board Meeting

[Click here](#) to view estimated apartment populations for each draft map scenarios A-F

- Livestream Views: 140
- Recorded Meeting views: 203 (as of 1 week after board meeting)

November 17, 2021
(Regular Board Meeting)

- 'Map Adoption' public hearing
 - [Click here](#) to review the proposed map scenarios that will be considered at this public hearing
 - [Click here](#) to view the eComments submitted for this public hearing
- Adopt final resolution
 - Board adopted **Resolution No. 21-44**, Selecting Proposed Trustee Map, Election Sequencing, and Initiating a Proposal to the County Committee for Adoption of By-Trustee-Area Elections
 - The NUSD Board of Trustees voted to approve and recommend the adoption of Map Scenario F, which can be viewed [here](#)

[Click here](#) to view the recording of the Board Meeting

- Livestream Views: 158
- Recorded Meeting views: _____ (will be posted approximately 1 week after the board meeting)

January/February County Committee hearing and action in regards to district's proposal

2022(Dates contingent on
County Committee's
availability to meet)

November 2022 Elections for trustee area seats by trustee-area

November 2024 Elections for remaining trustee-area seats by trustee-area

You may provide feedback on this process and draft maps at any time, 24/7, by
emailing trusteeareas@natomasunified.org



Lozano Smith
ATTORNEYS AT LAW


The California Voting Rights Act

Presented by: Roman J. Munoz and Michelle L. Cannon

Natomas Unified School District

December 16, 2020

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01



The California Voting Rights Act



California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”)

- Prohibits the use of “at-large” elections that impair the ability of a protected class to:
 - elect candidates of its choice; or
 - to influence the outcome of an election
- “Racially Polarized Voting”
- Proof of intent to discriminate not required

CVRA Litigation


- Public agencies lack of success in CVRA litigation
- High cost of litigation to public agencies- attorneys' fees
- Estimated fees and costs paid to *plaintiff's counsel*:
 - City of Modesto (\$3 million- settlement)
 - Tulare Regional Medical Center (\$500,000- settlement)
 - Madera Unified School District (\$162,500- court ordered)
 - ABC Unified (\$140,000- settlement)



At-Large Elections

Board members may reside anywhere in the District

Registered voters within the District may vote for all seats on the Board




By-Trustee Area Elections

Trustees must reside within specific trustee areas

Only voters residing within the specified trustee area may vote for that particular trustee

District boundaries



1 2 3 4 = Trustee

= Voters residing in Trustee area

Transitioning to By-Trustee Area Elections

- Public agencies can avoid CVRA *litigation* entirely, if transition within safe-harbor periods
 - Safe Harbor 1: Adopt resolution signaling intent to begin process to transition to by-trustee area elections within 45 days of receiving “Demand letter”
 - Cap on Plaintiff’s Attorney Fees (\$32,000)
 - Safe Harbor 2: If District adopts resolution of intent within 45 days of receiving demand letter, plaintiff cannot bring CVRA lawsuit for another 90 days from the date the resolution was passed

Process to Establish By-Trustee Area Elections

Local School Districts: Current Trustee Election System

- Board: 5 Trustees
- Election System: At-Large
- Sample Election Cycle:
 - 2020: Elect 3 Trustees
 - 2022: Elect 2 Trustees



Step 1: Adopt Intent Resolution

- District Board adopts intent resolution
- For safe harbor, intent resolution must be adopted within 45 days of receipt of demand letter to prevent plaintiffs from filing CVRA lawsuit for an additional 90 days



Step 2: District Development and Adoption of Map

“Pre-Map” Hearings: 2 public hearings prior to preparing proposed by-trustee area maps

“Map Consideration” Hearings: 2 public hearings to consider proposed by-trustee area maps

Map Adoption Hearing: Public hearing before adopting final by-trustee area map



Step 3: County Committee Review

- The County Committee must hold at least one hearing in the District to change the method of election
- The County Committee must vote to approve or deny the District's proposal.
- District would coordinate with Sacramento COE and the County Committee



Step 4: Election or Waiver from State Board of Education

- If County Committee approves the proposal, an election is called seeking voter approval
- This voter approval requirement can be waived by the State Board of Education
- Overwhelming majority of school districts who make the transition seek and have received this waiver from the SBE
- SBE waiver is requested in advance through the waiver process
 - SBE meeting schedule must be considered

Sample Timeline If Demand Letter Received



February 8: Demand letter received

March 10: Adopt Resolution of Intent &
Public Hearing on SBE Waiver, adopt Resolution
to seek SBE Waiver

March 24: Pre-map public hearing No. 1

March 31: Pre-map public hearing No. 2

Sample Timeline (Con't)

March 31-April 14: Demographer prepares multiple trustee area map options. Maps and “staggering schedules” must be published at least 7 days before public hearing

April 28: Map review public hearing No. 1

May 6: SBE hearing on District waiver request

May 12: Map review Public Hearing No. 2

Sample Timeline (Con't)

May 26: Final public hearing prior to map adoption.

May 28-June 5: County Committee Hearing on proposal, and potential acceptance

June 8: Last Day of 90 day Safe Harbor Period

November 2022: Election for three trustee areas

November 2024: Election for two trustee areas

Other Considerations

- District boundaries do not change.
- Terms of current board members do not change.
- All incumbent trustees complete their terms.
- By-Trustee Area maps must be adjusted after each federal census- every 10 years.



Unique Timing

- New Census data released in 2021 but delays expected
- Action before or after new census data?
- Action before or after demand letter?



What to do now, based on unique timing?

Public agencies may contemplate the following options:

- Proactively adopt a “letter of intent” to begin transition process when 2021 data released, for 2022 election.
- Adopt trustee areas with 2010 census data, and then update with 2020 census data.
- “Wait and see” approach. (Least conservative)

Presenter

Michelle L. Cannon

AT LOZANO SMITH

Michelle L. Cannon is a Partner in Lozano Smith's Sacramento office and co-chairs the firm's Labor and Employment Practice Group. Ms. Cannon works closely with school districts, county offices of education and community colleges in all areas of education law. She is an active member in the Labor & Employment, Students, Community Colleges, Charter Schools and Litigation Practice Groups. Ms. Cannon represents clients in all areas of education law, and has extensive experience in board governance, labor and personnel-related matters, student discipline, and charter school facilities. She was named a Northern California Super Lawyer each year from 2013 to 2018.



CONNECT

mcannon@lozanosmith.com
[916.329.7433]



Thank you from Lozano Smith.

Together with you, we're impacting communities and lives through:

- Professional development
- Volunteer projects
- Sponsorships and award programs
- Scholarships

#BlueHatProject
#LozanoSmithFoundation



Subscribe on your
favorite app or device.



Stay informed on your time.

Lozano Smith Podcast

lozanosmith.com/podcast

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

29

NUSD0045

For more information, questions and comments about the presentation, please feel free to contact:

Michelle L. Cannon

Partner


Tel: [916.329.7433]

mcannon@lozanosmith.com

*Or any of the attorneys
in one of our 8 offices*

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01





@LozanoSmith

Disclaimer: These materials and all discussions of these materials are for instructional purposes only and do not constitute legal advice. If you need legal advice, you should contact your local counsel or an attorney at Lozano Smith. If you are interested in having other in-service programs presented, please contact clientservices@lozanosmith.com or call (559) 431-5600.

Copyright © 2020 Lozano Smith

All rights reserved. No portion of this work may be copied, distributed, sold or used for any commercial advantage or private gain, nor any derivative work prepared therefrom, nor shall any sub-license be granted, without the express prior written permission of Lozano Smith through its Managing Partner. The Managing Partner of Lozano Smith hereby grants permission to any client of Lozano Smith to whom Lozano Smith provides a copy to use such copy intact and solely for the internal purposes of such client. By accepting this product, recipient agrees it shall not use the work except consistent with the terms of this limited license.

WDX #715893



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Resolution No. 21-03

IN THE MATTER OF: Initiate a Transition to a By-Trustee Area Election System
Commencing with the 2022 Governing Board Election

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Trustees of the Natomas Unified School District, at a regular meeting held on the 20th of January 2021, by the following roll call vote:

Jag Bains	aye
Micah Grant	aye
Ericka Harden	aye
Susan Heredia	aye
Lisa Kaplan	aye

Signed and approved by me after its passage:



Susan Heredia, President

Attest:



Ericka Harden, Clerk

WHEREAS, California Education Code sections 5019 and 5030 authorize the Sacramento County Committee on School District Organization (“County Committee”), upon application of a school district’s Governing Board, to change the method of election of governing board members in a school district under its jurisdiction;

WHEREAS, the California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”) disfavors the use of an “at-large” election system for governing board members of a school district if the “at-large” election system may impair the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election;

WHEREAS, board members of the Natomas Unified School District (“District”) are currently elected using an “at-large” election system (i.e., election system in which registered voters of the entire jurisdiction elect candidates to the Governing Board);

WHEREAS, the Board desires to promote meaningful voter involvement in the election of Board members and increase the ability of candidates to seek elected office;

WHEREAS, it is the considered view of the Board that the public interest will be better served by election of its board members using a “by-trustee area” election system (i.e., elections in which one candidate residing in each trustee area is elected by only the registered voters in that particular trustee area);

WHEREAS, the boundaries for trustee areas in a by-trustee area election system are established based on population counts and demographics from the most recent United States' census; and

WHEREAS, the United States' census count occurs every ten (10) years with the last census count occurring in 2010 ("2010 Census") and the next census count scheduled to take place on April 1, 2020 ("2020 Census"), with the results to be made available to state and local agencies on or after March, 2021;

WHEREAS, due to the Coronavirus pandemic the results of the 2020 Census will be delayed and are not expected to be released until on or after July 1, 2021;

WHEREAS, if the District transitioned to by-trustee area elections prior to the release of the 2020 Census, the trustee areas would be established based on the 2010 Census, which (1) may not fairly and accurately reflect the current voter population distribution and demographics of the District, and (2) would require the District to incur additional, duplicative costs to adjust the trustee areas based on the 2020 Census as required by Education Code Section 5019.5;

WHEREAS, further due to the Coronavirus pandemic Governor Newsom issued Executive Orders N-34-20 and N-38-20 which toll the public hearing requirements and safe harbor provisions of the CVRA while social distancing measures remain in place;

WHEREAS, the adoption of "by-trustee area" elections will not affect the terms of any Board members serving or elected during this transition, each of whom will serve out his or her full term; and

WHEREAS, the Board, cognizant of its need to be fiscally responsible, desires to implement this change in the manner of electing board members in a cost effective and efficient manner but with all deliberate speed following release of the 2020 Census data.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board hereby resolves, orders and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct;
2. Trustee area boundary lines shall be developed based on the most updated federal decennial census data following its release in 2021 to provide for "by-trustee areas" elections to be implemented in the 2022 and 2024 election cycles;
3. After the availability of the 2020 Census, pursuant to Education Code sections 5019, 5030 and other applicable provisions of law, the Board directs District staff to transmit this resolution to the County Committee so that the County Committee will be on notice of the District's intent, to adopt a change in the method of electing members of the Board from "at-large" elections to "by-trustee area" elections commencing with the 2022 Board elections;
4. Before submitting a final proposal to the County Committee for trustee area maps using the 2020 federal census data, multiple public hearings in accordance with Elections Code section 10010 and other applicable laws shall be scheduled to obtain public input on the draft maps and proposals;

5. The Board shall apply to the County Committee for establishment of trustee areas pursuant to Education Code section 5019 in a timely manner and as soon as feasible to have the 2022 elections for the Board conducted within the new trustee areas;
6. The Superintendent, or designee, is hereby directed to contract with National Demographics Corporation or other reputable demographer as soon as possible following adoption of this resolution to ensure that the District is able to move with all deliberate speed following release of the 2020 census data;
7. The Superintendent, or designee, is hereby directed to prepare additional Board resolutions and documents, as needed, to meet all applicable legal requirements in a timely manner acting with all deliberate speed, and to seek a waiver from the State Board of Education of the election requirement imposed by Education Code section 5020;
8. The Superintendent, or designee, shall consult with legal counsel to take all steps necessary to implement and give effect to this resolution; and
9. The foregoing resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) Survey

Last December, the Natomas Unified Board of Trustees directed staff to begin the process of moving Natomas Unified (NUSD) from at-large elections to Trustee Areas. Trustee Areas will include five (5) areas that make sure the 5 areas are each represented by an elected NUSD Trustee who will live within a specific Trustee Area.

Our Natomas Unified community will have multiple chances to learn more about this process. This is Natomas Unified's first 2021 engagement opportunity for our community.

1. Please mark the boxes that best describe you (check all that apply)

Check all that apply.

- Natomas resident
- NUSD staff member
- NUSD parent / guardian
- NUSD student
- Natomas business owner
- Other not already mentioned

2. If you are NOT an NUSD stakeholder, please select the box below

Mark only one oval.

- I am not an NUSD stakeholder

3. Major streets/highways can often act as natural boundaries and help map makers (demographers) when they draft Trustee Areas. Which streets do you see as potential natural boundaries in NUSD? There are no right or wrong answers, just information to help the demographers. Check all that apply from your perspective:

Check all that apply.

- I-5
- I-80
- Del Paso Road
- El Centro Road
- San Juan Road
- Truxel Road / Natomas Blvd.
- Arena Blvd.
- Club Center Drive
- East Commerce Way
- W. El Camino Ave.

4. What major landmarks do you feel can also help with identify Trustee Areas?
 (Examples: Natomas High School, Aquatic Center, Fire Station on El Centro, etc)
-

5. As of today, Natomas has three city council member districts. Should city council districts play a role in NUSD boundary setting?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

6. If you would like, please briefly explain why you answered the previous question the way you did.
-

7. NUSD has 21 schools including charter schools. Do you think there should be a minimum or maximum number of schools included in each Trustee area?

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

8. If you would like, please briefly explain why you answered the previous question the way you did.

9. North Natomas and South Natomas - How important is it for you to have South and North representation?

10. What else would you like to know about the change from At-Large Trustee elections to By-Trustee Area elections?

11. On a scale of 1 to 10 (ten being VERY IMPORTANT and 1 being I DON'T CARE) what does this change in Trustee elections mean to you?

Mark only one oval.

- 1 - I don't care
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Very important

12. What are your biggest worries or negatives about new Trustee Areas?

13. What are the biggest plusses or positives about new Trustee Areas?

14. Other comments or questions:

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Encuesta sobre la Ley de Derechos Electorales de California (CVRA)

El diciembre pasado, la Junta Directiva del Distrito Escolar Unificado de Natomas dirigió al personal para iniciar el proceso de trasladar el Distrito Escolar Unificado de Natomas (NUSD) de las elecciones generales a las Áreas de Fideicomisarios. Las Áreas fideicomisarias incluirán cinco (5) áreas que se aseguran de que las 5 áreas estén representadas por un fideicomisario electo de NUSD que vivirá dentro de un área fideicomisaria específica.

Nuestra comunidad de Natomas tendrá oportunidades múltiples de aprender más sobre este proceso. Esta es la primera oportunidad en el 2021 del Distrito Unificado de Natomas para la participación para nuestra comunidad.

1. Marque las casillas que mejor lo describan (marque todas las que le correspondan)

Check all that apply.

- Residente de Natomas
- Empleado de NUSD
- Padre/Tutor de NUSD
- Estudiante de NUSD
- Dueño de negocio de Natomas
- Otros ya no mencionados

2. Las calles / carreteras principales a menudo pueden actuar como límites naturales y ayudar a los creadores de mapas (demógrafos) cuando redactan las áreas fiduciarias. ¿Qué calles ve como posibles límites naturales en el Distrito Unificado de Natomas? No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas, solo información para ayudar a los demógrafos. Marque todo lo que se aplique desde su perspectiva:

Check all that apply.

- I-5
- I-80
- Del Paso Blvd.
- El Centro Road
- San Juan Road
- Truxel Road / Natomas Blvd.
- Arena Blvd.
- Club Center Drive
- East Commerce Way
- W. El Camino Ave.

3. ¿Qué puntos de referencia importantes cree que también pueden ayudar a identificar las áreas fiduciarias? (Ejemplos Natomas High School, Aquatic Center, Estación de Bomberos en El Centro, etc.)
-

4. Al día de hoy, Natomas tiene tres distritos de miembros del consejo de la ciudad. ¿Deberían los distritos del consejo de la ciudad jugar un papel en el establecimiento de límites del NUSD?

Mark only one oval.

- Sí
- No

5. Si lo desea, por favor explique brevemente por qué respondió a la pregunta anterior de la manera en que lo hizo.
-

6. NUSD tiene 21 escuelas, incluidas las escuelas chárters. ¿Cree que debería haber un número mínimo o máximo de escuelas incluidas en cada área del Fideicomisario?

Mark only one oval.

Sí

No

7. Si lo desea, por favor explique brevemente por qué respondió a la pregunta anterior de la manera en que lo hizo.
-
-
-

8. Natomas del Norte y Natomas del Sur - ¿Qué tan importante es para usted tener representación del Sur y del Norte?
-

9. ¿Qué más le gustaría saber sobre el cambio de las elecciones de fideicomisario a las elecciones de área por fideicomisario?
-

10. En una escala del 1 al 10 (diez es MUY IMPORTANTE y 1 es NO ME IMPORTA), ¿qué significa para usted este cambio en las elecciones de Fideicomisario?

Mark only one oval.

1 - No me importa

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 - Muy Importante

11. ¿Cuáles son sus mayores preocupaciones o aspectos negativos acerca de las nuevas Áreas de Fideicomisarios?
-

12. ¿Cuáles son las mayores ventajas o aspectos positivos de las nuevas Áreas fideicomisarias?
-

13. Otros comentarios o preguntas:
-
-
-
-



This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

1st Community Survey

Feedback on Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections

July 2021



What major landmarks do you feel can also help with identifying Trustee Areas?

(Examples: Natomas High School, Aquatic Center, Fire Station on El Centro, etc)¹⁰⁹

responses

Natomas High School

Aquatic center

Arena

South Natomas, North Natomas, Natomas High, Inderkum

Kohl's, H Allen Height, Paso Verde School, Natomas High School, Leroy Greene

None.

NUSD School District

Librarys

Northgate Blvd

West lake Park, Natomas Regional Park, NHS

McClellan

I don't know

Natomas high and Inderkum

I don't believe this matters as trustees should represent every child and landmarks have nothing to do with learning

none

Elkhorn blvd is the end on the north and west elcamino in the south.

Inderkum HS, Natomas HS and Fire Station at Club Center

Zip code

Canal

NHS

natomas high, natomas charter, Allen Hight middle, pfaa, garden highway

Natomas High, Inderkum,

All of the schools in the district

Neighborhoods like NextDoor does, ie Natomas Park, Village 5, South Natomas, Creekside, Witter Ranch

PFAA Campus, Inderkum HS

Elkhorn Rd

Water Tank on Elkhorn

South Natomas Library, North Natomas Library

Huckleberry

Natomas elementary school

Currently existing schools and fire stations

El centro

NA

North Natomas Library

I think major roadways would be better suited.

Public libraries, aquatic center, westlake park, blackbird park, natomas regional park, former arco

High Schools

Westlake Area (PVS, Wlitter), Natomas Park Area (NMS, HAH, Heron, IHS, Creekside), East NP (NP
Elem, Natomas Crossing), Natomas HS (JF, AL, BC), and SW area (Two Rivers Elem, LGA)

Westlake, Natomas High, Inderkum, LGA -

Inderkum HS; Aquatic Center, Sleep Train

na

Club center Area

All NUSD schools, parks and community centers, commerce and retail centers

TARGET, PARKS, AND GROCERY STORES

The existing school boundaries should inform the boundaries so parents can escalate issues to a
trustee over their school.

Westlake, west shore, the clubhouse

Inderkum High School

Natomas High School

Fire Station on W. El Camino

Probably by subdivisions/developments as they are listed on city maps.

Inderkum high school and the club center

Natomas high school, el centro, San Juan, arena blvd

Charters

Fire Stations

Natomas High, Leroy Greene Academy, El Centeno Fire Station, inderkum high school

Doc does not allow East Commerce Way to be checked. I don't think landmarks should be used.

None, its a bad idea.

Acro Arena

The 2 high schools

Aquatic Center on Del Paso Blvd.

South Natomas Library, North Natomas Library, Natomas Marketplace/Promenade, Northgate Blvd,

Ideally create trustee areas that have vertical integration- where a trustee would represent portions of north and south Natomas where feasible

El Centro, Garden Highway, Sacramento & American Rivers,

Aquatic Center

Sleep Train Arena

Each high school, including charters- Natomas, Inderkum, PFAA, NP3, WCHS, North & South

Natomas libraries

Community centers

Use census population data to draw the boundary. Follow standard process followed by city and county across the country to draw their boundary every 10 years

School geographic area boundaries

Natomas High

Inderkum and Natomas High Schools also the Fire Station

Inderkum High School, Club House on Club Center

Aquatic Center and Fire Station in El Centro

schools

bannon creek parkway, north natomas regional park

Natomas library on truxel road south

Arco Arena

truxel road. El Camino east commerce

South Natomas Library

South Natomas Library/Community Center, North Natomas Library

Whittier Ranch school

Natomas high school

Arco Arena, Natomas high school

We should use a mathematical model based on population, or this BS.

Inderkum High, Natomas High

Natomas High School, Leroy Green, Inderkum

Northgate corridor, parks or neighborhood centers

Natomas High School, H. Allen Height, Fire Station on El Centro, Fire Station on Club Center,

Each public high school (IHS, NHS-DHS, NP3)

Our existing schools

I'm new to the area so I'm not sure.

Truck Stop on El Centro, Elkhorn Blvd, all of Natomas Park West


Natomas High Inderkum High Leroy Greene Fire Stations, and Community Centers

poor grammar in question - someone should have proof read! Irrelevant question to me.

South Natomas Library,

As of today, Natomas has three city council member districts. Should city council districts play a role in NUSD boundary setting?

163 responses



If you would like, please briefly explain why you answered the previous question the way you did. 93 responses

I think we should have new boundaries for new roles, especially because existing ones may favor specific groups because of segregation, redlining, etc.

The council districts struggle with fragmentation of services.

Different geographic areas and agendas

Consistency & less confusing if they align

Should be kept in house.

Wouldn't it be easier to use boundaries that are already set? That way you only need to make up two more districts for trustees, correct?

I live out of the "norm" district

I don't think city council district representatives really represent their districts as well

Balance of powerb

See answer above - every trustee represents every child and the city council districts should not influence the maps drawn.

Because the city council districts are gerrymandered garbage.

Because it's all Natomas and they should have a say so

It should be the area covered by NUSD.

It politicizes academics very very negatively

South Natomas should not be obliterated by the power, money, and influence of the north.

I'm not entirely sure it would be inclusive/representative of the diversity

I do not think the City Council member district accurately depicts the demographics or represents the student body in the distrit

For more equal representation, the 5 districts should be divided equally by population density so that each of the 5 represents the same approx number of students/families. How would you decide the other 2 if you went by city districts? Also, the city districts are based upon population density of entire city, so it would screw the districts in NUSD boundaries.

"I don't know" wasn't an option, and I think it would be better to at least take them into consideration than not at all.

I live in Natomas (off East Commerce and Greg Thatch), however my child has to attend school in Twin Rivers school district. It's a five minute walk to a NUSD school in our neighborhood but instead she is required to attend a school 8 miles away.

Based on Natomas population

City council districts aren't chosen with any regards to kids - this is about what's best for the kids

Designate by Natomas Communities and not political boundaries

They have a more in depth information and understanding.

Tying NUSD boundaries to city districts adds another level of unnecessary bureaucracy.

City council should play a role for NUSD

N/A

I would like it to be a committee of stakeholders in the district instead.

Efficient election process, work together cohesively, same grouping demographics, similar landmarks and issues

they can be natural boundaries

No, those are based on city wide demographic data, I think that isn't equal to Natomas. Natomas should be divided based on Natomas only

It should be parents of NUSD students and local business owners - not politicians

Natural geography, rather than political map is more logical

Avoid setting up political office stepping stones. Political competition by local electeds keeps them all focused on a bigger picture.

It will create power imbalances. City council districts should have ZERO impact upon NUSD boundaries. Also, the city is undergoing redistricting, so what is true now might not be true 2 or 3 years from now. Also, there are SIGNIFICANT equity and equality issues.

City of Sacramento redistricting should have no impact on NUSD boundaries....it doesn't work that way in other area school districts.

I have no idea what those are.

The school board does not need to align with any other political bodies and should be focused and responsive to the community regardless of how the city divides areas

Boundaries already established I assume based on populations.

It is easier to use any existing boundaries in place that work.

Most do not live in Natomas

City council districts don't split just The district. They include other areas/districts.

City Council members may politicize School Boards, should be kept separate and apart

Redlining and boundary-setting is serious political work. You do not want the city council boundaries the same as the trustee boundaries. It can duplicate and exacerbate inequities.

If you actually live in Natomas you should be apart of the NUSD instead of Twin Rivers

These are distinct and separate reasons

Cross representation will better serve our students, instead of Trustees or Council members only focusing on their area

City Council already does a poor job with their current duties there is no reason to give the city council more responsibility to screw up.

It is my understanding that only five trustees will be chosen. The only way to distribute these districts fairly would be to have six trustees or two per district. Otherwise lines should be drawn in a more diplomatic fashion to fairly and evenly represent Natomas.

Knowledge of city, experience

The boundaries should be newly defined. The city council boundaries were decided before recent construction.

The council districts seem to have no correlation to school districts

The city council should have no influence. The public should be able to vote for whoever lives in the school district.

The way those districts are broken up won't make sense to how our schools would be divided by Trustee areas.

There may be a benefit to trustees/board members being defined along with the council districts to align with council members on the local area needs

It seems logical to use the City Council boundaries, since they already exist. I'm not sure if those boundaries reflect our district's diversity though.

No comment

Those lines will likely be redrawn this year, possibly making them irrelevant. Also, we don't need to be a political stepping stone.

This will bring politics into decision making process

City council districts are unbalanced within NUSD and we're drawn to protect existing council members.

NUSD should remain independent.

Preference to keep separate.

Manage their own respective areas includes schools. Overlap may conflict with other events that represent I've may not be fully versed in

Change

n/a

city council districts are already wonky and poorly represent natomas. linking those to new trustee districts will reinforce the poorly designed city council districts at the natomas level.

For better development and empowerment decision making

I would like an impartial body deciding I feel politicians may have a different motive than educators

I don't feel counsel member agree and can cause conflict

City Council can't find their way out of a box. They wouldn't add anything.

Council areas stretch outside NUSD boundaries which may complicate the issues of accurately representing the various parts of our district

They know the city

City council play important rule in society

I would like to see 1 or at the most 2 council districts in Natomas

Because we do not want undue influence from the city council.

Those districts are completely irrelevant to NUSD

Not necessarily, NUSD trustee boundaries should be based on neighborhoods. I'm not sure how the city Council draws their lines.

Consistency, sustainability, and integrity of rules

Only if the city council members are aware of the needs of their constituents when it comes to education.

Could lead to political favoritism

The focus should be on schools not the general population

No because all right the trustees should be knowledgeable to set the boundaries that will best benefit each School and sector

I don't like the idea of sectioning out the district as kids go to schools outside what would be considered boundaries in Natomas. My kids go to different Natomas schools and neither are near our house. This makes absolutely no sense.

Not sure that matters

With city council politics can get in the way- instead of an objective decision based upon the best interests of the children


They have the experience with the neighborhoods.

They have expertise on enrollment and population in the district

Do not want to encourage people to run for school board only because it would appear to be a stepping stone for city council.

NUSD has 21 schools including charter schools. Do you think there should be a minimum or maximum number of schools included in each Trustee area?

168 responses



If you would like, please briefly explain why you answered the previous question the way you did. 93 responses

Just because certain schools/areas may have more people, and I think it's more important for there to be a number of people to be represented, than a number of schools. Thus, everyone despite their school is getting a say.

There are many Charter Schools in Natomas, there needs to coordination with the district to determine the best place for Charter Schools as well as traditional schools.

There should be some balance

I think the break up should distribute the areas schools as evenly as possible also keeping the population even.

Enrollment # makes more sense than # of schools Divide each area to include similar # of students
If there is a minimum and maximum number of schools in an area, it would hopefully prevent one school from dominating an area and setting up boundaries that would lead certain schools (students and parents)to be more dominant and have more impact when voting

So the trustees have an equal as possible to look after an not have one overwhelmed by too many schools to look after.

The trustees are meant to represent the schools and it doesn't make sense for one district to have two and another to have 10. They don't have to have the exact number for each district, but numbers should be close.

To keep it a manageable size to oversee accountability

Fairness

Balance

Each district should have the same number of charters - spread evenly through the trustee areas as they are independent charters. It would be nice if districts represented 3 or 4 schools each including charters.

Trustee areas should include roughly the same number of students but also not be concentrated in just a few schools. Minimum number of schools is a good idea. Don't care about maximum number nor do I think it makes sense.

Due to lack of schools in Natomas, we need to make sure we are at the max. They keep building all these over priced homes in Natomas and no schools.

Trustees should know and represent several schools.

Schools need flexibility to support those children being serviced. Sweeping accountability inevitably leads to inequities and lessening responsibility.

The less schools, the more attention each school can receive.

student population averages or maximums may be more telling?

I think there should be a certain number to give a better depiction of the students

The trustees need to have non-charter schools in their areas. Right now, the charter schools are far superior than the non-charter. It creates a disproportionate learning experience in the district for those students who did not "win the lottery" or those socioeconomically disadvantaged who cannot afford the transportation & other expenses that come along with the charter schools. We need trustees who are going to level the playing field so we stop losing families moving out or transferring to private because the local non-charter school is low quality.

Areas should be roughly balanced, but may vary by location.

Too many schools in one area doesn't allow the trustee to invest adequate time into the schools.

Schools need to be all open for enrollment based on location

Fairness and representation

Each area of Natomas is different and should be represented

Trustees should represent roughly the same population/area as other trustees

It shouldn't matter how many schools a trustee has in his/her area

N/A

Most of the charter schools are independent and do not represent the interest of Natomas Unified. It should be based mostly on population and diversity. Further there are many charters in the north area of Natomas. There are no charters located in South Natomas bordered by I-5 to the west, Garden Hwy to the south, and I-80 to the north.

Hard for Trustee to meet each pta and principal and group needs if one has more schools constitutes to manage than the other.

Areas should be based on resident population.

It should be geographical, and balanced by population.

This should be based on demographics of the population, some of those are charters. School numbers can change

It will be easier to have Trustees with knowledge of their neighborhood schools- kind of a local expert

I support the goal.of having the map makers look at facility equity when approaching their task.

Are we talking about charter schools operating under the NUSD or the county?

At least a minimum number.

The focus should be number of students or households represented.

Attempt to divide schools evenly among trustee areas.

To evenly distribute the influence each Trustee has

I think if more NUSD students live in a particular geographic area, that area should have more board trustee representation.

The 5 areas should operate uniformly , the idea of giving min/max lends to open up disparaging inequities

Natomas is growing, more people are moving here, there should be a sufficient number of schools for kids

Construction may not have kept up with population growth. Let the schools and boundaries fall where they may.

Each Trustee area should have no more than 1 charter school in their area, and should represent at least 2 Natomas Unified Schools

We need people who live here to represent our schools. Any out of town principal can work here and not do it for the district but for the salary. We need to focus on local accountability

While each area should evenly represent residence and students we must also be cautious that there is not a largely uneven amount of schools represented in any given area. Perhaps setting a minimum such as three would help in this.

It would seem odd to have, say, 3 schools in one district and 10 in another

The trustee areas should be roughly equivalent based on number of students/residents in each area, not based on geographic size

Vote for whoever lives in the district. The five people with the most votes win.

Trustee areas should represent number of students, not number of schools in an area

One person cannot be effective if they have too many schools under them - additionally, if the schools they are covering include elementary, middle, high and charter, the obvious differences that occur in the needs of them would also bog down the trustee/board member from being able to provide proper service to all.

The borders and locations of the schools don't exactly match the different concerns of each area of Natomas.

This way all schools may have equal(ish) representation to the governance of the district

No comment

A somewhat equal amount of schools and population should be represented

Trustee role and responsibility should be equally divided.

Each should have approximately the same number of schools

Too many become unmanageable.

This will help ensure equity in responsibility.

Each trustee should be responsible to consider impact on children's education.

Share the duties

The more school the better parents and teachers need to know their community school is reliable instead of going some place else

Reasonable class sizes is a priority for me and less schools means teachers will have more workload and would not have the time needed to help students

Every school every student needs a trustee in their area that they can focus on or parents know they can reach if there is an issue

Considering charter schools, the number of schools in a district is not necessarily representative of that area's population and school attendance.

I think this should be considered, but more importantly the consideration should be around school populations and communities with similar needs should be represented by a candidate who can truly understand those needs.

We need more middle and high schools

Easier to handle

A minimum number of schools in each district

With the population growth and new developments, we have to look at where the constituents are and will be. Schools schools properly reflect population density and thus have an impact on representation.

Yes, because, some schools will have more influence than others or more population.

It should be by area

I think the areas should be based on population and geography, not school sites.

It's similar to the population demographic regulations for city council district boundaries

I think it should be geographical.

Just so the Trustees have a bit if similarity in the work they are doing.

Putting a max on number of schools per rep will prevent any one board member from having more power than the others

I feel they should be spit close to evenly. It won't be exact. Ideally a mixture of schools would be best NSM

It should be divided by population

Trustee areas make no sense and my kids go to different schools in Natomas and my house is in a different area so the Trustee would make no sense. I am not alone in taking my kids to schools not in my neighborhood.

Everyone should have several schools so the workload is spread out

Not enough data to make an educated answer

fairness

Number of schools is not the same as enrollment. Both factors should be considered, perhaps additional factors as well.

It should be by area, whatever happens to be there

This whole plan is a bad idea. The evidence all points to elections by area as resulting in worse governance of the school district.

North Natomas and South Natomas - How important is it for you to have South and North representation?142 responses

Very important

Very

Very important

Very

Important

VERY! South Natomas gets dealt way less resources than North Natomas and they need to be heard!

All parts of the community should be represented. Each neighborhood has unique issues that need representation.

All areas should be represented

Very. All students should have someone living in their immediate area to fight for them.

Very Important

It's a boundary so it's important

Very important since there are different beds for each section.

Both should be represented. There are different needs at times in these areas of Natomas. One area should not be overly represented. This could lead to de facto segregation and unequal representation

Very important. So all schools are looked after and have representation.

Both are important.

Not important

I'd rather have left and right of I-5 and north and south of Arena/Del Paso

It is not important- more important that maps are drawn so there is not a N/S Natomas fight - maybe draw districts east to west

The geography is not relevant. It is if the residents within the trustee areas have common concerns and issues. I do think those concerns and issues are likely to be different in north and south Natomas due to different demographics. But there is nothing inherently important about the geography.

Extremely important

Very...The energy is very different. I'm not a big fan of South Natomas. North Natomas is safer to me.

Not important. When you have north and south, you should have East and West

As long as they are from the areas where the schools are, they will represent that geography.

Meh

Very important

VERY important to have both halves represented so there don't end up being unequal representation/large disparities.

Very as the needs in each area are very different

Very important to have both sides represented as each have different needs and concernsd

Very important. South represents a lower socioeconomic population & those children deserve high quality education as well.

Yes, better to have both represented.

Not important. We should be ONE Natomas. Separation has caused a stigma to be place on residents in South Natomas.

Vital

very important

South Natomas is grossly underrepresented in many aspects and it is the lower income area with older schools

very

As each area has its own libraries , community centers it is important

It's important to represent both sides of Natomas

Very important to have South Natomas representation

Important. Different demographic and issues. Deserve equal voice.

It is most important since south Natomas is currently not physically represented except for Trustee Harden.

South must be, it is not now.

VERY! each community is unique and knows their neighborhood the best. They are able to decide the priorities that best meet the needs of that neighborhood

I support 5 district trustee seats that are as.equal in shape, population, diversity and economics as is possible.

VERY South Natomas has been ignored for SO LONG. Also, South Natomas is more diverse and less wealthy. Please make sure to center and amplify South Natomas!!

Extremely...South Natomas was developed before North Natomas, and often gets neglected.

South Natomas is underrepresented

Extremely important!

Most important issue to those of us who live in South Natomas, because we are often left out when it comes to representation

I think representation should be based on population and not on number of schools,

Very important because both areas are totally different

Very Important

We're ALL Natomas !!!

I prefer not to continue the stigma of North or South, but trustee areas should be drawn to include both North and South in them. If we were to only draw N/S - South Natomas would only have 2 trustees and it would always continue the us vs them - which is inappropriate when dealing with children and their education.

Very important. Natomas is not meeting the needs in either case.

All of Natomas should be represented to create the equity the board is seeking.

Important— these areas have a history of claiming inequity

Very. South Natomas is under represented and each area has unique needs

The board represents the entire district, not just the area where each member lives.

important

Very Important. There should be representation in both North and South Natomas..

I believe this need to be broken down even further. I live in North but just above San Juan Road. Our community is significantly different than say the Regency Park or Club areas while still being different than the South. People need to be familiar with the subtle differences that exist in all of Natomas's great neighborhoods.

100% vital

Ideally both. Trustees should have the interests of all nusd students - not just one geographic area.

very important!! I've only lived here for six months, but even I can see the wonderful diversity in South Natomas as compared to north natomas.

Representation should reflect the population

Fairly important

Very important because of the growing community

Unsure

not really

Very important to ensure South has fair representation

Don't care.

Very keep them separate!

Important

All should be represented.

somewhat. the demographics, house values, and family income levels are quite different. this change will inherently reinforce those disparities.

South is a must, currently South is overlooked and ignored, took forever to update Jefferson while north had new schools built.

100% agree we need all hands on deck to make all matters work best for the community
very important all should be heard, each area have different priorities

Somewhat important

very important

Extremely. Needs ans demographics differ.

It is not important

North Natomas is important to me.

N/A

Both areas has different envirnoment so its better to have thrie own representatives

South Natomas will have less proportionate representation because you will carve it out that way.

South Natomas is poorer and poorer places always get fucked in these situations. As a south Natomas resident I am fully against the idea of making representation I've boundaries.

Not very important

Extremely important because they represent different demographics.

VERY IMPORTANT.

Critical.

Not important as long as there is equal representation based on population.

All NUSD area should be represented.

No

Very: utmost importance that South be represented fairly and equitably

Of course. Isn't that the point?

i want North represented

I think it should just be divided by population in numbers not by distance

It is very important that South Natomas schools have same representation and resources as North Natomas Schools. It is a known and felt divide amongst staff, students and families.

Both should be represented as we have schools in both areas. Income disparities should not affect their ability to be represented on school trustee issues.

I live in So. Natomas and I don't think it matters they should represent all areas the same.

What else would you like to know about the change from At-Large Trustee elections to By-Trustee Area elections?66 responses

None

Nothing

NA

We have a north and a south...how will we break up the five trustees? Do we make north Natomas have two larger areas and south of three smaller areas or vice versa?

Good change 

Not sure yet

If you live in Natomas- you should attend school in Natomas USD not twin rivers

I would like to know all the benefits. It is a good idea because living inside the district you represent encourages the Trustee to be invested

The specific district boundaries

Can the district approve maps and still get elected district wide b/c it doesn't make sense that a trustee only represents a certain area.

What is the justification for this change? is it mandated by law? Because explanation didn't say that. Making each trustee accountable to a smaller group of citizens is completely negative. The explanation of lower cost campaigns is ridiculous. It is already extremely low for school board trustee.

Not at the moment

Just keep it simple - a paragraph will do.

that it will create better representation and not have the same board members on the board for years
Hopefully this will make things better for the students and lessen the inequalities between the charter and non-charter schools that harm students.

What will the areas be? How can I get information about trustees from my area?

Results

What does it change?

When is this change effective?

How many ppl and schools in each area. How will first election work.

How will it affect current sitting members?

What is the first election that these will be in place? 2022? 2023? 2024?

How will change be implemented in terms of voting cycles.

This is good and long overdue.

I would like to know population and demographic information about the new districts to ensure they are fair.

In the last election there were 3 great candidates from the same small neighborhood, How do we ensure that we have the best board members and are not missing out on great leadership because of where people live?

Everything I need to know, as a resident & tax payer

Transparency is key

Why

How much money from their affiliate political parties are helping or donating to elect trustees. The board is very one way politically and will not acknowledge their failings

Impact on current trustees. How many are at risk of losing their seats? Will every seat be up for reelection with the shift to by-trustee area election process takes effect?

Are citizens in the district limited who they can vote for based on where the citizen lives?

What the territory's are going to be and who is in my territory in term of Trustee. in my territory

Updates and ways to participate

What exactly it means

Just updates

What are the possible benefits of this way, what could we lose?

Bring diversity, make minimum education requirement for trustee. should not have conflict of interest, religious & political affiliation etc....

Nothing.

Background, accomplishments (data), intent, impacts, etc.

n/a

Nothing much. Just equal share of what is given

What happens if no one in a trustee area wants to run?

Will there be an opportunity to provide additional input after a draft of trustee districts is available?

Nothing. Don't do it. It is a terrible idea for such a small region. Living on a particular street does not drastically change ones needs from a school board.

Must make sure the Trustee elected does live in the specified area and it must be their main residence.

Transparency in process and outcomes and current members' voting records on the process and decisions

What happens if a trustee moves out of their elected area?

What differences will occur?

why would this be beneficial other than for election purposes. Hopefully its not just for trustees to get votes

Terrible idea, don't know why this is being done. I know folks from all Natomas areas and feel we are all represented the same.

Is there a possibility there will not be anyone running in 2022

What specific improvements for equity for students will come about due to this change?


THe impact on current Trustees. Will they need to move?

Who came up with this idea?

What options do we have to stop this from happening?

On a scale of 1 to 10 (ten being VERY IMPORTANT and 1 being I DON'T CARE) what does this change in Trustee elections mean to you?

167 responses



What are your biggest worries or negatives about new Trustee Areas? 101 responses

None

Certain schools or people will dominate the board/ elections.

Limiting good representatives who happen to live in the same area.

I am afraid that as population grows, South Natomas will lack representation.

Maybe the best candidates won't always be able to run

I want all students to be represented and fought for, including lower income, extra needs and charter.

Nine it's being taken very slowly

That it is done in a transparent and equitable manner. It needs to be thought out and responsible.

I just don't want it to become a political mess. Will Natomas be able to move forward without selfishness?

Some areas are none to minimally represented

None, I'm hopeful it can represent and address the neighborhood challenges that can affect my child's education

Perception of a North / South fight... making sure that maps are drawn that cross boundaries and are not just aligned with a neighborhood so that Trustees represent cross sections of Natomas not just their area. Not sure why we have to go to trustee areas when what Natomas has is working and has diversity on the board.

Making each trustee accountable to smaller portion of residents is entirely negative. Allows for even smaller groups of people to exert too much influence which already happens because so few people engage in this area.

People being segregated based on neighborhood values.

I don't know

Parents/voters not invested.

unsure yet

I have no worries or negatives I think anything is better than what we currently have

That they will favor some higher performing schools and leave out lower performing schools.

What will happen if there is not a competent candidate in an area? What happens when their interests are at odds with other trustees?

Busing of out of neighborhood kids

I don't know how it will change things so transparency is key

Lack of candidates to volunteer to run for elections in certain areas

Making sure our area has adequate and informed representation

NA

I'm not even sure what it means honestly

I do not have any big worries about this.

Potentially less representation since we only have one person vs "all" trustees and we may be stuck with a "bad" one until election. Will they represent NUSD demographics.

Experienced trustees will be removed from the Board and replaced by inexperienced members based on their residence

None. It will be a positive move, and we have needed it for a while.

That they are gerrymandered

No worries at all.

That the those in power (who all live in North Natomas) will do all they can to keep power concentrated in North Natomas.

The area is growing a lot. Hope it is representative of our community.

Loss of institutional knowledge and squeezing out great board members because they live in the same area

Only on fairness of area division.

South Natomas being left out

With all the leadership failures in our public service, everything is suspect if people being appointed have hidden agenda or are there to be of service to all people

I want the Trustee Areas to be equally represented

No representation or advocates for underrepresented or underserved students

North / South us vs them mentality, too many charter schools in one trustee area, making sure that a district is drawn with a minority - majority is very important. Not always sticking with the freeway as a natural barrier when drawing maps b/c that would segregate Natomas...

My worries are that the budgets get spent and the schools don't get any better. The ROI is pretty low and home school is looking better all the time

Unsure

The potential siloed thinning that can arise from Trustee Areas could cause rifts when all system initiatives are presented.

Fairness in division of the area

I don't want to lose institutional knowledge of current trustees. Is there a way to phase this in?

Can residents in the district vote for anyone living in the district, or only candidates who live in the residents Trustee Area?

None

We all know that certain schools get more attention than others because of greater parent involvement, I hope schools without that parent involvement are not taken for granted in decision making; there is a north side school that has an AP; many south side schools don't have that, but really need one, if not more because the support at home is not as great or available.

They do not know the area and the school's in that area.

The delays that will inevitable exist until everyone is up to speed - in the end, however, it should be better for all.

That the power will be uneven towards richer and whiter neighborhoods

It would be sad if NUSD became like SacCity or Twin Rivers with in fighting

Funding to local schools and parent/student representation

Over representation of one side versus the other.

Don't know

Pitting neighborhoods against one another for services and money

Segregation

not have right representation from some area

Inclusiveness.

Inequity. False promises with little action.

misrepresentation or manipulation

I fear this will reinforce a system in which south natomas schools are underresourced and north natomas schools receive more focus.

South N trustees will be ignored

People would have more say and not one sided

nothing getting done, yearly objectives should be clear

Unqualified trustees who run opposed.

We are too concentrated they all seem to live in my immediate neighborhood

No concerns.

That South Natomas area school will not be adequate representation by someone who understands the unique needs of our students/families.

That we get bumped into South Natomas

No idea

Segregation by income

It will not represent the will of the people because the top candidates in the district will not be chosen. It will be gerrymandered. It will be poorly representative, especially for poorer people.

Due to lack of participation or unequal population there will be lack of resources and advocacy.

That there will be a bigger division between North and South.

My neighborhood won't be represented.

As always, I want to make sure every school is represented fairly.

Boundaries will be drawn to penalize lower income areas and further isolate their representation

Want to make sure the needs of residents is met. I moved from Regency Park still in North Natomas to Natomas Park because we had no real choice of where my kids went to school. Regency Park Elementary is great but didn't want to bus my kids out of North Natomas for middle and high school.

Isn't Regency Park part of Natomas

No

Gerrymandering of the 5 areas

Having Trustees from each area that understand education and the process and commitment of being a board member.

Not clear on how the changes will benefit my child specifically

i think it's dumb. it's a way for the voters to purposely not be allowed to vote for who we want
Kids go to schools not in their neighborhood so having someone represent the area you live in is a terrible idea. They should represent the entire district.

None at this time

I want South Natomas to have 2 representatives; one from each side of I-5; biggest concern is you won't do it

That it will make equity worse on accident

the unknown

Lack of qualified candidates in a given area. It is a critical job and far more time consuming and thankless than most people realize. I'm also concerned about politics getting in the way. Special interest groups taking this opportunity to push an agenda such as white washing history or banning books.

Equity instead of equality.

They will not be qualified to serve and do not understand what the role of the school board is. This is what happens when you go down this route.

What are the biggest plusses or positives about new Trustee Areas? 98 responses

Better representation of ALL Natomas students and schools

Not sure

I hope more underrepresented communities will be represented and get the resources they need.

May help ensure schools get more equal attention.

Might offer better overall representation

It would spread if the trustees over the whole of Natomas.

Representation seems fair

Hopefully, this will lead to a better representation of Natomas

Already mentioned in previous question

Add options

Fairness

Not sure I know what positives there are

Residency requirement within trustee area is good. Would be even better if they had to have their children (if they have any) enrolled in purely public (not charter) NUSD schools.

Better ability to address needs in our area from other drama unfolding elsewhere
unsure yet

It will give those who are really invested in the community to represent the students of their area and it promotes equity and fairness in giving opportunities for those to run for a trustee position who may not have

See previous answer

More opportunity for representation of all schools.

Grid and guidelines

Better community representation

Represent where you live

NA

They would be more vested in the schools they represent in their area.

Better representation since person lives in boundary and has similar areas and potentially "designated" schools in their zone area. Less schools to worry about so more focus on their schools and pta. North and South better represented

We won't have 3 trustees congregated into one gated community as we do now. We will have south Natomas represented physically which is important for equity.

Knowing all areas are represented-Trustees are not all from one neighborhood

More representation

Active, local and focused representation

Smaller and more grassroots election appeal, lower election costs and more targeted campaigning to voters, more diversity of candidates coming from the district community.

More equitable representation!

Geographic representation is better for low-income and minority students.

Better representation & accountability for the areas.

More responsive board members.

More concentration in each area by a designated individual.

South Natomas becoming represented

New communities in Natomas may be represented

I can't answer until I understand why the change.

Making sure South Natomas is represented.

Nothing verifiable.

In order to truly represent and make decisions for every student we must ensure that our trustees understand Where they are coming from. The new structure will allow for this.

Each area has dedicated socials to communicate with. Learning about an area helps inform voting.

Having each area equally represented

I want to ensure all trustees are actively engaged. Some areas of Natomas seem to be currently underrepresented

None

Maybe each school, area, can be better represented.

Hopfully, they will be able to be transparent with the funding for our school.

A better understanding by the representatives as to the unique needs of the neighborhoods.

If down probably it can ensure each neighborhood has a voice

Easier elections = pro. Negatives are the potential infighting and less global perspective on the district as a whole.

Equality and diversity

Don't know

Possibly greater representation

More people to work together to help the communities

all areas will be equally represented in the board

Fair representation of older areas, smaller campaign expenditure

More representation,

n/a

People are more likely to elect one of their neighbors, who is more closely connected to the direct issues of that particular neighborhood

Finally someone who actually lives in S. Natomas representing the area

More empowerment

equity in areas

you would have representation that is familiar with the issues in their area;

Underrepresented areas will finally get some attention.

We are too concentrated they all seem to live in my immediate neighborhood

Ensures participation and representation from all neighborhoods and school communities in Natomas.

Positive: they can be more representative of their constituents.

The opportunity for trustees to live in and represent an area they are familiar with.

New hopes

Trustee must live in district

None. It is a useless plan and will not yield any benefits.

The new trustee area will be more specific and have a true representative who is invested because he/she will be from the area.

The possibilities of having reps that actually understand what South Natomas faces - not just on paper.

Better demographic representation

I don't know yet!!

Equity

I don't know

All neighborhoods will be represented, not just 1 or 2

Everyone feeling represented.

can't say since i am not clear on why this is needed in the first place other than for election purposes nothing

Increased diversity in terms of perspectives related to the needs of our students and families through lived experience/closer proximity to the diversity of our district.

Hopeful for South Natomas representation

What is the plus, I have no idea. I think it is a silly idea.

It's long overdue and the South will finally get representation

great representation; and hopefully a more engaged board who know the schools and neighborhoods they represent; and are held accountable

Better representation for all residents

equity

More representative voices.

Actual representation of people that live in those areas.

There are no positives about election by area. Only negatives.

Other comments or questions: 41 responses

None

No

NUSD has to do better with the board selection and stop the inequity

Stop overcrowding our kids schools. They don't learn when teacher/ student ratio is outnumbered.

N/A

NA

Make sure community is involved and informed about process.

Suggest: West El Camino as the southern boundary, Truxel or I-80 as the midpoint between two southern areas/districts, I-80 as the southern border for 3 northern districts, I-5 as one boundary and Truxel as another middle of 3 northern areas/districts is what makes the most sense.

Looking forward to meetings

I have continued interest in this project.

The district should mail information to everyone who lives in the district and not just parents and guardians.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment!

Charter schools draw from all parts of Natomas (geography doesn't play a role), so how does this change support (or not support) charter schools?

Why is del paso blvd on the list of boundaries? Shouldn't it be del past road?

The new community (Parkebridge) behind Natomas High School should be apart of NUSD instead of Twin Rivers

Publish the school budget. Don't make the parents who are unable to find the budget work so hard to look.

Probably should have been done sooner

Natomas is still in a state of high growth. Staggered board elections are a good thing in my opinion. How often will trustee districts be redrawn (and by whom) to reflect our communities' ongoing growth, while also hopefully preserving staggered terms?

What happens if a Trustee Area has one candidate? Does that person win the election with no competition?

Thanks for the opportunity to give input

Why would you say more money in elections is a good thing?

n/a

Could not been better

Don't go forward with this plan.

Please continue to be transparent and provide all communications to all Natomas Residents. Thank you.

American Lakes needs an assistant principal. More new building of schools in South Natomas are needed.

Bravo to nusd for adopting these equitable practices

Nothing

I would recommend offering informational meetings for candidates that are "required" at least strongly encouraged. It's a big responsibility and a long commitment that people should be informed before they try to run.

If you can answer my questions/comments under each question would be great.

I would like to know if it is possible to receive School transportation for out of district students.

Why is the district doing this? I have two kids who go to different schools in Natomas and I live in a different area, so my family/kids won't be represented if we have someone represent us from our neighborhood. Why can't all the Trustees represent all residents? I have friends who live in different areas but our kids attend the same schools so it means our kids school isn't represented. This makes no sense, they should represent all families the same regardless of where you live. Truly disappointed.

I don't really understand.

This was a very vague form

I'm sorry the district doesn't think non-parents aren't worthy of being surveyed. this was forwarded to me - you need to ask the general public in Natomas - who pay for bonds not just the parents

Could we develop an academy for potential future trustees? I realize there are statewide trainings once folx are elected, but what about a pre-run shadowing program? Help people see if the position is a good match for them and their lifestyles. Trustess are out many evenings.

This seems more feasible with the proposed changes. If we move to a regional model, those with experience from a different area would not be in a position in which they are assisting those they would be running against.

I would like to know what options parents have to stop this from happening. In Sac City Unified, the voters approved this shift. What is NUSD's justification for thinking this change can be made without voter approval?

I need more information before having much more to say about this subject

Timeline for Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections

July 21, 2021



Roman Muñoz
Lozano Smith

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

81

NUSD0097

Objectives Tonight

1. Brief overview of CVRA and Process for Transitioning to By-Trustee Area Elections
2. Review NUSD's Current Reality
3. Present timeline for transition to by-trustee area elections
4. Actions In Progress & Next Board Meeting

California Voting Rights Act (CVRA)

REMINDER

From December 16, 2020 Board Meeting

- The California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) is a state law that allows a school district to be sued for using “at-large” elections in areas that have a history of racially polarized voting. (Elections Code § 14032.)
- Districts statewide are transitioning to “by-trustee area” elections, either on their own initiative, or in response to a threat of a CVRA lawsuit. In a by-Trustee area election system, Trustees must reside within specific, defined, Trustee areas.

Process for Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections

REMINDER

From December 16, 2020 Board Meeting

Step 1: Adopt an Intent Resolution - COMPLETED

Step 2: Development and adoption of maps

- 2 “pre-map” public hearings”
- 2 “map consideration” hearings
- 1 “map adoption” hearing”

Step 3: County Committee Review

Current Reality

- Natomas Unified has 5 elected board members who were all elected “at large”
 - Board members may reside anywhere in the District
 - Registered voters within the District may vote for all seats on the Board
- Trustees hold four-year terms
 - Two Trustees have terms that expire in 2022, and three have terms that expire in 2024
- Numerous government entities in the state and Sacramento region have received PRAs and/or demand letters claiming the district is in violation of the CVRA
 - In December 2020 Trustees directed staff to bring forward a **proactive Letter of Intent to begin the transition process** when the 2021 data released, for 2022 election

Timeline

January 2021 - August 2021

Date	Action
January 20, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	Board adopted Resolution 21-03 of intent to initiate transition from at-large to by-trustee area elections beginning with the 2022 governing board election
 July 21, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	Present timeline for transition to by-trustee area elections
August 4, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographer presents on map development process, criteria, etc. Pre-map public hearing #1
August 5 - August 31, 2021	District meets with stakeholders regarding the SBE waiver
August 18, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	Present info on stakeholder engagement to-date & dates for planned stakeholder engagement

Timeline Continued

September 2021 - December 2021

Date	Action
September 1, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-map public hearing #2 Public hearing to consider seeking SBE waiver of the election requirement Adopt resolution directing Superintendent to seek the SBE waiver
October 27, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographer presents proposed maps. Map review public hearing #1
November 17, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographer presents proposed maps. Map review public hearing #2
December 14, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	Public hearing and adopt Final Resolution NUSD0103

Proposed Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01: Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 100000 Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

87

NUSD0103

7

Timeline Continued

January 2022 and Beyond

Date	Action
January 12, 2022	SBE will likely consider the District's waiver request at its regularly scheduled Board meeting
January/February 2022 (Dates contingent on County Committee's availability to meet)	County Committee hearing and action in regards to district's proposal
November 2022	Elections for trustee area seats by trustee-area
November 2024	Elections for remaining trustee-area seats by trustee-area

Actions In Progress & Next Board meeting

- **July 2021:**
 - On July 14, informed the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE) of the timeline so the County Committee can schedule their meetings appropriately
 - Continue planning / scheduling stakeholder engagement opportunities. In NUSD we're doing more than just the minimum required by law.
- **August 4, 2021 Regular Board Meeting**
 - A demographer will present on the map development process, criteria, etc.

QUESTIONS

State Board of Education (SBE) Waiver for Trustee Areas

The Natomas Unified Board of Trustees has made it clear, they believe it is time to move from an At-Large Election to Trustee area elections. Every 10 years, CA public entities are required to look at this process or examine if boundary adjustments are needed (if a district, city, etc is already represented by Trustee areas). So far, after a survey we sent out last week, Natomas appears to agree with the School Board.

83.5% of NUSD stakeholders surveyed stated that Trustee areas are of medium importance to very important. And 57.3% state that this is important or very important. Trustee areas would begin transitioning in the November 2022 election.

From August to November you will get multiple chances to learn more about this process with Pre-Map hearings in August and September, opportunities to see and provide feedback on proposed maps in October and November (maps cannot even be crafted until Pre-Map hearings are complete in September), and more opportunities to learn and give feedback in between. You will be able to submit e-comments at Board meetings or attend in person and change your mind after learning more. But there are just 1 or 2 important questions we need you to answer now to help us move forward this week. It will take 30 secs to 1 minute (maybe less).

1. Please mark the boxes that best describe you (check all that apply)

Check all that apply.

- Natomas resident
- NUSD staff member
- NUSD parent / guardian
- NUSD student
- Natomas business owner
- Other not already mentioned

2. If you are NOT an NUSD stakeholder, please select the box below

Mark only one oval.

I am not an NUSD stakeholder

3. NUSD has two choices. Please mark your choice.

Mark only one oval.

No waiver: Hold a special election in the spring 2022 which will require NUSD to spend money designated for students on the costs of a special election. All costs are the responsibility of NUSD. Expect this to cost at least \$100,000 and likely more. This is a recommendation for a no waiver.

Seek waiver: NUSD would submit a waiver request to the State Board of Education, to skip a special election, and save the money. Feedback on this topic would also be received labor partners and multiple different parent groups. To our knowledge, the SBE has not ever denied a waiver on this topic. This is a recommendation for stakeholder engagement and seeking a waiver.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Consejo Estatal de Educación (SBE)

Excención para Áreas Administrativas

La Directiva del Distrito de Natomas ha dejado claro, ellos creen que es tiempo de cambiar de unas Elecciones generales a elecciones de área administrativa. Cada 10 años, se requiere que las entidades públicas de California vean hacia este proceso o examinen si ajustes de límites son necesarios (si un distrito, ciudad, etc. está ya representado por áreas de la administración). Por el momento, después de una encuesta que enviamos la semana pasada, Natomas parece estar de acuerdo con la Directiva Escolar.

El 83.5% de los interesados de NUSD que llenaron una encuesta declararon que las áreas de la directiva administrativa son de mediana importancia a muy importantes. Y un 57.3% declaró que esto es importante o muy importante. Las áreas administrativas comenzaran con la transición en las elecciones de noviembre de 2022.

De agosto a noviembre usted tendrá varias oportunidades de aprender más acerca de este proceso con sesiones de Pre-Map en agosto y septiembre, oportunidades para ver y proporcionar opiniones en mapas propuestos en octubre y noviembre (los mapas no pueden ser elaborados hasta que las sesiones de pre-maps sean completadas en septiembre), y más oportunidades para aprender y dar opiniones mientras tanto. Usted podrá someter sus comentarios electrónicamente en las juntas de la directiva o asistir en persona y cambiar de opinión después de aprender más de esto. Pero hay solo 1 o 2 preguntas importantes que necesitamos que usted responda ahora para ayudarnos a avanzar esta semana. Esto le tomará de 30 segundos a un minuto (quizás menos tiempo) para contestar.

1. Por favor marque las cajas que mejor le describan a usted (marque todas las que apliquen)

Check all that apply.

- Residente de Natomas
- Miembro del personal de NUSD
- Padre/tutor de NUSD
- Estudiante de NUSD
- Dueño de un negocio en Natomas
- Otro no mencionado aquí

2. Si usted NO es un miembro activo participante de NUSD, por favor seleccione la siguiente caja

Mark only one oval.

- No soy un miembro activo de NUSD

3. NUSD tiene dos opciones. Por favor marque su selección.

Mark only one oval.

- No excención: Tener una elección en la primavera de 2022 la cual requerirá que NUSD use fondos designados para estudiantes sobre el costo de una elección especial. Todos los costos son responsabilidad de NUSD. Espere que esto cueste por lo menos 100, 000 y posiblemente más. Esta es la recomendación para no excepción.

- Solicitud de exención: NUSD presentaría una solicitud de exención a la Junta Estatal de Educación, para omitir una elección especial, y ahorrar el dinero. Los comentarios sobre este tema también recibirán opiniones socios laborales y de múltiples grupos de diferentes padres. Lo que sabemos es que el SBE nunca ha negado una exención sobre este tema. Esta es una recomendación para la participación de las partes interesadas y la búsqueda de una exención.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms



► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

AUGUST 4, 2021



COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

ASSESS • PLAN • FUND • BUILD

97

NUSD0113

► BACKGROUND

WHAT IS THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT ("CVRA")?

- Took effect January 1, 2003.
- Prohibits the use of "at-large" elections when such an election system:

"impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election...."

-(Elections Code §14027.)

► TYPES OF ELECTIONS

AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside within the District's boundaries and are elected by all the voters who reside in the District's boundaries (Education Code Section 5030(a)). This is the method of election currently used by Natomas Unified School District ("NUSD").

FROM-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside in specific geographic areas within the District's boundaries called "Trustee Areas" but are elected by all the voters who reside in the District's boundaries (Education Code Section 5030(c)).

BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside in specific Trustee Areas within the District's boundaries and are elected only by the voters who reside in the same Trustee Areas (Education Code Section 5030(b)). ***This method of election is the only method that is safe from challenge under the California Voting Rights Act.***

► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

DATE	ACTIVITY
August 4, 2021	Board meeting: First Pre-Map Public Hearing and Presentation
September 1, 2021	Board meeting: Second Pre-Map Public Hearing
September – October 2021	Preparation of draft trustee area scenarios
October 27, 2021	Board Meeting: First Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
November 17, 2021	Board Meeting: Second Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
December 14, 2021	Board Meeting: Third Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios Board Selection of Trustee Area Map
January / February 2022	County Committee on School District Organization Holds a Public Hearing and Considers Approval of Change in Election Method and Trustee Area Map
November 8, 2022	First Election Held Utilizing Trustee Areas

► CONSIDERATIONS IN TRUSTEE AREAS



Each area shall contain nearly equal number of inhabitants



Follow man-made and natural geographic features, as much as possible



Drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act



Respect incumbency, if possible



Compact and contiguous, as much as possible




Other local considerations (i.e., school boundaries, locations of school sites)



Respect communities of interest, as much as possible

DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHICS

2010 CENSUS DATA




Population	Total Population		Age 18 and over	
	Total	%	Total	%
Hispanic/Latino	16,987	23.78%	10,983	20.97%
White	24,549	34.37%	20,220	38.60%
Black / African American	10,724	15.01%	7,576	14.46%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	321	0.45%	258	0.49%
Asian	13,951	19.53%	10,592	20.22%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	722	1.01%	524	1.00%
Other	3,944	5.52%	2,083	3.98%
Two or More Races	228	0.32%	147	0.28%
Total	71,426	100.00%	52,383	100.00%

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

102


DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHICS

CITIZEN VOTING AGE POPULATION ESTIMATES



2015-2019 CVAP		
Population	Total	%
Hispanic/Latino	11,085	21.22%
White	18,742	35.88%
Black / African American	8,710	16.68%
American Indian / Alaska Native	301	0.58%
Asian	10,715	20.51%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	408	0.78%
Two or More Races	2,271	4.35%
Total	52,232	100.00%

► HOW SHOULD LINES BE DRAWN?



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5010 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

104

► PRE-MAP PUBLIC HEARING
EXAMPLES OF FEEDBACK FOR MAPPING PROCESS

"I would like to keep Neighborhood X and Neighborhood Y in the same trustee area..."

► PRE-MAP PUBLIC HEARING
EXAMPLES OF FEEDBACK FOR MAPPING PROCESS

I think:

- ***Arena Boulevard***
- ***Natomas Boulevard***
- ***Del Paso Road***

... may make sense as a trustee area boundary because . . .

- **It keeps communities together**
- **It provides good representation**

► PRE-MAP PUBLIC HEARING
EXAMPLES OF FEEDBACK FOR MAPPING PROCESS

I think:

- All of Y community should be in one area
- Each elementary or middle school boundary should be in multiple/single areas
- Every trustee area should serve multiple school boundaries/sites

... may make sense as a trustee area boundary because ...

- It keeps communities together
- It provides good representation



QUESTIONS

California Voting Rights Act (CVRA)



► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

AUGUST 4, 2021



COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

ASSESS • PLAN • FUND • BUILD

111

NUSD0127

► BACKGROUND

WHAT IS THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (“CVRA”)?

- Took effect January 1, 2003.
- Prohibits the use of “at-large” elections when such an election system:

“impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election....”

-(Elections Code §14027.)

- ▶ TYPES OF ELECTIONS

NUSD currently uses at-large elections and is transitioning to by-trustee area elections

AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside within the District's boundaries and are elected by all the voters who reside in the District's boundaries (Education Code Section 5030(a)). This is the method of election currently used by Natomas Unified School District ("NUSD").

FROM-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTIONS

Note: This type of election does not meet requirements of federal law

Candidates must reside in specific geographic areas within the District's boundaries called "Trustee Areas" but are elected by all the voters who reside in the District's boundaries (Education Code Section 5030(c)).

BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside in specific Trustee Areas within the District's boundaries and are elected only by the voters who reside in the same Trustee Areas (Education Code Section 5030(b)). ***This method of election is the only method that is safe from challenge under the California Voting Rights Act.***

Timeline

Date	Action
January 20, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	Board adopted Resolution 21-03 of intent to initiate transition from at-large to by-trustee area elections beginning with the 2022 governing board election
July 21, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	Present timeline for transition to by-trustee area elections
August 4, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demographer presents on map development process, criteria, etc.• Pre-map public hearing #1

Timeline Continued

Date	Action
August 5 - August 31	<p>District meets with stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associations - NTA & CSEA - August 16, 2021 • Charter Leaders - August 16, 2021 • DELAC - August 19, 2021 • Community Advisory Council (CAC) - August 23, 2021 • Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council - August 25, 2021 • Natomas Chamber of Commerce - August 25, 2021 • Natomas Schools Foundation - August 25, 2021
<i>Estimate: Late August 2021</i>	Federal Census data received by the state of CA
September 1, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-map public hearing #2

Timeline Continued

Date	Action
October 27, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographer presents proposed maps. • Map review public hearing #1
November 17, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographer presents proposed maps. • Map review public hearing #2
December 14, 2021 (Regular Board Meeting)	Public hearing and adopt Final Resolution
January/February 2022	County Committee public hearing and action in regards to district's proposal

Timeline Continued

Date	Action
November 2022	Elections for trustee area seats by trustee-area
November 2024	Elections for remaining trustee-area seats by trustee-area

► CONSIDERATIONS IN TRUSTEE AREAS



Each area shall contain nearly equal number of inhabitants



Follow man-made and natural geographic features, as much as possible



Drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act



Respect incumbency, if possible



Compact and contiguous, as much as possible



Other local considerations (i.e., school boundaries, locations of school sites)




Respect communities of interest, as much as possible

The law requires that we look at this every 10 years.

► DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHICS

Natomas is an example of why the law requires it - some of the demographic shifts in the last 10 years have been significant




Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

Population	Natomas Population (2010 Census Data)		NUSD Enrollment (2020-2021)	
	Total	%	Total	%
Hispanic/Latino	16,987	23.78%	32%	
White	24,549	34.37%	16%	
Black / African American	10,724	15.01%	16.3%	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	321	0.45%	0.5%	
Asian	13,951	19.53%	17.6%	
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	722	1.01%	1.6%	
Other	3,944	5.52%	5%	
Two or More Races	228	0.32%	119	11%
Total	71,426	100.00%	NUSD0135	100.0%

► HOW SHOULD LINES BE DRAWN?

Major streets and highways often act as natural boundaries and help map makers (demographers)

Major landmarks can also help identify Trustee areas



- Your feedback *could* look like this, and will help the demographer learn more about our community as they put the draft maps together:

“I would like to keep Neighborhood X and Neighborhood Y in the same trustee area...”

I think:

- *Arena Boulevard*
- *Natomas Boulevard*
- *Del Paso Road*

... may make sense as a trustee area boundary because ...

- **It keeps communities together**
- **It provides good representation**

- Your feedback *could* look like this, and will help the demographer learn more about our community as they put the draft maps together:

I think:

- All of Y community should be in one area
- Each elementary or middle school boundary should be in multiple/single areas
- Every trustee area should serve multiple school boundaries/sites

... may make sense as a trustee area boundary because ...

- It keeps communities together
- It provides good representation

For the most up-to-date information on the transition to by Trustee-areas, please visit our website here:

<https://natomasunified.org/board-of-trustees/transition-to-by-trustee-area-elections/>

QUESTIONS?

Please provide feedback [here](#)

Ley de Derecho al Voto (CVRA)



► PROCESO DEL ÁREA FIDUCIARIA

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS

4 de agosto del 2021



**COOPERATIVE
STRATEGIES**

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

A S S E S S • P L A N • F U N D • B U I L D

127

NUSD0143

► ANTECEDENTES

¿QUÉ ES LA LEY DE DERECHO AL VOTO DE CALIFORNIA ("CVRA")?

- Entró en vigor el 1 de enero del 2003.
- Prohíbe el uso de elecciones "at-large" cuando dicho sistema electoral:
"perjudica la capacidad de una clase protegida para elegir a los candidatos de su elección o su capacidad para influir en el resultado de una elección...."
-(Código Electoral §14027.)

► TIPOS DE ELECCIONES

NUSD actualmente utiliza las elecciones generales y está haciendo la transición a las elecciones por área de fideicomiso

ELECCIONES GENERALES

Los candidatos deben residir dentro de los límites del Distrito y son elegidos por todos los votantes que residen en los límites del Distrito (Código de Educación Sección 5030(a)). Este es el método de elección utilizado actualmente por el Distrito Escolar Unificado de Natomas ("NUSD").

ELECCIONES EN EL ÁREA DEL FIDEICOMISO

Nota: Este tipo de elección no cumple los requisitos de la ley federal

Los candidatos deben residir en áreas geográficas específicas dentro de los límites del Distrito llamadas "Áreas de Fideicomisarios", pero son elegidos por todos los votantes que residen en los límites del Distrito (Código de Educación Sección 5030(c)).

ELECCIONES DE ÁREA POR PARTE DE LOS FIDEICOMISARIOS

Los candidatos deben residir en áreas específicas de fideicomisarios dentro de los límites del Distrito y son elegidos únicamente por los votantes que residen en las mismas áreas de fideicomisarios (Código de Educación, Sección 5030(b)). *Este método de elección es el único que está a salvo de la impugnación de la Ley de Derecho de Voto de California.*

Cronograma

Fecha	Acción
20 de enero, 2021 (Reunión regular de la Mesa Directiva)	La Mesa Directiva adoptó la Resolución 21-03 de la intención de iniciar la transición de las elecciones generales a las elecciones por áreas de los fideicomisarios iniciando con la elección de la Junta de Gobierno de 2022.
21 de julio 2021 (Reunión regular de la Mesa Directiva)	Presentar el cronograma para la transición a las elecciones por área de los fideicomisarios
4 de agosto 2021 (Reunión regular de la Mesa Directiva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● El demógrafo presenta el proceso de elaboración del mapa, los criterios, etc. ● Audiencia pública previa al mapa #1

Continuación de Cronograma

Septiembre 2021 - Diciembre 2021

Fecha	Acción
5 de agosto - 31 de agosto <div style="position: absolute; top: 42%; left: 10%; width: 40px; height: 40px; background-color: red; border-radius: 50%; padding: 5px; color: white; font-weight: bold; text-align: center; line-height: 1;">WE ARE HERE</div>	<p>El distrito se reúne con los agentes interesados</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asociaciones - NTA y CSEA - 16 de agosto de 2021 • Líderes de Charter - 16 de agosto 2021 • DELAC - 19 de agosto del 2021 • Consejo Asesor Comunitario (CAC) - 23 de agosto de 2021 • Consejo Asesor de Padres del Superintendente - 25 de agosto 2021 • Cámara de comercio de natomas - 25 de agosto 2021 • Fundación escuelas natomas - 25 de agosto 2021
<i>Estimación: finales de agosto de 2021</i>	Datos del Censo Federal recibidos por el estado de CA
1 de septiembre del 2021 (Reunión regular de la Mesa Directiva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audiencia pública previa al mapa #2

Continuación de Cronograma

Fecha	Acción
27 de octubre del 2021 (Reunión regular de la Mesa Directiva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El demógrafo presenta los mapas propuestos. • Audiencia pública de revisión de mapas #1
17 de noviembre del 2021 (Reunión regular de la Mesa Directiva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El demógrafo presenta los mapas propuestos. • Audiencia pública de revisión de mapas #2
14 de diciembre del 2021 (Reunión regular de la Mesa Directiva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audiencia pública y adopción de la Resolución final
Enero/febrero del 2022 (Las fechas dependen de la disponibilidad del Comité del Condado para reunirse)	Audiencia pública del Comité del Condado y acción en relación con la propuesta del distrito

Continuación de Cronograma

Fecha	Accion
Noviembre del 2022	Elecciones para los puestos restantes de la zona de fideicomisarios por área de fideicomisarios
Noviembre del 2024	Elecciones para los puestos restantes de la zona de fideicomisarios por área de fideicomisarios

► CONSIDERACIONES EN LAS ÁREAS DE LOS FIDEICOMISARIOS



Cada zona deberá contener un número casi igual de habitantes



Seguir los aspectos geográficos artificiales y naturales, en la medida de lo posible



Elaborado para cumplir con la Ley Federal del Derecho al Voto



Respetar el cargo, si es posible



Compacto y contiguo, en la medida de lo posible



Otras consideraciones locales (por ejemplo, límites de las escuelas, ubicación de los centros escolares)




Respetar las comunidades de interés, en la medida de lo posible

La ley requiere que lo revisemos cada 10 años.

► DEMOGRAFÍA DEL DISTRITO

Natomas es un ejemplo de por qué la ley lo impone: algunos de los cambios demográficos de los últimos 10 años han sido significativos




Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action Item #151 NUSD0151-01
Dose mas taxa 228

Población	Población de Natomas (Datos del censo 2010)		Inscripción en el NUSD (2020-2021)
	Total	%	
Hispano/Latino	16,987	23.78%	32%
Blanco	24,549	34.37%	16%
Negro/Afroamericano	10,724	15.01%	16.3%
Indio Americano/Nativo de Alaska	321	0.45%	0.5%
Asiático	13,951	19.53%	17.6%
Nativo de Hawái/Islas del Pacífico	722	1.01%	1.6%
OtRO	3,944	5.52%	5%
Dose mas taxa 228	228	0.32%	135 11% NUUSD0151
Total	71,426	100.00%	100.0%

► ¿CÓMO DEBEN TRAZARSE LAS LÍNEAS?

Las principales calles y carreteras a menudo actúan como límites naturales y ayudan a los creadores de mapas (demógrafos)

Los hitos mayores también pueden ayudar a identificar las zonas de los fideicomisarios



- ▶ Sus comentarios podrían tener este aspecto, y ayudarán al demógrafo a conocer mejor nuestra comunidad mientras elabora el borrador de los mapas:

"Me gustaría que el vecindario X y el vecindario Y se mantuvieran en la misma zona del fideicomisario..."

Yo creo:

- *Arena Boulevard*
- *Natomas Boulevard*
- *Del Paso Road*

...puede tener sentido como límite de área del fideicomisario porque...

- Mantiene unidas a las comunidades
- Proporciona una buena representación

- ▶ Sus comentarios podrían tener este aspecto, y ayudarán al demógrafo a conocer mejor nuestra comunidad mientras elabora el borrador de los mapas:

Yo creo:

- Toda la comunidad Y debe estar en una sola área
- Cada límite de la escuela primaria o secundaria debe estar en áreas múltiples/individuales
- Cada área del fideicomisario debe servir a múltiples límites/sitios escolares

...puede tener sentido como límite de la zona del fideicomisario porque...

- Mantiene unidas a las comunidades
- Proporciona una buena representación

Para obtener la información más actualizada sobre la transición a las áreas de los fideicomisarios, visite nuestro sitio web aquí:

<https://natomasunified.org/board-of-trustees/transition-to-by-trustee-area-elections/>

¿PREGUNTAS?

Por favor, envíe sus comentarios aquí



► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SEPTEMBER 1, 2021



COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

ASSESS • PLAN • FUND • BUILD

142

NUSD0158

► BACKGROUND

WHAT IS THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT ("CVRA")?

- Took effect January 1, 2003.
- Prohibits the use of "at-large" elections when such an election system:

"impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election...."

-(Elections Code §14027.)

► TYPES OF ELECTIONS

AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside within the District's boundaries and are elected by all the voters who reside in the District's boundaries (Education Code Section 5030(a)). This is the method of election currently used by Natomas Unified School District ("NUSD").

FROM-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside in specific geographic areas within the District's boundaries called "Trustee Areas" but are elected by all the voters who reside in the District's boundaries (Education Code Section 5030(c)).

BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTIONS

Candidates must reside in specific Trustee Areas within the District's boundaries and are elected only by the voters who reside in the same Trustee Areas (Education Code Section 5030(b)). ***This method of election is the only method that is safe from challenge under the California Voting Rights Act.***

► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

DATE	ACTIVITY
August 4, 2021	Board meeting: First Pre-Map Public Hearing and Presentation
September 1, 2021	Board meeting: Second Pre-Map Public Hearing
September – October 2021	Preparation of draft trustee area scenarios
October 27, 2021	Board Meeting: First Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
November 17, 2021	Board Meeting: Second Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
December 14, 2021	Board Meeting: Third Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios Board Selection of Trustee Area Map
January / February 2022	County Committee on School District Organization Holds a Public Hearing and Considers Approval of Change in Election Method and Trustee Area Map
November 8, 2022	First Election Held Utilizing Trustee Areas

► CONSIDERATIONS IN TRUSTEE AREAS



Each area shall contain nearly equal number of inhabitants



Follow man-made and natural geographic features, as much as possible



Drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act



Respect incumbency, if possible



Compact and contiguous, as much as possible




Other local considerations (i.e., school boundaries, locations of school sites)



Respect communities of interest, as much as possible

► DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHICS

2010 CENSUS DATA




Population	Total Population		Age 18 and over	
	Total	%	Total	%
Hispanic/Latino	16,987	23.78%	10,983	20.97%
White	24,549	34.37%	20,220	38.60%
Black / African American	10,724	15.01%	7,576	14.46%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	321	0.45%	258	0.49%
Asian	13,951	19.53%	10,592	20.22%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	722	1.01%	524	1.00%
Other	3,944	5.52%	2,083	3.98%
Two or More Races	228	0.32%	147	0.28%
Total	71,426	100.00%	52,383	100.00%

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

147


DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHICS

CITIZEN VOTING AGE POPULATION ESTIMATES



2015-2019 CVAP		
Population	Total	%
Hispanic/Latino	11,085	21.22%
White	18,742	35.88%
Black / African American	8,710	16.68%
American Indian / Alaska Native	301	0.58%
Asian	10,715	20.51%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	408	0.78%
Two or More Races	2,271	4.35%
Total	52,232	100.00%

► HOW SHOULD LINES BE DRAWN?



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5010 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

149

► PRE-MAP PUBLIC HEARING
EXAMPLES OF FEEDBACK FOR MAPPING PROCESS

"I would like to keep Neighborhood X and Neighborhood Y in the same trustee area..."

► PRE-MAP PUBLIC HEARING
EXAMPLES OF FEEDBACK FOR MAPPING PROCESS

I think:

- ***Arena Boulevard***
- ***Natomas Boulevard***
- ***Del Paso Road***

... may make sense as a trustee area boundary because . . .

- **It keeps communities together**
- **It provides good representation**

► PRE-MAP PUBLIC HEARING
EXAMPLES OF FEEDBACK FOR MAPPING PROCESS

I think:

- **All of Y community should be in one area**
- **Each elementary or middle school boundary should be in multiple/single areas**
- **Every trustee area should serve multiple school boundaries/sites**

... may make sense as a trustee area boundary because ...

- **It keeps communities together**
- **It provides good representation**



QUESTIONS

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

153

NUSD0169

Public Comment for:

Item XV - CVRA Second Public Hearing Regarding Potential Composition of Trustee Areas, Prior to Drawing of Maps

Public Comment #1 - Heather Fargo

President Heredia and Trustees of the Natomas Unified School District,

I am writing to voice my strong support for establishing trustee areas within the Natomas USD. I support having two of the five areas south of I-80 to serve the residents and students of South Natomas, who have no representative on the current Board of Trustees, and therefore do not feel fairly represented. To make workloads among trustees more even, I suggest that the population and number of schools be as equal as possible within each area.

Thank you for your efforts on this and the other issues facing the Natomas community.

Sincerely,

Heather Fargo
Co-chair, South Natomas Redistricting Ad-hoc Committee

Public Comment #2 - Krystal Pickett

The purpose of this email is to provide input as a community member. After reviewing dedicated pages regarding by trustee area elections, I found only 173 surveys have been submitted. This is not a full representation of Natomas and all of its stakeholders.

My concern pertains to the efforts that will be made to broaden and engage the communities to participate in a process that directly impacts the families and children in these communities. Including these stakeholder understanding of this process. How will this board ensure that their voices are heard?

Equally concerning, how will this families who are unhoused and inter districts transfers within the Natomas community have an opportunity to actively participate in the election process?

Respectively,
Krystal

Additional Stakeholder Engagement - Upcoming Transition to By-Trustee Areas

Natomas & NUSD community - this is an additional stakeholder engagement survey related to the upcoming transition to by-trustee areas. Please help us inform the demographer (map maker) about what is important to you by completing this very brief survey.

In addition, we wanted to make sure you are aware of this dedicated webpage where you can access information: <https://natomasunified.org/board-of-trustees/transition-to-by-trustee-area-elections/>

You can also email trusteeareas@natomasunified.org at any time with comments or questions that you may have on this matter, as well as any ideas you have for maps.

1. I am a member of the following stakeholder group(s) in Natomas Unified (please check all that apply):

Check all that apply.

- Natomas resident
- NUSD staff member
- NUSD parent / guardian
- NUSD student
- Natomas business owner
- Other stakeholder not already mentioned

2. If you are NOT an NUSD stakeholder, please select the box below

Mark only one oval.

- I am not an NUSD stakeholder

3. Please select one of the following options below:

Mark only one oval.

- I am supportive of NUSD moving to trustee areas *Skip to question 4*
 I am NOT supportive of NUSD moving to trustee areas *Skip to question 5*

4. Please indicate why you are supportive of NUSD moving to trustee areas (check all that apply):

Check all that apply.

- It would allow me to develop a closer relationship with one or more Trustees that would represent where I live and/or where my kids go to school
 It may reduce the amount of money spent on political elections
 It would ensure that each geographic region in Natomas is represented
 Viewpoints that may not be district-wide can be represented

Other: _____

Skip to question 6

5. Please briefly explain why you are NOT supportive of NUSD moving to trustee areas:

Skip to question 6

Final Questions

6. Do you know that the Board of Trustees will be viewing proposed Trustee area maps during the October 27 and November 17 Regular Board Meetings and that you can give input at these two meetings based on specific proposed maps?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes, I know this
 - No, I did not know this
 - I think I knew this

7. If you have any other strong opinions or any other comments or questions about by-trustee area elections please feel free to share with us below:

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Encuesta adicional de participación de los agentes interesados en el CVRA - septiembre de 2021

Comunidad de Natomas y NUSD - esta es una encuesta adicional de participación de agentes interesados relacionada con la próxima transición a áreas por directiva. Por favor, ayúdenos a informar al demógrafo (creador del mapa) sobre lo que es importante para usted completando esta breve encuesta.

Además, queríamos asegurarnos de que conociera esta página web dedicada donde puede acceder a la información: <https://natomasunified.org/board-of-trustees/transition-to-by-trustee-area-elections/>

También puede enviar un correo electrónico a trusteeareas@natomasunified.org en cualquier momento con comentarios o preguntas que pueda tener sobre este asunto, así como cualquier idea que tenga para los mapas.

1. Soy miembro de los siguientes grupos de interesados en el Distrito de Natomas (marque todos los que correspondan):

Check all that apply.

- Residente de Natomas
- Miembro del personal de NUSD
- Padre/tutor de NUSD
- Estudiante de NUSD
- Empresario de Natomas
- Otras agentes interesados no mencionados anteriormente

2. Si no es usted parte del agente interesado de NUSD, seleccione la casilla siguiente.

Mark only one oval.

- No soy parte del agente interesado de NUSD

3. Seleccione una de las siguientes opciones:

Mark only one oval.

Estoy a favor de que el NUSD se traslade a las áreas de la Mesa Directiva
Skip to question 4

NO estoy a favor de que NUSD se mueva a las áreas de la Mesa Directiva
Skip to question 5

4. Por favor, indique por qué apoya que NUSD se traslade a las áreas de la Mesa Directiva (marque todo lo que corresponda):

Check all that apply.

- Me permitiría desarrollar una relación más cercana con uno o más Administradores que representaran el lugar donde vivo y/o donde mis hijos van a la escuela
- Puede reducir la cantidad de dinero que se gasta en las elecciones políticas
- Garantizaría que cada región geográfica de Natomas esté representada
- Los puntos de vista que no sean de todo el distrito pueden estar representados

Other:

Skip to question 6

5. Por favor, explique brevemente por qué NO es partidario de que NUSD se traslade a las zonas de la Directiva:

Skip to question 6

Preguntas finales

6. ¿Sabe usted que la Mesa Directiva verá los mapas propuestos del área de los Directivos durante las reuniones periódicas de la Mesa Directiva del 27 de octubre y del 17 de noviembre y que usted puede dar su opinión en estas dos reuniones basándose en los mapas específicos propuestos?

Mark only one oval.

- Sí, lo sé.
 No, no sabía esto
 Creo que sabía esto

7. Si tiene alguna otra opinión firme o cualquier otro comentario o pregunta sobre las elecciones en el área de los Directivas, no dude en compartirlo con nosotros a continuación:


Google Forms

3rd Community Survey

Additional Stakeholder Engagement Survey - Upcoming Transition to By-Trustee Areas September 2021


I am a member of the following stakeholder group(s) in Natomas Unified (please check all that apply):

240 responses




Please select one of the following options below:

191 responses



[If you are supportive question]



[If you are not supportive question]

Please briefly explain why you are NOT supportive of NUSD moving to trustee areas:

26 responses

Dishonest board members

I don't have enough information. Not sure if this will increase the inequities of the education system. Representation should be determined across all district areas on an at-large platform. I'm concerned that fragmented elective procedures (electing officials by designated sections of the district) will create inequality in representing the diverse needs across the district. However, a subcommittee of voices, advocates, and reps from each section could identify potential areas/pockets of need unique to certain area. For instance, rural-living students may require more access to internet or technology, while students living in highly populated areas of the district may express need for expanded transportation options to and from school. Segmenting the elective procedures designed to represent the diversity in population across the district may risk inequality in representation overall.

This is what we've always trusted and changing it doesn't seem to make anything "better"

Natomas is two places, South and North. North has all the money they don't also need all the power.

All Trustees should represent interests of students of the whole district

There are not five recognizable regions with five high schools or middle schools or even two elementary schools in each area to designate for each trustee. Separate areas will lead trustees to focus on and favor their local schools instead of the entire community.

I think it's important our Trustees are prioritizing the needs of all students when making decisions, and not just those in their area. I have seen boards that represent trustee areas become very divisive. Sometimes it feels and appears that the public or faculty members' presence and input are not in place due to the limited number of people allowed to attend meetings. There should be other ways people may attend virtually if not physically to have their feedback/responses.

I think as long as the trustee lives in the area of Natomas, that's enough for me.

I think its best to leave things alone

Throughout history, having smaller areas in which an individual is elected as a single issue and never works as it is supposed to.

It is gerrymandering. I do not agree.

I don't know what a trustee area is.

Significant concern about equity based on potential demographic mapping

I don't understand the need to make the change, our trustees are already diverse. Why can't we keep things as is - we have already elected them.

Reasoning doesn't matter since this will proceed forward

Parental oversight is gone.

No comment

If there are multiple qualified people from one neighborhood, I am supportive of that.

I do not have any trust in the board, or local government, so any changes that occur can not be trusted either. This seems like another power grab to further allow unions to dictate the education system. Clean your house first. Remove any far left or far right educators who openly promote their personal politics to their students. Allow the kids to be kids, get back to basic education standards not Covid obsessed standards. Open more charter schools.

I want to be able to vote for the best candidates in the district rather than be incumbered by choosing someone based off of where they live. Location does not make you the best suited for a position.


I support the concept, but am concerned about the timing. After the recent targeting by Project Veritas and taking over of NUSD Board Meeting, I am concerned that, at this time, the move to By-Trustee Areas will be a political power grab. Individuals at the board meeting made claims about doing a better job than existing board members with little knowledge of the actual role. Few realize the dedication, diplomacy and knowledge required to be a member of a school board. Individuals taking the role for political purposes can have long term, negative impacts on our children, families and communities. We can't afford that right now. Again, I support the eventual shift, just think there is too much influence from outside our community right now.

I believe that a trustee board needs to work together. I'm concerned that if only a few people choose the candidate that the candidate won't be able to work with other candidates and nothing will get done. Natomas residents move around Natomas, and should be represented by a trustee of their choosing. We are not big enough to break the Natomas area down into sections. I feel this divides our community into North and South, which what has happened with our city council. We then have problems in one area and not the other, like homelessness. The south has more homeless people than the North. We don't want any more of this disparity. My children go to different schools in the community, and thus could create different types of changes in one school area and not another school area. I would prefer all of the children to have one full trustee board, of all of us electing together. I like voting on all candidates. Keeping Natomas as a whole community is better for Natomas.

I think it is just going to make more restrictions that make governing even harder.

Costs. We need the money in our schools

Do you know that the Board of Trustees will be viewing proposed Trustee area maps during the October 27 and November 17 Regular Board Meeti... two meetings based on specific proposed maps?
196 responses



If you have any other strong opinions or any other comments or questions about by-trustee area elections please feel free to share with us below:

27 responses

I have no opinion, because I lack an understanding of what this is about

Please think about all the people in an area not just the most seen

Areas should represent many schools and not just be drawn along school boundary lines, keep incumbents, try and keep diversity on board.

I do not.

Try as much as possible to keep families going to the same elementary school with the same trustee,

None

Listen to parents

I think it will be helpful as I generally don't know much about all the different candidates before an election.

It seems like a great idea.

If the District were to use this there could be potential to also increase certain things when it comes to statistics, such as minority pass rate. Because for whatever reason specifically african americans have one of the lowest pass rates. I feel this would motivate students to try their best and could show them the "a black man or woman could do it then so can I" mentality. This is crucial in todays society and african americans in particular are severely underrated and tossed aside then to top it off teachers and others cont really care about it. I feel this is the first step to create a new beginning is by changing our school system

Kindly inform staff and public exactly what Trustee area maps are and what /how specific proposed maps would impact current status quo of proposed changes in Trustee and responsibilities if applicable. Thank you

The district does not have a chance at beating this. Save the money and change to Trustee areas.

Term limits would be another good issue to consider.

This is a bad idea that don't appear on paper, however in practice these often cause disproportionate representation that only helps the minority of people.

I do not agree with this. It is essentially just changing the will of the voters to remove a board member the board doesn't agree with.

I feel very strongly about this as the board has no representation from people that live in South Natomas and whose children attend South Natomas schools.

Not sure why this is needed since we can now go to any Trustee. Limites my options to go to one person.

Because Natomas is ethnically diverse and currently most of the trustees representing all of Natomas live in North Natomas, the residents of South Natomas do not get a fair voice of their concerns and I believe having a By-Trustee Area election would allow for easier resolution of concerns and issues that South Natomas students and their families have.

The only concern I have about the new By-Trustee elections is having vacancies due to not having candidates run in an area.

This seems like an equitable option to have all our communities represented.

This effort is not needed and should stop. Our board is already diverse and this is a waste of time and resources.

Fine with it as is system as well

I'm ready to do this!!

What election year would new districts go into effect?

Is there a way you could require all prospective candidates to shadow an existing board member for 1 month, ideally during a busy period such as when they are attending Back to School Nights at several campuses on one evening, reading through legal documents about policy and reviewing complex, multi-year budgets?

Irrelevant to this issue please take a closer look At each school parking and after school pick up situations are horrible for parents including charters . Why does the city or district allow this

Thank you for keeping us informed!

Trustee Area Stakeholder Engagement

October 13, 2021



Christina Huth, Executive Director

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

171

NUSD0187

Objectives Tonight

1. Brief overview of CVRA stakeholder engagement & what is required by law
2. Actions NUSD has taken to go above and beyond & Key Data Points
3. Update on Census Data
4. Next Steps

REMINDER

CVRA Stakeholder Engagement - What Is Required By Law

- Adopt an Intent Resolution
January 20, 2021 Regular Board Meeting
- 2 “pre-map” public hearings
August 4, 2021 Regular Board Meeting
September 1, 2021 Regular Board Meeting
- 2 “map consideration” hearings
October 27, 2021 Regular Board Meeting
November 17, 2021 Regular Board Meeting
- 1 “map adoption” hearing
December 14, 2021 Regular Board Meeting
- County Committee Review
January/February 2022

These 6 open session meetings allow time for public comment



REMINDER

CVRA Stakeholder Engagement

NUSD Board meetings are livestreamed and recorded at the direction of the Board of Trustees.

Recordings are available for viewing on the District's website the day after each board meeting at

<https://natomasunified.org/board-of-trustees/videos/>

Livestream views and recorded meetings views are monitored and noted on the dedicated webpage

Actions NUSD Has Taken to Go Above & Beyond

3 Community Surveys

July 14

July 26

September 24

7 Targeted Engagement Meetings for Key Stakeholders

August 5 - 31

Developed a Dedicated Webpage & Email Address

Webpage: <https://natomasunified.org/board-of-trustees/transition-to-by-trustee-area-elections/>

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5010 to Change

Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

Email: trusteeareas@natomasunified.org

NUSD0191

Key Data Points

All surveys were made available in both english and spanish, and sent to all NUSD households, key stakeholders, secondary students, posted on our district website, and advertised on social media

3 Community Surveys

July 14 Survey

- Purpose to gather initial input on this transition
- 173 total responses
- 83.5% of responses indicated that Trustee areas were of medium importance to very important
- 57.3% of responses indicated that this is important or very important

July 26 Survey

- Purpose to gather input about the possibility of NUSD seeking a waiver from the State Board of Education
- 2,419 total responses
- 78.7% of responses indicated they wanted the district to seek a waiver, as opposed to having a special election

September 24 Survey

- Purpose to gather additional input prior to the 'map consideration' hearings
- 260 total responses
- 80% of responses indicated support for a transition to Trustee-areas & almost half were aware of the upcoming 'map consideration' hearings

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

Key Data Points

Targeted engagement meetings were held both in-person and virtually and allowed key stakeholders an opportunity to directly ask staff questions / give recommendations

7 Targeted Engagement Meetings for Key Stakeholders

August 16 - NTA

- 4 in attendance

August 23 - Community Advisory Council (CAC)

- 7 in attendance

August 16 - CSEA

- 5 in attendance

August 25 - Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council

- 24 in attendance

August 16 - Charter Leaders

- 3 in attendance

August 25 - Natomas Chamber of Commerce & Natomas Schools Foundation

- 14 in attendance

August 19 - DELAC

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Elecational Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

- 25 in attendance

*Note: Attendance numbers do not include any staff members leading the engagement efforts*¹⁷⁷

Key Data Points

Developed a Dedicated Webpage & Email Address

Dedicated Webpage

- Launched August 9, 2021
- 903 page views to date
- Advertised at stakeholder engagement events, via email, on eFlyers & paper flyers, and in various district newsletters
- Updated as needed or in response to community feedback (i.e. added a map of NUSDs boundaries)

Dedicated Email Address

- Created on August 9, 2021
- Utilized 4x to date
- Advertised at stakeholder engagement events, via email, on eFlyers & paper flyers, and in various district newsletters

Update on Census Data

The census data is in

Based on data provided by a demographer for 2010 and 2020, the tables to the right show how Natomas has changed in 10 years

Population	Total Population		
	2010	2020	Difference
Hispanic/Latino	23.78%	23.30%	-0.48%
White	34.37%	26.80%	-7.57%
Black/African American	15.01%	15.30%	0.29%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.45%	0.40%	-0.05%
Asian	19.53%	25.20%	5.67%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.01%	1.20%	0.19%
Other	5.52%	0.80%	-4.72%
2 or More Races	0.32%	6.90%	6.58%

Population	Age 18 and over		
	2010	2020	Difference
Hispanic/Latino	20.97%	21.30%	0.33%
White	38.60%	29.70%	-8.90%
Black/African American	14.46%	15.20%	0.74%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.49%	0.40%	-0.09%
Asian	20.22%	25.90%	5.68%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.00%	1.20%	0.20%
Other	3.98%	0.80%	-3.18%
2 or More Races	0.28%	5.50%	5.22%

Comparison of the Natomas Population (as presented on the previous slide) and NUSD student enrollment data from 2020-21

	Natomas Population (2020 Census Data)	NUSD Enrollment (2020-2021)
Population	%	%
Hispanic/Latino	23.3%	32%
White	26.8%	16%
Black / African American	15.3%	16.3%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%
Asian	25.2%	17.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.6%
Other	0.8%	5%
Two or More Races	6.9%	11%
Total	100%	NUSD 100% 180


Next Steps

- **Continue to advertise the opportunities for public input at the 'map consideration' and 'map adoption' hearings via:**
 - Virtual & paper flyers sent home in student backpacks & placed throughout the Natomas community
 - Direct communications to NUSD families & key stakeholders
 - Our *Spotlight* newsletter, which goes to over 11,000 Natomas residents
 - Paid advertising with various media sources
 - NUSD's dedicated webpage
- **October 20** - Draft Maps Available for Public Viewing
- **October 27** - 'Map consideration' hearing #1

QUESTIONS

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT


POPULATION DENSITY MAP



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT


HISPANIC POPULATION PERCENTAGE MAP



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT


BLACK POPULATION PERCENTAGE MAP



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ASIAN POPULATION PERCENTAGE MAP



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01



► **TRUSTEE AREA
PROCESS**

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

OCTOBER 27, 2021



**COOPERATIVE
STRATEGIES**

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

ASSESS • PLAN • FUND • BUILD

189

NUSD0205

► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

DATE	ACTIVITY
August 4, 2021	Board meeting: First Pre-Map Public Hearing and Presentation
September 1, 2021	Board meeting: Second Pre-Map Public Hearing
September – October 2021	Preparation of draft trustee area scenarios
October 27, 2021	Board Meeting: First Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
November 17, 2021	Board Meeting: Second Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
December 14, 2021	Board Meeting: Third Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios Board Selection of Trustee Area Map
January / February 2022	County Committee on School District Organization Holds a Public Hearing and Considers Approval of Change in Election Method and Trustee Area Map
November 8, 2022	First Election Held Utilizing Trustee Areas

► CONSIDERATIONS IN TRUSTEE AREAS



Each area shall contain nearly equal number of inhabitants



Follow man-made and natural geographic features, as much as possible



Drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act



Respect incumbency, if possible



Compact and contiguous, as much as possible




Other local considerations (i.e., school boundaries, locations of school sites)



Respect communities of interest, as much as possible

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO A



► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO A

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	5.6%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	17,168	9,967	17,927	12,273	16,961	9,784	17,776	10,960	17,073	9,844
Population Variance	-1.2%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	-2.4%	N/A	2.3%	N/A	-1.8%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	22.2%	19.0%	35.2%	33.9%	20.4%	15.7%	18.8%	12.8%	19.8%	21.0%
White	25.7%	36.0%	22.9%	29.3%	24.8%	35.7%	25.9%	35.4%	34.7%	44.7%
Black/African American	16.2%	19.1%	18.3%	18.5%	15.5%	19.1%	14.1%	15.8%	12.2%	12.4%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	26.5%	21.9%	14.2%	10.9%	30.0%	23.9%	32.1%	29.8%	23.8%	18.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.7%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.5%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.4%	3.7%	6.7%	4.8%	7.0%	4.1%	7.2%	5.1%	7.4%	2.8%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

193

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO B



► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO B

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	16,809	9,588	17,927	12,273	17,022	9,217	17,810	10,821	17,337	10,929
Population Variance	-3.3%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	-2.1%	N/A	2.5%	N/A	-0.3%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	20.6%	19.1%	35.2%	33.9%	20.3%	17.1%	19.3%	13.0%	20.9%	19.2%
White	24.7%	36.2%	22.9%	29.3%	24.2%	35.8%	25.5%	33.6%	36.6%	45.4%
Black/African American	14.4%	14.6%	18.3%	18.5%	15.8%	19.2%	14.2%	15.9%	13.7%	16.7%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%
Asian	30.7%	27.3%	14.2%	10.9%	31.0%	23.0%	31.6%	30.9%	19.1%	13.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	1.1%	0.4%
Other	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	2.5%	6.7%	4.8%	6.3%	3.2%	7.6%	5.6%	7.2%	4.3%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposals Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

195

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO C



Public Hearing and Action on Nations Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

196

NUSD0212 Natomas Unified School District | Trustee Area Process

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	2.5%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	17,400	9,778	17,193	12,050	17,478	9,948	17,200	10,430	17,634	10,622
Population Variance	0.1%	N/A	-1.1%	N/A	0.6%	N/A	-1.0%	N/A	1.5%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	17.9%	34.7%	33.4%	20.5%	17.9%	19.3%	12.9%	19.3%	20.4%
White	22.6%	34.4%	24.3%	30.4%	24.6%	36.4%	25.6%	34.2%	36.5%	44.8%
Black/African American	15.8%	16.5%	19.0%	20.1%	15.5%	18.3%	14.3%	15.8%	12.1%	14.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%
Asian	28.6%	27.1%	12.8%	9.3%	30.6%	22.7%	31.4%	30.5%	22.7%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	3.1%	6.2%	4.8%	6.5%	3.2%	7.6%	5.7%	7.5%	3.8%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposals Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

197

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO D



198

NUSD0214

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO D

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.1%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	18,037	10,412	17,193	12,050	17,249	9,732	16,981	10,259	17,445	10,375
Population Variance	3.8%	N/A	-1.1%	N/A	-0.8%	N/A	-2.3%	N/A	0.4%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	18.5%	34.7%	33.4%	20.5%	17.7%	19.5%	12.8%	19.0%	19.9%
White	23.2%	34.5%	24.3%	30.4%	24.9%	37.5%	25.6%	33.8%	35.8%	44.3%
Black/African American	15.2%	16.3%	19.0%	20.1%	15.6%	18.3%	14.2%	15.9%	12.4%	14.1%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
Asian	28.2%	26.6%	12.8%	9.3%	30.1%	21.8%	31.4%	31.0%	23.5%	16.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.9%	0.2%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	7.1%	3.0%	6.2%	4.8%	6.4%	3.1%	7.5%	5.7%	7.4%	4.1%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

199

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO E



► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.3%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	16,840	11,275	17,927	12,273	17,475	9,302	17,808	10,780	16,855	9,198
Population Variance	-3.1%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	0.5%	N/A	2.5%	N/A	-3.0%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	21.4%	35.2%	33.9%	20.1%	15.0%	19.6%	12.6%	18.2%	19.0%
White	33.7%	43.3%	22.9%	29.3%	22.7%	36.2%	25.9%	34.4%	29.2%	37.1%
Black/African American	13.7%	16.4%	18.3%	18.5%	16.0%	18.8%	14.2%	16.6%	14.1%	14.5%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	13.8%	14.2%	10.9%	32.2%	25.7%	31.1%	30.0%	29.1%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	0.3%	1.5%	1.9%	1.4%	0.8%	0.9%	0.2%	1.0%	0.5%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	4.7%	6.7%	4.8%	6.4%	2.7%	7.5%	5.6%	7.2%	2.3%

*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposals Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

201

► ELECTION SEQUENCING

When transitioning to trustee area elections, an election cycle must be established. The draft maps included potential election sequences. In reviewing election sequencing schedules, consideration is given to, among other things, the fact that when a school board transitions to trustee area elections, each incumbent is afforded the right to serve out their four-year term, regardless of how the elections are sequenced. (Education Code section 5021.)

Currently the Board's elections are sequenced so that two seats are up for election in 2022 and three seats are up for election in 2024. The potential election sequences maintain this sequencing.



QUESTIONS


Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

203

NUSD0219


NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

2020 CENSUS DATA - STATEWIDE REDISTRICTING FILE



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO A



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO A

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	5.8%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
Population Variance	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
Hispanic/Latino	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
White	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
Black/ African American	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Asian	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
Hispanic/Latino	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
White	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
Black/ African American	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Asian	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
Hispanic/Latino	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
White	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
Black/ African American	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
Asian	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS

ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO A

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	5.8%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
Variación de población	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
Hispano/Latino	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
Blanco	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Asiático	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
Hispano/Latino	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
Blanco	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Asiático	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
Hispano/Latino	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
Blanco	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
Negro/ Afroamericano	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
Asiático	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸਾ ਏ (Scenario A)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਰਿਵਰਤਨ:	5.8%
--------------------	---------------	---------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਡਰ	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਡਰ	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

ਵੋਟਿੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਰਿਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO B



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO B

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
Population Variance	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
Hispanic/Latino	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
White	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
Black/ African American	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
Hispanic/Latino	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
White	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
Black/ African American	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
Other	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
Two or More Races	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
Hispanic/Latino	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
White	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
Black/ African American	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO B

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.4%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
Variación de población	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
Hispano/Latino	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
Blanco	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
Hispano/Latino	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
Blanco	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
Otro	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
Dos o más razas	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
Hispano/Latino	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
Blanco	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO B)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.4%
-------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

ਵੇਂਟੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	2.5%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Population Variance	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
White	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Black/ African American	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
White	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Black/ African American	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispanic/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
White	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Black/ African American	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO C

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	2.5%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Variación de población	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
Blanco	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
Blanco	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispano/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
Blanco	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO C)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ:	2.5%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟਾ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO D



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO D

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.1%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
Population Variance	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
White	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
Black/ African American	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
White	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
Black/ African American	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
Hispanic/Latino	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
White	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
Black/ African American	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
Asian	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO D

Población total:	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.1%
------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
Variación de población	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
Blanco	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
Blanco	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
Hispano/Latino	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
Blanco	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
Asiático	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਸਿਦਾਂ 12 ਨਵੰਬਰ 2020 ਵੇ (SCENARIO D)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.1%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.3%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Population Variance	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
White	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
White	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
White	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Black/ African American	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asian	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO E

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.3%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	áfYU1	áfYU2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Variación de población	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispano/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
Blanco	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
Blanco	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Otro	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispano/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
Blanco	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asiático	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 ਨਵੰਬਰ 2020 ਦੇ (SCENARIO E)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.3%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

POTENTIAL ELECTION SEQUENCING SCHEDULES

Below are the potential election sequencing schedules for each of the draft maps. In preparing these election sequencing schedules, consideration was given to, among other things, the fact that when a school board transitions to trustee area elections, each incumbent is afforded the right to serve out their four-year term, regardless of how the elections are sequenced. (Education Code section 5021.)

Currently the Board's elections are sequenced so that two seats are up for election in 2022 and three seats are up for election in 2024. The options provided below maintain this sequencing.

SCENARIO MAP A

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)	Heredia (2024)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5

SCENARIO MAP B

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 5

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 4

SCENARIO MAP No. C

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 5

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 4

SCENARIO MAP No. D

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Vacant	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022) Heredia (2024)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5

ALTERNATIVE SEQUENCING SCENARIO MAP D

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 5

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 4

SCENARIO MAP E

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Vacant	Vacant	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	Vacant	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 2; or
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5
- Plus one of either Trustee Area 1, Trustee Area 2 or Trustee Area 4

POSIBLES CICLOS ELECTORALES

A continuación se presentan los posibles ciclos electorales para cada uno de los borradores de mapas. En la preparación de estos calendarios de secuencia de las elecciones, se tuvo en cuenta, entre otras cosas, el hecho de que cuando un consejo escolar hace la transición a las elecciones de área de fideicomisarios, cada titular tiene el derecho de cumplir su término de cuatro años, independientemente de cómo se secuencien las elecciones (Código de Educación sección 5021).

Actualmente, las elecciones de la Directiva están secuenciadas de manera que dos puestos se eligen en 2022 y tres en el año 2024. Las opciones que se presentan a continuación mantienen esta secuencia.

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO
A

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)	Heredia (2024)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 4 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 5

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO B

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 5 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 4

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO C

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 5 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 4

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO D

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Vacante	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022) Heredia (2024)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 4 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 5

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO DE SECUENCIACIÓN ALTERNATIVO D

SECUENCIA
<p>Eleción de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 5 <p>Eleción de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 4

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO E

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Vacante	Vacante	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	Vacante	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 2, O• Área de fideicomisarios 4 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 5• Más uno de los siguientes: Área 1 de los Fideicomisarios, Área 2 de los Fideicomisarios o Área 4 de los Fideicomisarios

ਸੰਭਾਵੀ ਚੋਣ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਸਮਾਂ-ਸਾਰਣੀ

ਹੇਠਾਂ ਹਰੇਕ ਡਰਾਫਟ ਨਕਸੇ ਲਈ ਸੰਭਾਵੀ ਚੋਣ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਸਮਾਂ-ਸਾਰਣੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਚੋਣ ਕ੍ਰਮ-ਸੂਚੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਤਿਆਰ ਕਰਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ, ਹੋਰ ਗੱਲਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ-ਨਾਲ, ਇਸ ਤੱਥ ਨੂੰ ਵੀ ਧਿਆਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਜਦੋਂ ਇੱਕ ਸਕੂਲ ਬੋਰਡ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਤਬਦੀਲ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਹਰੇਕ ਅਹੁਦੇਦਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਆਪਣੀ ਚਾਰ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਮਿਆਦ ਪੂਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਦਾ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਚਾਹੇ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਕਿਵੇਂ ਵੀ ਹੋਣ। ਕ੍ਰਮਬੱਧ (ਸਿੱਖਿਆ ਕੋਡ ਸੈਕਸ਼ਨ 5021।)

ਵਰਤਮਾਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਬੋਰਡ ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਕ੍ਰਮਵਾਰ ਹਨ ਤਾਂ ਜੋ 2022 ਵਿੱਚ ਦੋ ਸੀਟਾਂ ਲਈ ਚੋਣ ਹੋਣ ਅਤੇ 2024 ਵਿੱਚ ਤਿੰਨ ਸੀਟਾਂ ਲਈ ਚੋਣ ਹੋਣ। ਹੇਠਾਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਵਿਕਲਪ ਇਸ ਕ੍ਰਮ ਨੂੰ ਕਾਇਮ ਰੱਖਦੇ ਹਨ।

ਫਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਏ A

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)	Heredia (2024)

ਕੁਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

ਦਿੱਸ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ B

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕੁਮਖਾਂ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

2024 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸਾ ਬੀ C

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕੁਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ D

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022) Heredia (2024)

ਕੁਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

ਵਿਕਲਪਿਕ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਦਿਸ਼ਾ ਦਾ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ D

ਕ੍ਰਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ E

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਖਾਲੀ	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)


- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2; ਜਾਂ
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
- ਨਾਲ ਹੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1, ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2 ਜਾਂ
ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4 ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਇੱਕ


NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

2020 CENSUS DATA - STATEWIDE REDISTRICTING FILE



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO A



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO A

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	5.8%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
Population Variance	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
Hispanic/Latino	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
White	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
Black/ African American	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Asian	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
Hispanic/Latino	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
White	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
Black/ African American	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Asian	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
Hispanic/Latino	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
White	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
Black/ African American	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
Asian	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS

ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO A

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	5.8%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
Variación de población	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
Hispano/Latino	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
Blanco	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Asiático	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
Hispano/Latino	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
Blanco	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Asiático	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
Hispano/Latino	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
Blanco	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
Negro/ Afroamericano	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
Asiático	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸਾ ਏ (Scenario A)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਰਿਵਰਤਨ:	5.8%
--------------------	---------------	---------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------


ਆਬਾਦੀ	ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))				
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਗ੍ਰੇਂਡ ਆਈਲੰਡਰ	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

ਆਬਾਦੀ	18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)				
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਗ੍ਰੇਂਡ ਆਈਲੰਡਰ	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

ਆਬਾਦੀ	ਵੋਟਿੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਰਿਕ				
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਗ੍ਰੇਂਡ ਆਈਲੰਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO B



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO B

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
Population Variance	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
Hispanic/Latino	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
White	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
Black/ African American	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
Hispanic/Latino	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
White	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
Black/ African American	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
Other	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
Two or More Races	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
Hispanic/Latino	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
White	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
Black/ African American	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO B

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.4%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
Variación de población	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
Hispano/Latino	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
Blanco	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
Hispano/Latino	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
Blanco	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
Otro	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
Dos o más razas	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
Hispano/Latino	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
Blanco	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO B)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.4%
-------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

ਵੇਂਟੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	2.5%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Population Variance	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
White	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Black/ African American	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
White	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Black/ African American	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispanic/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
White	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Black/ African American	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO C

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	2.5%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Variación de población	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
Blanco	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
Blanco	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispano/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
Blanco	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO C)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ:	2.5%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟਾ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO D



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO D

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.1%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
Population Variance	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
White	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
Black/ African American	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
White	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
Black/ African American	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
Hispanic/Latino	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
White	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
Black/ African American	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
Asian	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO D

Población total:	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.1%
------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
Variación de población	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
Blanco	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
Blanco	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
Hispano/Latino	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
Blanco	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
Asiático	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਸਿਦਾਂ 12 ਨਵੰਬਰ 2020 ਵੇ (SCENARIO D)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.1%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.3%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Population Variance	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
White	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
White	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
White	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Black/ African American	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asian	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO E

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.3%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	áfYU 1	áfYU2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Variación de población	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispano/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
Blanco	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
Blanco	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Otro	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispano/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
Blanco	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asiático	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 ਨਵੰਬਰ 2020 ਦੇ (SCENARIO E)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.3%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%



► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

OCTOBER 27, 2021



COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

ASSESS • PLAN • FUND • BUILD

270

NUSD0286

► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

DATE	ACTIVITY
August 4, 2021	Board meeting: First Pre-Map Public Hearing and Presentation
September 1, 2021	Board meeting: Second Pre-Map Public Hearing
September – October 2021	Preparation of draft trustee area scenarios
October 27, 2021	Board Meeting: First Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
November 17, 2021	Board Meeting: Second Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
December 14, 2021	Board Meeting: Third Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios Board Selection of Trustee Area Map
January / February 2022	County Committee on School District Organization Holds a Public Hearing and Considers Approval of Change in Election Method and Trustee Area Map
November 8, 2022	First Election Held Utilizing Trustee Areas

► CONSIDERATIONS IN TRUSTEE AREAS



Each area shall contain nearly equal number of inhabitants



Follow man-made and natural geographic features, as much as possible



Drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act



Respect incumbency, if possible



Compact and contiguous, as much as possible




Other local considerations (i.e., school boundaries, locations of school sites)



Respect communities of interest, as much as possible

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO A



► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO A

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	5.6%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	17,168	9,967	17,927	12,273	16,961	9,784	17,776	10,960	17,073	9,844
Population Variance	-1.2%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	-2.4%	N/A	2.3%	N/A	-1.8%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	22.2%	19.0%	35.2%	33.9%	20.4%	15.7%	18.8%	12.8%	19.8%	21.0%
White	25.7%	36.0%	22.9%	29.3%	24.8%	35.7%	25.9%	35.4%	34.7%	44.7%
Black/African American	16.2%	19.1%	18.3%	18.5%	15.5%	19.1%	14.1%	15.8%	12.2%	12.4%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	26.5%	21.9%	14.2%	10.9%	30.0%	23.9%	32.1%	29.8%	23.8%	18.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.7%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.5%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.4%	3.7%	6.7%	4.8%	7.0%	4.1%	7.2%	5.1%	7.4%	2.8%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

274

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO B



► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO B

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	16,809	9,588	17,927	12,273	17,022	9,217	17,810	10,821	17,337	10,929
Population Variance	-3.3%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	-2.1%	N/A	2.5%	N/A	-0.3%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	20.6%	19.1%	35.2%	33.9%	20.3%	17.1%	19.3%	13.0%	20.9%	19.2%
White	24.7%	36.2%	22.9%	29.3%	24.2%	35.8%	25.5%	33.6%	36.6%	45.4%
Black/African American	14.4%	14.6%	18.3%	18.5%	15.8%	19.2%	14.2%	15.9%	13.7%	16.7%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%
Asian	30.7%	27.3%	14.2%	10.9%	31.0%	23.0%	31.6%	30.9%	19.1%	13.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	1.1%	0.4%
Other	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	2.5%	6.7%	4.8%	6.3%	3.2%	7.6%	5.6%	7.2%	4.3%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposals Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

276

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO C



277

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	2.5%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	17,400	9,778	17,193	12,050	17,478	9,948	17,200	10,430	17,634	10,622
Population Variance	0.1%	N/A	-1.1%	N/A	0.6%	N/A	-1.0%	N/A	1.5%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	17.9%	34.7%	33.4%	20.5%	17.9%	19.3%	12.9%	19.3%	20.4%
White	22.6%	34.4%	24.3%	30.4%	24.6%	36.4%	25.6%	34.2%	36.5%	44.8%
Black/African American	15.8%	16.5%	19.0%	20.1%	15.5%	18.3%	14.3%	15.8%	12.1%	14.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%
Asian	28.6%	27.1%	12.8%	9.3%	30.6%	22.7%	31.4%	30.5%	22.7%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	3.1%	6.2%	4.8%	6.5%	3.2%	7.6%	5.7%	7.5%	3.8%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposals Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

278

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO D



► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO D

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.1%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	18,037	10,412	17,193	12,050	17,249	9,732	16,981	10,259	17,445	10,375
Population Variance	3.8%	N/A	-1.1%	N/A	-0.8%	N/A	-2.3%	N/A	0.4%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	18.5%	34.7%	33.4%	20.5%	17.7%	19.5%	12.8%	19.0%	19.9%
White	23.2%	34.5%	24.3%	30.4%	24.9%	37.5%	25.6%	33.8%	35.8%	44.3%
Black/African American	15.2%	16.3%	19.0%	20.1%	15.6%	18.3%	14.2%	15.9%	12.4%	14.1%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
Asian	28.2%	26.6%	12.8%	9.3%	30.1%	21.8%	31.4%	31.0%	23.5%	16.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.9%	0.2%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	7.1%	3.0%	6.2%	4.8%	6.4%	3.1%	7.5%	5.7%	7.4%	4.1%


*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

280

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO E



281

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.3%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	16,840	11,275	17,927	12,273	17,475	9,302	17,808	10,780	16,855	9,198
Population Variance	-3.1%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	0.5%	N/A	2.5%	N/A	-3.0%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	21.4%	35.2%	33.9%	20.1%	15.0%	19.6%	12.6%	18.2%	19.0%
White	33.7%	43.3%	22.9%	29.3%	22.7%	36.2%	25.9%	34.4%	29.2%	37.1%
Black/African American	13.7%	16.4%	18.3%	18.5%	16.0%	18.8%	14.2%	16.6%	14.1%	14.5%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	13.8%	14.2%	10.9%	32.2%	25.7%	31.1%	30.0%	29.1%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	0.3%	1.5%	1.9%	1.4%	0.8%	0.9%	0.2%	1.0%	0.5%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	4.7%	6.7%	4.8%	6.4%	2.7%	7.5%	5.6%	7.2%	2.3%

*Total Population: Source: Redistricting Database for California. Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposals Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019 Data

282

► ELECTION SEQUENCING

When transitioning to trustee area elections, an election cycle must be established. The draft maps included potential election sequences. In reviewing election sequencing schedules, consideration is given to, among other things, the fact that when a school board transitions to trustee area elections, each incumbent is afforded the right to serve out their four-year term, regardless of how the elections are sequenced. (Education Code section 5021.)

Currently the Board's elections are sequenced so that two seats are up for election in 2022 and three seats are up for election in 2024. The potential election sequences maintain this sequencing.

A photograph of several yellow school buses parked in a row in a grassy field. The buses are facing towards the left of the frame. The sky above is filled with large, white, billowing clouds against a dark blue background.

QUESTIONS

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

284

NUSD0300

**ITEM X - Public Hearing - CVRA Map Consideration Public Hearing
#1**

#1 - Rosalyn Bell

I believe that Scenario A & D most reflect our community. While the district transitions to trustee-area, what happens when several trustees live in one area?

Roslyn Bell

#2 - B.C. (Beka Clement)

As a parent of students in this school district, I urge the board to adopt Scenario E.

Thank you.

#3 - Michael Mills

Dear Honorable Members of the Board of Trustees:

I reside at 3235 Spinning Rod Way in the River Oaks Community. I have lived here over 19 years. My children (3) all attended or attend Two Rivers Elementary School and Leroy Greene Academy. Nearly all of the children at these schools are from South Natomas.

My comments on the five draft maps are these: (1) Scenario E is the only option that doesn't divide communities in numerous ways as the other options do. I support this option. (2) Scenarios A, B, and C appear to be gerrymandered to optimize the number of districts to be drawn from the Westlake Community where three members currently reside in close proximity to each other. (3) Scenario D unnecessarily divides River Oaks. (4) My neighborhood has no connection to Westlake and I do not support any map that lumps together a portion of River Oaks with Westlake.

Thank you.

#4 - Doyle Radford Junior

Greetings Repected Board of Trustees.

First and foremost I want to thank you for the hard work and dedication to our children this past year.

Laborers Local 185 has a great deal of members who's children attend NUSD schools. We also have lots of members who are NUSD alumni. It has been our honor to be a local partner in connecting students to their future.

It was recently brought to my attention that the board was looking to redraw the trustee district map. On behalf of the members we represent, I would like to encourage the board to adopt a map that retains the most amount of incumbants that are currently seated. With that being said, I believe best option available is map C.

Thank you for your Consideration.

Respectfully,

Doyle S. Radford Jr.
Laborers Local 185
1320 National Dr.
Sacramento, CA 95834

#5 - Yating Campbell

Good evening NUSD Board Members,

I'm writing to voice my opinion on trustee maps. I've submitted the attached map for your consideration. The way I've suggested the map be drawn is important for Natomas because:

- It more evenly splits schools between trustee areas. The way the other lines are drawn, some trustees have 5-6 schools, others 2-4. It would make it difficult for the schools that are in denser areas to get an even amount of the trustee's attention. With a more equitable spread of schools in the sections, each school and community surrounding it has an equal voice and chance to be heard.

- Except for the most northern and southernmost areas, three districts split into South Natomas and include South Natomas schools. This ensures we don't have a North/South divide and enables South Natomas to have a stronger voice.
- The map follows natural boundary lines of the freeway and community streets and has contiguous lines (with no weird intrusions).
- This map helps the Asian American community (a fast-growing community group in California and Natomas) to have a strong voice while spreading out the population variances to allow other voices to be heard.

I hope this map helps provide additional ideas for how to equitably spread the schools among the areas. Making sure each school and community surrounding it is well represented and has equal access to a trustee is key to ensuring equal representation.


Also, it would be helpful to label the schools on the map to help parents and community members unfamiliar with the locations to have a perspective of distance and school type.

Yating Campbell

[Attachment: Yating Campbell Attachment for Public Comment]

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	2.5%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Population Variance	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
White	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Black/ African American	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
White	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Black/ African American	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispanic/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
White	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Black/ African American	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO C

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	2.5%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Variación de población	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
Blanco	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
Blanco	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispano/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
Blanco	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO C)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ:	2.5%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	----------	------

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟਾ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

#6 - Brenda Borge

I wanted to put in a pitch for Map Scenario D which makes the most geographical sense. As someone who knows every area of Natomas very well, and has lived and worked in Natomas for the past 20+ years, since 1989, I believe Map Scenario D makes the most sense for the voters of Natomas, and eliminates the gerrymandering towards current board members that Scenario A, B and C are attempting.

Thank you.

Brenda Borge
bborgeca@gmail.com
Past President, NTA

#7 - Tracy Chatters

Thank you NUSD Board for your time in this matter-

I have closely reviewed each of the presentations regarding Trustee Area redrawing and the policies and procedures related to such. It is my sincere hope that the Board will send the demographer back to review the possible maps and begin the process again, with clear direction regarding the following:

- Board members residences should not be relevant, nor drawn on to the maps. This confuses the public reviewing the maps and leads to the perception that board member seats should be draw in a way that protects particular (or all) members. This is the definition of gerrymandering and should be avoided, whether in practice or perception.
- New possible map scenarios should include at least one scenario that does not give the impression of using one master map based on trustee residences and tweaking the boundaries slightly to reflect board member seats or carving in/out particular neighborhoods. At least one map should rely solely on natural boundaries and communities.

Further, additional efforts should be made to reach out to ALL members of the community for input, including actual public hearings and forums where the Natomas community may present their opinion and hear/see what others have to say. Because the Board has not posted minutes from the previous meetings in nearly two months, the community has not been a part of a discussion. Rather,

community members can leave a comment with no feedback, no sense of the audience and no actual indication that it has been read/received by the Board. As a member of the community whose child has already graduated high school, I have received zero information about this topic from NUSD, community associations or other interest groups. I am only aware because I am an avid reader of the Natomas Buzz. Community engagement should not fall solely on the shoulders of our local journalists.

Finally, transparency is key in any redistricting process. Nobody I have spoken with in this process was actually aware that the most recently elected board members are protected and will not lose their seats immediately upon the adoption of the maps. This has not been clearly articulated and unless you're well versed in lawyer-speak and saw the first presentation, you wouldn't know this. Most people think that the only choices on the table are the five maps presented.

As a long time Natomas resident, I ask the board to throw them all back and try again. NUSD can do better all around about being transparent, accurate and clear and equitable in the process.

Tracy Chatters
5142 Isador Lane
Sacramento, 95835

#8 - Heather Fargo

Dear Chair and Trustees:

I am writing to support Scenario/Map E for the new NUSD trustee areas.

I believe it best meets the criteria for fair representation of all areas of the district. It respects neighborhood and community boundaries, creates compact and contiguous areas, follows natural and manmade, conforms with the Voters Right Act, and establishes trustee areas within the 10% deviation limit.

Maps A-C clearly violate the criteria and should be rejected out right. Map D is a possibility but not as good for South Natomas residents as Map E.

I want to thank you the Board for committing to this change to create trustee areas. I appreciate each of your efforts on behalf of the students of Natomas, and recognize that this change is personally difficult for you. Establishing trustee areas is what is best for the overall community. Thank you for doing this.

Sincerely,

Heather Fargo
South Natomas resident

9 - Nate Pelczar

NUSD Board,

As a resident of North Natomas, and as someone that wants NUSD districts that reflect the diversity of our community, and as someone that wants to support elected officials that truly support diversity in our community, I'm expressing my support for Map C. Map C should be adopted as it keeps the most amount of incumbents and rewards the board and awards trustees for their hard work. Selecting maps D or E appears to be a slick political move and an effort to get rid of trustees that are among our community's most effective. Selecting map C also preserves the diversity of Natomas per the diversity split shown on Map C.

In support of our community,
Nate Pelczar
Westlake Resident, North Natomas
916.572.7135

#10 - Pat Sandlin

I am writing to support Map E for the new NUSD trustee area. I believe this map clearly meets the criteria for fair representation of all areas of the district, while Maps A-C clearly violates the criteria and should be rejected.

Map D could be a possibility, but it's not as good a choice for S. Natomas as Map E.

I thank the Board for your efforts in creating trustee areas for the benefit of students of Natomas! I have a personal stake in this process, having

grandchildren who attended Natomas schools from kindergarten through High School and now have four great-grandchildren attending elementary school, with two morel starting in two & four years.

Our family has a generational commitment to our schools!

Thank you,

Pat Sandlin
10 City Ct.
Sacramento, CA 95833

916-616-2391

#11 - Mariana Sabeniano

I urge the Trustees to give strong consideration and adopt a map that takes into conservation the growth that Natomas is currently in and will experience in the coming years.

I also support a map that does not dilute minority votes and celebrate the diversity in Natomas. Specifically, map C is the best option for the district. The variance in population is only 2.5%, which means each district has roughly the same amount of voters. Map C also maintains the voters' choice in their elected trustees. In our democratic process, voters should be the only ones making the choice of who their representative body is, not trustees themselves. I urge the trustees to act in good faith to maintain the voters choice. Thank you for all your work and dedication to this process.

Thank you

#12 - William Eberhart

Map E divides the trustee zones in equitable areas where the other maps have an extremely large zone in the western part of the district.

Understanding the western area is lightly populated, I feel having one district running from the south border to the north border is disproportional to the boundaries of the other zones.

Map E is currently separating the western zone in an equitable way and would be acceptable.

Bill Eberhart

#13 - Nancy Eberhart

I am recommending map E . Thank you.

#14 - Virginia FairAmitani

I am sending this email in support of Map E for the Natomas area.
Thank You

Virginia FairAmitani

#15 - Elton Seagraves

Greetings Board of Trustees,
First and foremost. I want to thank you for your dedication this past year. I believe that Map D makes the most sense for the voters of Natomas. I had the pleasure of working for NUSD for over 14 years, I know the schools well. I've lived in Natomas over 25 years and am a native of Sacramento.

Thank you,
Elton Seagraves

#16 - Monique Blue Langer

Hello - I am submitting my comments regarding the new draft maps, and parent volunteers in classrooms.

First, for the maps, I think Option C works well, but my concern is that the Sundance Lake community seems to be an afterthought, wedged in to "make numbers." The attached modification would do a better job of keeping Sundance Lake in the same represented group as its immediate neighbors.

Second, I have serious concerns about an unlimited amount of parents on campus and in classrooms. Prior to the pandemic, I was a regular on school campus and at school events. However, we have done our best to limit our kids' exposure to people not in our household, and introducing an uncontrolled number of parents to our children seems counterintuitive during a pandemic. There should be a notification system in place that lets us know who will have access to the classroom, and this should NOT be an unlimited number. Perhaps one a week or only outside. It seems premature to allow parents on campus without strict guidelines and limitations on exposure to children.

Thank you,
Monique Langer

#17 - Sachiko Konatsu (on behalf of Natomas Community Association)

Natomas community association is in support of scenario Efor the new NUSD trustee areas.

I believe it best meets the criteria for fair representation of all areas of the district. It respects neighborhood and community boundaries, creates compact and contiguous areas, follows natural and manmade, conforms with the Voters Right Act, and establishes trustee areas within the 10% deviation limit.

Maps A-C clearly violate the criteria and should be rejected. Map D is a gerrymandered map and is not good for Natomas residents. Map E is the only map that meets the criteria.

Sachiko Konatsu
NCA President

#18 - Sachiko Konatsu

As a parent in NUSD I support scenario E as it meet the requirements and ia not a gerrymandered map. This is the only map that will benefit Natomas children.
Sachiko Konatsu

#19 - Kenji Konatsu

I am in support of scenario E for NUSD Trustee

#20 - Teri Burns

The advantage I see to Scenario A is that it keeps Natomas High School with the South Natomas community who worked long and hard to build our first high school and where generations of families can relate.

It also holds the majority of the Garden Hwy neighborhood together. The Sacramento Riverfront Property Owners Association (SRPOA) is essentially a very long narrow neighborhood of similar interests and concerns. Scenario E unfortunately divides this community of interest.

Unlike scenario B, Trustee Area 1 in this version includes multiple school sites. My recommendation at this time would be for Scenario A.

My concern with scenario D is that it is already on the high side of population for Trustee Area 1 and that more housing growth is most likely in this area which would exacerbate the difference before the next 10 year redistricting.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

B. Teri Burns
Former NUSD Trustee

#21- Patricia Adams

I am in complete support of Map E this would be a great way for the community to be fully supported by an elected person that represents the community they live in.

Patricia Adams

#22 - Daniel Aderholt

Topic: support of Map E. South natomas unified school district

I would also like to be a part of this school board .. how do I become a school board member? I'm NCA executive board member of natomas and founder and leader of American River Homeless Crews

My name

Daniel Aderholt age 51

Address 2045 West El Camino avenue apt 360, Sacramento, CA,95833

My. Cell 916-753-2752

#23 - David Brady

Dear Chair and Trustees:

I am writing to support Scenario/Map E for the new NUSD trustee areas. It accurately represents communities of interests within the district, conforms with the Voting Right Act, and creates a balanced population for each trustee area.

In particular, Scenario E links the River Oaks community with adjacent neighborhoods in South Natomas. This is important, because River Oaks has never had a representative on the NUSD school board. Other maps link River Oaks with far-removed communities, such as Westlake, where three existing board members live. Most egregious is Map A, which divides our neighborhood in half and completely disenfranchises our neighborhood.

Scenario E is the only map that reflects the spirit of the law, and should therefore be your only choice moving forward.


Thank you,

David Brady
NUSD Resident

[Attachment: David Brady Attachment for Public Comment]

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.3%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Population Variance	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
White	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
White	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
White	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Black/ African American	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asian	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO E

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.3%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	áfYU1	áfYU2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Variación de población	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispano/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
Blanco	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
Blanco	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Otro	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispano/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
Blanco	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asiático	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 ਨਵੰਬਰ 2020 ਦੇ (SCENARIO E)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.3%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
ਡਿਚੱਟਾ	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਨਡਰ	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

#24 - Noel Mora

Good evening,

My name is Noel Mora. I am a resident of South Natomas and I support Map E.

Thank you,
Noel Mora

#25 - Terrell Grant

Hello

I am emailing in Support of Map E. I fully support this map as it is the only valid map.

Thank you

#26 - Z. Wayne Johnson

As President of the River Oaks Community Association (ROCA), I want to raise our voice in support of Map E. Adoption of this map would reflect our connection to our contiguous Communities of Interest (North and South Natomas, plus Downtown)and bring opportunity for representation on the NUSD for a recombined South Natomas and the under-represented minority and immigrant populations in the depicted areas. These goals are all consistent with the spirit and intent of the Redistricting process and equity for the proposed areas. The resulting population numbers meet the required per district targets within the allowed up to 10% deviation.

We urge adoption of Map E.

Z. Wayne Johnson
President, ROCA
lifeisgrand9@hotmail.com
916.475.3557 cell

#27 - Lois Walker

Looks good to me.

Lois

#28 - Deb Vinson

Good Evening Trustees

I hope that you all vote on the side of children and choose Democracy so that representation of all families can be experienced through the election process for families that need it.

Today, more than ever, it is crucial for children to see a unified and diversified group of school board trustees that will make decisions to strengthen public education. It is also crucial for children/students to see their community reflected in the decision making process that will impact their education.

I wish you all well in putting children first!

Thank you

#29 - Alyssa Lozano (on behalf of Natomas Chamber of Commerce)

Hello,

We're sorry this is late, we wanted to poll our entire board. We listened to your meeting this evening and want to still submit a public comment.

Our board supports map E.

Respectfully,

Alyssa Lozano

916.212.4209

President, Natomas Chamber of Commerce

Owner A.L.L. REAL ESTATE, RE/MAX GOLD

CalDRE#02057900

#30 - Sophia Hicks

I am in support of the MAP E.

Sophia Hicks

Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections Outreach Efforts

As of Monday, October 25 @ 9:00 a.m.

Action	Details
Community Surveys <i>July 14, July 26, & September 24</i>	<p>Received 2,843 responses overall. All surveys were made available in both English and Spanish, and were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sent to all NUSD households ● Sent to NUSD key stakeholders ● Sent to secondary students ● Posted on our district website ● Advertised on social media <p>The September 24 survey was also advertised in the <i>Natomas Buzz</i></p>
Targeted Meetings for Key Stakeholders <i>Month of August</i>	<p>Meetings were held both in-person and virtually and allowed key stakeholders an opportunity to directly ask staff questions / give feedback. Staff met with 82 people from the following stakeholder groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NTA ● CSEA ● Charter Leaders ● Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council ● Community Advisory Council (CAC) ● District English Learners Advisory Committee (DELAC) ● Natomas Chamber of Commerce & Natomas Schools Foundation
Created a Dedicated Webpage <i>Launched Aug 9</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1,697 page views to date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Over 800 views (including google folder) since October 20 when draft maps were posted ● Dedicated webpage has a 'Quick Link' on the NUSD home page ● Dedicated website can be translated into 5 additional languages with the click of a button ● Advertised at stakeholder engagement events, via email, on eFlyers & paper flyers, and in various district newsletters
Created a Dedicated Email Address <i>Launched Aug 9</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Utilized 4 times to date ● Advertised at stakeholder engagement events, via email, on eFlyers & paper flyers, and in various district newsletters
Flyers Advertising the 'Map Consideration' and 'Map Adoption' Hearings <i>Month of October + plans to continue into Nov/Dec</i>	<p>Flyers were made available in English, Spanish & Punjabi, and both electronic & paper format</p> <p><u>eFlyer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email home to NUSD families (including charters) - Approx. 16,573

Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections Outreach Efforts

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Posted in two areas on NUSD website ● <i>Spotlight</i> newsletter - sent to over 11,000 people ● Email blast to NUSD staff - Approx. 1,297 ● <i>In the Loop</i> staff newsletter ● <i>Matters of Principal</i> newsletter - requested Principals send info home in their weekly communications to families ● Email blast to NUSD key stakeholders - 139 ● Advertised in the Natomas Buzz - 18,226 impressions overall (including advertisements for surveys) ● Advertised in N Magazine (November issue) - average 4,000 viewers ● Shared with the Presidents/leaders of various community groups throughout Natomas ● Worked with City Council members to share with various District 1 contacts - approximately 300 people <p><u>Paper flyers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sent home in student backpacks ● Joey's Food Locker - distributed with groceries to 1,237 people on Oct. 22 ● Posted at the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ed Center /Service Center lobbies ○ N. Natomas Library ○ S. Natomas library ○ Mexican Consulate ○ Homecoming @ Creekside Apartments ○ Safeway ○ Grocery Outlet ○ Real Life Church ○ The Crossing Church ○ Adventure Christian Church
Announcement of Draft Maps Available for Viewing <i>Wednesday, October 20</i>	<p>A context-setting message from the Superintendent, 5 draft maps & associated documents were announced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email home to NUSD families (including charters) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 ways to view maps - website, google folder or pick-up hard copies at Ed Center ● Posted in two areas on NUSD website ● Special Edition of <i>Spotlight</i> newsletter - sent to over 11,000 people ● Email blast to NUSD staff ● <i>Matters of Principal</i> newsletter - requested Principals send the info home in their weekly communications to families ● Email blast to NUSD key stakeholders <p>Documents shared/announced on Wednesday, October 20 were made</p>

Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections Outreach Efforts


	<p>available in English, Spanish & Punjabi</p> <p><u>Since the Draft Maps Became Available:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The dedicated webpage has been accessed 751 times ● The public google folder has been accessed 54 times ● 2,000 hard copies were available for pick up at the Ed Center
Regular Board Meetings <i>December 2020 - present</i>	<p>Opportunities for public comment / viewing at the following meetings:</p> <p><u>Meetings Required by Statute</u> <i>Beginning Aug. 4, any eComments posted on the dedicated webpage the day after the Board Mtg.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● January 1 - Adoption of an Intent Resolution ● August 4 - 'Pre-Map' Public Hearing #1 ● September 1 (continued to 9/14) - 'Pre-Map' Public Hearing #2 <p><u>Meetings that Went 'Above and Beyond'</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● December 16, 2020 - Presentation on CVRA from legal counsel ● July 21 - Presentation on Timeline for Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections ● October 13 - Presentation on Trustee Area Stakeholder Stakeholder Engagement <p>Board meetings are live streamed / recorded. The number of livestream meeting views & recorded meetings views for each meeting are noted on the dedicated webpage</p> <p>Total livestream views (all 6 meetings): 554*</p> <p>Total recorded views (all 6 meetings): 1,177</p> <p>* does not include livestream views from Sept. 1 meeting (only Sept. 1 continuance held on Sept. 14)</p>

Estimated total number of potential engagements: 59,183*

*This estimated total number likely includes duplicates, but there's really no way for us to distinguish that. When using the same communication mechanism repeatedly (example: *Spotlight* newsletter that goes to over 11,000 people) that number was only counted once.

October 27, 2021

This was requested at the 10/27/21 board meeting. Below is a general heat map that shows the general locations of our 464 Punjabi speaking students.



Monday, October 25, 2021

Estimated Apartment Population					
Scenario A - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,456	11,712	17,168	31.8%	68.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,564	6,403	9,967	35.8%	64.2%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	5,628	11,333	16,961	33.2%	66.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,119	6,665	9,784	31.9%	68.1%
4					
2020 Population	2,813	14,963	17,776	15.8%	84.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,111	8,849	10,960	19.3%	80.7%
5					
2020 Population	3,041	14,032	17,073	17.8%	82.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,807	8,037	9,844	18.4%	81.6%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario B - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	2,662	14,147	16,809	15.8%	84.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,741	7,847	9,588	18.2%	81.8%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	6,531	10,491	17,022	38.4%	61.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,483	5,734	9,217	37.8%	62.2%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	15,455	17,810	13.2%	86.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	9,103	10,821	15.9%	84.1%
5					
2020 Population	5,390	11,947	17,337	31.1%	68.9%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,659	7,270	10,929	33.5%	66.5%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario C - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,349	12,051	17,400	30.7%	69.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	6,870	9,778	29.7%	70.3%
2					
2020 Population	6,423	10,770	17,193	37.4%	62.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,427	7,623	12,050	36.7%	63.3%
3					
2020 Population	6,017	11,461	17,478	34.4%	65.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,287	6,661	9,948	33.0%	67.0%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	14,845	17,200	13.7%	86.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	8,712	10,430	16.5%	83.5%
5					
2020 Population	4,328	13,306	17,634	24.5%	75.5%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	7,714	10,622	27.4%	72.6%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario D - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	4,989	13,048	18,037	27.7%	72.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,744	7,668	10,412	26.4%	73.6%
2					
2020 Population	6,423	10,770	17,193	37.4%	62.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,427	7,623	12,050	36.7%	63.3%
3					
2020 Population	6,377	10,872	17,249	37.0%	63.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,451	6,281	9,732	35.5%	64.5%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	14,626	16,981	13.9%	86.1%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	8,541	10,259	16.7%	83.3%
5					
2020 Population	4,328	13,117	17,445	24.8%	75.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	7,467	10,375	28.0%	72.0%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario E - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Est. Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,665	11,175	16,840	33.6%	66.4%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,990	7,285	11,275	35.4%	64.6%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	4,847	12,628	17,475	27.7%	72.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,618	6,684	9,302	28.1%	71.9%
4					
2020 Population	3,182	14,626	17,808	17.9%	82.1%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,239	8,541	10,780	20.8%	79.2%
5					
2020 Population	3,244	13,611	16,855	19.2%	80.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,754	7,444	9,198	19.1%	80.9%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Proposed Dwelling Units

Project Name	General Location	Elementary Boundary	Type	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	Totals
Arena ReUse Project	Arena at Truxe / E Commerce	HAH	Multi-family	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	250	250	259	1059
Duckhorn Apartments	Duckhorn at I 5 -	WRE	Multi-family	0	0	0	239	129	0	0	0	0	0	368
Medley Apartments	E Commerce at Arena	HAH	Multi-family	0	0	0	0	96	64	0	0	0	0	160
Natomas Fountains Apartments	Truxel at Gateway	NPE	Multi-family	0	0	0	0	0	187	125	0	0	0	312
Natomas II Apartments	E Commerce across from Arena	HAH	Multi-family	0	0	0	307	165	0	0	0	0	0	472
Natomas Meadows East	Gateway at Arena & Del Paso	NPE	Single Unit Detached	0	0	22	22	21	21	17	0	0	0	103
River Oaks/The Cove	San Juan at I/80	TRE	Single Unit Attached	188	188	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Tanzanite	Airport Road	HAH	Single Unit Attached	0	0	0	0	0	81	54	0	0	0	135
The Core Natomas	San Juan at I/80	TRE	Multi-family	15	195	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300
Vista del Lago at Westshore	Del Paso at NP3	PV	Single Unit Detached	0	0	0	34	19	0	0	0	0	0	53
Upper westside 20 years to build out UW average pace of construction of 468 dwelling units and 155,000 of commercial space per year			Combination of units											9356

CVRA Survey

In this extraordinary time of a pandemic, political divisiveness, and other stressors our plates are already full. But I am asking for your help right now. It can be a quick effort or extended - your choice. I promise that your feedback matters and IS NEEDED because a decision in 13 days will radically change how this district is led and your students are served.

Below are questions that I need you to consider. You can answer 1 or all of them (and everything in between). This can be anonymous or if you share your email we will share a participation badge you can add to your email that recognizes your assistance. We don't even need your name. Just an email gets you a badge.

1. Are you interested in providing feedback on the creation of By Trustee Area Maps or is that not an interest for you. If you mark “Not interested” you are done but still helped us.

Mark only one oval.

Interested

Not Interested

2. Are you aware NUSD is one of the most integrated communities in the nation?

Mark only one oval.

I am aware

I think I am aware

I was not aware of that until now

3. What degree does having all NUSD neighborhoods and/or school communities represented with the Board of Trustees matter to you?

Mark only one oval.

- 100% important
- Mostly important
- Somewhat important
- Not Really important
- Not important to me

4. Does having a strong likelihood of 2 predominately South Natomas Trustee Areas matter to you to make sure all students and communities are represented?

Mark only one oval.

- 100% important
- Mostly important
- Somewhat important
- Not Really important
- Not important to me

5. Are you okay if two Trustees cannot run again in 2022 because a map may be chosen that forces two incumbents off the Board until they can run again in 2024?

Mark only one oval.

- I am not ok with this and would rather voters decide who is elected to the Board
- I am ok with this possibility
- I have no opinion

6. Are you aware that some of Natomas is served by the Twin Rivers School District and not all of Natomas is within Natomas Unified?

Mark only one oval.

- I am aware
- I think I am aware
- I was not aware of that until now

7. All maps except Map E allow for every Trustee area to have a Trustee representing each area by the next election (2022). Either South Natomas, Southwest Natomas, or Heron/Creekside/etc al. would have to wait until 2024 with Map E. How important is it to you to have all five areas represented by 2022?

Mark only one oval.

- Very Important
- Important
- Somewhat Important
- Not Important

8. Have you looked at the 6 maps proposed to reorganize the Natomas Unified School Board (this is required to be considered by federal and state law every decade)?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

9. Please click on the hyperlink at the end of this question to look at the draft maps, which will open in a new tab. Then pick which one(s) you feel best represent the function of Natomas Unified - serving its students and school communities. You can choose more than one. View draft maps here:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1MmGDuHvhPBewUPrhQpuhKqzAbXXLCgIKq>

Check all that apply.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F

10. If you want, please tell us why we chose the map(s) you did

11. Voluntarily put in your email to receive your engagement badge in the next few weeks

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

ENCUESTA DE CVRA

En esta época extraordinaria de pandemia, división política y otros factores de estrés, nuestros platos ya están llenos. Sin embargo, pido su ayuda en este momento. Puede ser un esfuerzo rápido o prolongado, usted decide. Le prometo que su opinión es importante y SE NECESITA porque una decisión en 13 días cambiará radicalmente la forma en que se dirige este distrito y se sirve a sus estudiantes.

A continuación hay preguntas que necesito que consideres. Puedes responder a 1 o a todas ellas (y a todo intermedio). Esto puede ser anónimo o si compartes tu correo electrónico compartiremos una insignia de participación que puedes añadir a tu correo electrónico y que reconoce tu asistencia. Ni siquiera necesitamos tu nombre. Sólo un correo electrónico te sirve para obtener una placa.

1. ¿Está usted interesado en dar su opinión sobre la creación de los mapas de la zona de los fideicomisarios o no le interesa? Si marca "No estoy interesado" ha terminado, pero aún así nos ha ayudado.

Mark only one oval.

Interesado

No estoy interesado

2. ¿Sabía usted que NUSD es una de las comunidades más integradas del país?

Mark only one oval.

Estoy al tanto

Creo que estoy al tanto

No estaba al tanto de eso hasta ahora

3. ¿Hasta qué punto le importa que todos los vecindarios y/o comunidades escolares de NUSD estén representados en el Consejo de Administración?

Mark only one oval.

- 100% importante
- Más importante
- Algo importante
- No es realmente importante
- No es importante para mí

4. ¿Le importa tener una fuerte probabilidad de 2 áreas fideicomisarias predominantemente en el sur de Natomas para asegurarse de que todos los estudiantes y las comunidades están representadas?

Mark only one oval.

- 100% importante
- Más importante
- Algo importante
- No es realmente importante
- No es importante para mí

5. ¿Está de acuerdo con que dos fideicomisarios no puedan volver a ser candidatos en 2022 porque se puede elegir un mapa que obligue a dos miembros titulares a abandonar la Mesa Directiva hasta que puedan volver a ser candidatos en 2024?

Mark only one oval.

- No estoy de acuerdo con esto y prefiero que los votantes decidan quién es elegido para la Mesa Directiva
- Estoy de acuerdo con esta posibilidad
- No tengo opinión

6. ¿Sabía usted que parte de Natomas es servido por el Distrito Escolar de Twin Rivers y no todo Natomas está dentro del Distrito de Natomas?

Mark only one oval.

- Estoy al tanto
- Creo que estoy al tanto
- No estaba al tanto de eso hasta ahora

7. Todos los mapas, excepto el mapa E, permiten que cada área de los administradores tenga un administrador que represente a cada área para la próxima elección (2022). South Natomas, Southwest Natomas, o Heron/Creekside/et al. tendrían que esperar hasta el 2024 con el Mapa E. ¿Qué tan importante es para usted tener las cinco áreas representadas para el 2022?

Mark only one oval.

- Muy importante
- importante
- Algo importante
- No es importante

8. ¿Has mirado los 6 mapas propuestos para reorganizar la Mesa Directiva del Distrito de Escolar Natomas (esto es requerido para ser considerado por la ley federal y estatal cada década)?

Mark only one oval.

- Si
- No

9. Por favor, haga clic en el enlace al final de esta pregunta para ver el proyecto de mapas, que se abrirá en una nueva pestaña. Luego, elija el o los que considere que representan mejor la función del Distrito de Natomas: servir a sus estudiantes y comunidades escolares. Puede elegir más de uno. Vea el borrador de los mapas aquí:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1MmGDuHvhPBewUPrQpuhKqzAbXXLCgIKq>

Check all that apply.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F

10. Si lo desea, díganos por qué motivo debemos elegir el mapa o los mapas que ha elegido

11. Introduzca voluntariamente su correo electrónico para recibir su placa de participación en las próximas semanas

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

CVRA Survey

ਮਹਾਂਮਾਰੀ, ਰਾਜਨੀਤਿਕ ਵੰਡ, ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਤਣਾਅ ਦੇ ਇਸ ਅਸਾਧਾਰਣ ਸਮੇਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਾਡੀਆਂ ਪਲੇਟਾਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਹੀ ਭਰੀਆਂ ਹੋਈਆਂ ਹਨ। ਪਰ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਮਦਦ ਮੰਗ ਰਿਹਾ ਹਾਂ। ਇਹ ਇੱਕ ਤੇਜ਼ ਜਤਨ ਜਾਂ ਵਧਾਇਆ ਜਾ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ - ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਪਸੰਦ। ਮੈਂ ਵਾਅਦਾ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਫੀਡਬੈਕ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਇਸਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ ਕਿਉਂਕਿ 13 ਦਿਨਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਇੱਕ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਮੂਲ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਬਦਲ ਦੇਵੇਗਾ ਕਿ ਇਸ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹੇ ਦੀ ਅਗਵਾਈ ਕਿਵੇਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਸੇਵਾ ਕਿਵੇਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ।

ਹੇਠਾਂ ਉਹ ਸਵਾਲ ਹਨ ਜੋ ਮੈਨੂੰ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਿਚਾਰ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ। ਤੁਸੀਂ 1 ਜਾਂ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਸਾਰਿਆਂ (ਅਤੇ ਵਿਚਕਾਰਲੀ ਹਰ ਚੀਜ਼) ਦਾ ਜਵਾਬ ਦੇ ਸਕਦੇ ਹੋ। ਇਹ ਅਗਿਆਤ ਹੋ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ ਜਾਂ ਜੇਕਰ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਈਮੇਲ ਸਾਂਝੀ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋ ਤਾਂ ਅਸੀਂ ਇੱਕ ਭਾਰੀਦਾਰੀ ਬੈਜ ਸਾਂਝਾ ਕਰਾਂਗੇ ਜੋ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਈਮੇਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਸ਼ਾਮਲ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹੋ ਜੋ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਨੂੰ ਪਛਾਣਦਾ ਹੈ। ਸਾਨੂੰ ਤੇਰੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਵੀ ਲੋੜ ਨਹੀਂ। ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਇੱਕ ਈਮੇਲ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇੱਕ ਬੈਜ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਦੀ ਹੈ।

- ਕੀ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਏਰੀਆ ਨਕਸੇ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਬਣਾਏ ਜਾਣ ਬਾਰੇ ਫੀਡਬੈਕ ਪ੍ਰਦਾਨ ਕਰਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਿਲਚਸਪੀ ਰੱਖਦੇ ਹੋ ਜਾਂ ਕੀ ਇਹ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਲਈ ਦਿਲਚਸਪੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੈ। ਜੇਕਰ ਤੁਸੀਂ "ਦਿਲਚਸਪੀ ਨਹੀਂ" 'ਤੇ ਨਿਸ਼ਾਨ ਲਗਾਉਂਦੇ ਹੋ ਤਾਂ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਪੁਰਾ ਕਰ ਲਿਆ ਪਰ ਫਿਰ ਵੀ ਸਾਡੀ ਮਦਦ ਕੀਤੀ।

Mark only one oval.

 ਦਿਲਚਸਪੀ ਇਛੁਕ ਨਹੀਂ

- ਕੀ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਣਦੇ ਹੋ ਕਿ NUSD ਦੇਸ਼ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਭ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਏਕੀਕ੍ਰਿਤ ਭਾਈਚਾਰਿਆਂ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਇੱਕ ਹੈ?

Mark only one oval.

 ਮੈਂ ਜਾਣੂ ਹਾਂ ਮੈਨੂੰ ਲੱਗਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਜਾਣੂ ਹਾਂ ਮੈਨੂੰ ਹੁਣ ਤੱਕ ਇਸ ਬਾਰੇ ਪਤਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਸੀ

3. ਬੋਰਡ ਆਫ਼ ਟਰੱਸਟੀਜ਼ ਨਾਲ ਨੁਮਾਇੰਦਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਵਾਲੇ ਸਾਰੇ NUSD ਆਂਢ-ਗੁਆਂਢ ਅਤੇ/ਜਾਂ ਸਕੂਲੀ ਭਾਈਚਾਰਿਆਂ ਦੀ ਕਿਹੜੀ ਡਿਗਰੀ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਲਈ ਮਾਇਨੇ ਰੱਖਦੀ ਹੈ?

Mark only one oval.

- 100% ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ
- ਜ਼ਿਆਦਾਤਰ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ
- ਕੁਝ ਹੱਦ ਤੱਕ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ
- ਅਸਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਨਹੀਂ
- ਮੇਰੇ ਲਈ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਨਹੀਂ

4. ਕੀ 2 ਮੁੱਖ ਤੌਰ 'ਤੇ ਦੱਖਣੀ ਨੈਟੋਮਾਸ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਮਜ਼ਬੂਤ ਸੰਭਾਵਨਾ ਹੋਣਾ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਲਈ ਇਹ ਯਕੀਨੀ ਬਣਾਉਣ ਲਈ ਮਾਇਨੇ ਰੱਖਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਸਾਰੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਅਤੇ ਭਾਈਚਾਰਿਆਂ ਦੀ ਨੁਮਾਇੰਦਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ?

Mark only one oval.

- 100% ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ
- ਜ਼ਿਆਦਾਤਰ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ
- ਕੁਝ ਹੱਦ ਤੱਕ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ
- ਅਸਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਨਹੀਂ
- ਮੇਰੇ ਲਈ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਨਹੀਂ

5. ਕੀ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਠੀਕ ਹੋ ਜੇ ਦੋ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ 2022 ਵਿੱਚ ਦੁਬਾਰਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਚੱਲ ਸਕਦੇ ਕਿਉਂਕਿ ਇੱਕ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਚੁਣਿਆ ਜਾ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ ਜੋ ਬੋਰਡ ਤੋਂ ਦੋ ਅਹੁਦੇਦਾਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਜ਼ਬੂਰ ਕਰਦਾ ਹੈ ਜਦੋਂ ਤੱਕ ਉਹ 2024 ਵਿੱਚ ਦੁਬਾਰਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਚੱਲ ਸਕਦੇ?

Mark only one oval.

- ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਨਾਲ ਠੀਕ ਨਹੀਂ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਵੇਟਰ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਕਰਨਗੇ ਕਿ ਬੋਰਡ ਲਈ ਕੌਣ ਚੁਣਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ
- ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਸੰਭਾਵਨਾ ਨਾਲ ਠੀਕ ਹਾਂ
- ਮੇਰੀ ਕੋਈ ਰਾਏ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੈ

6. ਕੀ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਣਦੇ ਹੋ ਕਿ ਟਵਿਨ ਰਿਵਰਜ਼ ਸਕੂਲ ਡਿਸਟ੍ਰਿਕਟ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਕੁਝ ਨਟੋਮਾਸ ਦੀ ਸੇਵਾ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਨੈਟੋਮਾਸ ਨੈਟੋਮਾਸ ਯੂਨੀਡਾਈਡ ਦੇ ਅੰਦਰ ਨਹੀਂ ਹਨ?

Mark only one oval.

- ਮੈਂ ਜਾਣ ਹਾਂ
- ਮੈਨੂੰ ਲੱਗਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਜਾਣ ਹਾਂ
- I was not aware of that until now

7. Have you looked at the 6 maps proposed to reorganize the Natomas Unified School Board (this is required to be considered by federal and state law every decade)?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes

8. Please click on the hyperlink at the end of this question to look at the draft maps, which will open in a new tab. Then pick which one(s) you feel best represent the function of Natomas Unified - serving its students and school communities. You can choose more than one. View draft maps here:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1MmGDuHvhPBewUPrQpuhKqzAbXXLCgIKq>

Check all that apply.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F

9. If you want, please tell us why we chose the map(s) you did


This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

4th Community Survey
Input on Six (6) Draft Map Scenarios
November 2021


Are you interested in providing feedback on the creation of By Trustee Area Maps or is that not an interest for you. If you mark “Not interested” you are done but still helped us.

592 responses




Are you aware NUSD is one of the most integrated communities in the nation?

544 responses



What degree does having all NUSD neighborhoods and/or school communities represented with the Board of Trustees matter to you?

536 responses




Not Really important (green) - 3.2%

Not Important to me (purple) - 3%

Does having a strong likelihood of 2 predominately South Natomas Trustee Areas matter to you to make sure all students and communities are represented?


528 responses



Not important to me (purple) - 4.2%


Are you okay if two Trustees cannot run again in 2022 because a map may be chosen that forces two incumbents off the Board until they can run again in 2024?

534 responses




Are you aware that some of Natomas is served by the Twin Rivers School District and not all of Natomas is within Natomas Unified?

534 responses




All maps except Map E allow for every Trustee area to have a Trustee representing each area by the next election (2022). Either South Natomas, Southwest Natomas, or Heron/Creekside/etc. would have to wait until 2024 with Map E. How important is it to you to have all five areas represented by 2022?
528 responses




Have you looked at the 6 maps proposed to reorganize the Natomas Unified School Board (this is required to be considered by federal and state law every decade)?

526 responses



Please click on the hyperlink at the end of this question to look at the draft maps, which will open in a new tab. Then pick which one(s) you feel best represent the function of Natomas Unified - serving its students and school communities. You can choose more than one. View draft maps here: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1MmGDuHvhPBewUPrQpuhKqzAbXXLCgIKq>

421 responses



If you want, please tell us why we chose the map(s) you did

163 responses

If you want, please tell us why we chose the map(s) you did

The Two Rivers/Leroy Greene neighborhood in which I live is not lumped in with a far North Natomas Area in E and F maps. I'd rather our area be grouped with other S Natomas sections or the Witter area only. I feel that the North area would likely take precedence, and the North area is already over-represented. My area would be ignored. none... some areas like south natomas do not have representation

It is important that all areas within NUSD have a representative from that area. It is unsettling that 3 current board members all live within 1 map area. I don't feel like they can truly represent South Natomas' unique needs and values.

It seems to spread out representation more.

I honestly haven't a clue what this is about

The blatant gerrymandering of Trustee Area Lines in plans A-D is not a good look.

The areas the freeways divide are different--following those lines as much as possible makes sense.

Also, while Trustee Area #5 is currently within size, it is the area with the most potential for growth. Having that area divided in two, as in plan E, ensures the growing population will be represented.

I haven't lived here long enough to have a strong opinion. Will hope the voters will decide.

Even divide region not by population

Seems like a more even distribution of trustees to residents

A, B, and D appear nearly the same, the differences are very subtle. E seems more geographically even. In addition, we, personally, are in the Twin Rivers area (had to do intra district transfer) and would much rather be moved to Natomas USD. But the maps don't appear to include our address, therefore, this doesn't really apply to our residence. It's unclear

Map c doesn't split my school American lakes into two trustee areas

Lisa Kaplan area is too big.

Map C maintains communities and school boundaries, has the least variance in representation, and gives the voters the most choice in electing their representatives. Geography Keeping neighborhoods whole. However I think voters should decide for their area so would recommend special election in 2022 for the area with 3 board members I am against splitting up the district into Trustee Areas. We should be able to vote the BEST candidates in regardless of what area of Natomas they live in. I feel like this is a ploy to keep certain board members on the board based on the location of their home address.

Equality

This seems to best represent the communities I know in Natomas.

Most looks like Natomas. There are 3 trustees in Westlake, which is not fair.

Population appears most evenly spread

it was the first choice

It makes easy to divide the areas

I believe this gives South Natomas the best chance at 2 reps and it puts the Natomas HS with a South Natomas rep because that's where it is. And it makes sense and meets the criteria.

Continuity in geographic representation

Map F was not included in the docs in the link and that's why I didn't vote for it (but based on the explanation in the letter sounds like a good proposal). I chose B and C because those seem to have the population more evenly distributed among the areas, and most areas are represented with the exception of Area 2.

Only reasonable option.

the people in the seats is more important to me than where they live. We currently have trustees living in the North, who care about south-area kids, there are others who don't care about south area kiddos. Hearts are more important to me than boundaries

(1) Scenario E is the only option that doesn't divide communities in numerous ways as the other options do. I support this option. (2) Scenarios A, B, and C appear to be gerrymandered to optimize the number of districts to be drawn from the Westlake Community where three members currently reside in close proximity to each other. (3) Scenario D unnecessarily divides River Oaks. (4) My neighborhood has no connection to Westlake and I do not support any map that lumps together a portion of River Oaks with Westlake.

Because where current trustees live has no bearing on how trustee areas should be drawn.

I choose none of the above. These maps do not have the language data included that should be a part of making a majority/minority trustee area map. Further, each map has flaws that do not take into account natural communities, HOA boundaries and areas of growth.

N/A

Protecting incumbents is a silly reason to draw a map. If they're that good, voters will reelect them again in the next election.

This is the most fair distribution of populations, allows room for growth and doesn't create a protected seat area for Kaplan.

I am in South Natomas so it makes little difference, but Map C keeps South Natomas whole more than the other maps.

F creates a better balance of schools per area.

It seems to be a more even distribution

I thought each trustee had to represent every child in Natomas - so why can't 3 districts touch South Natomas forcing whomever the elected is represent ALL of Natomas. Also, I don't really like the above choices because each one doesn't address the significant difference in which districts have more apartments or residences in them - looks like one area has only 19% apartments but another has over 40%. Shouldn't this matter? I thought the district looked at equity and putting more apartments in districts in South Natomas doesn't look good for promoting equity.

Divides southwest Natomas in a way that makes the most sense.

Districts best represent neighborhoods.

This would represent my neighborhood. My children's school is not in South Natomas so I dont feel the needs are the same as a North Natomas school.

I selected A since I believe it leaves the least vacant area for representation. However, I am also new to learning about this, so I could be wrong and hope this is helpful. I also believe that healthy, legal, competitive elections, even with long standing candidates,

can be beneficial for the organization at hand, and the community. My thought was A would represent those who may need to be represented the most and bring a new light or ideas to the table based on experience and/or preference to serve the district and community.

It is the best representative of the communities

This map gives the best representation for ALL Natomas students. If I had to give a second choice it would be F. Equal representation sooner than later.

I think the line for area 2 should stop at the freeway. Area 1 should include the additional school. We obviously want representation as soon as possible but really Area 4's interests are likely covered by area 3 or 5, so two more years is not terrible since it is no different than now where it does not matter where trustees live. Map F appears to cut a neighborhood in half and the trustee lives on the "north" side while largely representing the south. This seems to be what we are trying to fix by making these changes. The district letter does not seem fair to say that Map E is unacceptable.

The cultural distribution in each district seemed more evenly spread out, so if one district was dropped off, the map was still well representative of Natomas residents. Makes the most sense going forward, no weirdly crossing freeway boundaries.

This survey is not very scientific. It is also clearly biased against map E. Why is that? Didn't the demographer draw this map?

Who wrote these insanely biased questions? Don't you have a demographer?

What's important to me is unrelated to the incumbents. Trustee areas must be fair, unbiased and represent minorities in an equal way. Your questions are terribly worded with bias.

Areas are not split

I think it is best representation. Some maps appear to gerrymander districts.

It's all natomas

I didn't pick a map- I don't understand why my neighborhood- regency park- is only 1/2 in the school district. Why draw a line in the middle of a subdivision? Why isn't regency park part of NUSD?

Not really sure, I thinks it gives a better futuristic view of where the growth of Natomas is heading and how it ca be better served, since we are a the most integrated communities in the nation Trustees should not represent a specific area, they should represent all of Natomas and Serve all the needs and necessities of its constituents as ONE.

I do not reside in the map areas, but I feel all students should be represented. I do not know which map best does this.

I chose F because it seemed a little odd to have a member represent a portion of South Natomas and the West Lake neighborhood. The other four maps seemed similar so I choose A as another option.

Its good

It's weird that a map was added which doesn't appear to be from a member of the community. I would like to see any maps proposed by the public also posted on the website, not just in the public comment section.

This map gives greater representation for every area.

Only maps that don't appear to be gerrymandered around sitting trustees' residences (which should not be a factor in the mapping process).

Random. Stupid survey!

I think it matches current school assignments/boundaries. So I think if trustees were to represent areas, it would make sense that they'd be clustered by school boundaries of the area

Gerrymandering around three current incumbents seems irresponsible.

No map appears ideal, it would be nice to use map C as a base and adjust to have equal representation of apartments vs residences in each district

I don't think any of them best serve its students. I disagree with the school system except Charter schools.

Please give more explanation of each outcome & make user friendly. My education and work experience did not prepare me for maps & scenarios sent as if I'm a trustee nor on the board. I'm a pretty smart cookie but I'm sure I'm not alone in saying: Toggling btwn screens of maps and scenarios makes no sense to those not in your field of expertise and seems time consuming to google what this and that mean. I'd suggest opening sports and extra curriculars to all students at all schools (including charters) if Mr. Evans would like to gain the attention of ALL parents and tax payers within the district (particularly those parents and tax payers that "hung in there" during the recession (pre Chris Evans in his current role).

The geography makes more sense on that map. It doesn't make sense to have such large geographic areas. It's actually counterproductive to have such large areas because they are vastly different.

The boundary lines make sense to utilize the main roads and freeways as boundary lines.

I am in the purple section (non-gated Westlake) and do not want to be separated from my neighborhood nor do I want the area too big.

Map C divides the schools between the district areas and is the best start. Also, I don't like any of the maps because it doesn't take into account single homes vs. apartments and we can still divide the schools more evenly in the areas. There's too many schools in some and too few in others. Also, it doesn't account for growth in the arena area due to the recent news story and growth in the pink and blue areas in the future. I don't appreciate having less time to figure this out since these are the people who will represent us in the future and we are stuck with these maps for a while! What analysis is

being done with maps that residents are submitting? Are you replying to those maps? I didn't add my email because I don't want my kids retaliated against at their school. Most even distribution of population and only one area without a trustee at this time. Looks like student population is balanced best in this map.

same trustee on all the maps

no

None really , think current system is okay 3 trustees live in populated North Natomas son't know why we would pit them against each other that's who voters picked Map C is the most evenly divided based on purely population numbers, thus seems equal for all areas in my opinion.

Meh. Your maps and data sent tell me you were unprepared and caught off guard. It's going to be difficult to rally the troops for those of us who have paid all the taxes for 20+ years rallied & barely got to keep schools open during the recession. Suggestion for Mr. Evans: instead of academic political surveys sent, send a survey to every teacher, employee, student and parent within the district over the past 5-10 years to get a beat (pulse) on the districts' performance. I've heard there's been a huge turnover NPE due to the lack of organization and the constant changes in leadership...good luck & god speed (but if that vibe continues: we're abandoning Natomas to avoid the HUGE loss of equity and neighborhood dynamics that this community has had for over 20 yrs).

More diverse

Best

The inclusion of Westpark with North Natomas Park in Trustee

Most equitable

They are the most fairly represented

Looked at maps, looks like a lot analysis is required to figure out who is doing what to whom

Makes the most geographic sense, and is the most fair to the community. It follows the law, and does not gerrymander current trustees or any other irrelevant things.

smaller

My #1: Map 3 will finally give South Natomas constituents equitable representation in the governance of this district. I've worked in SoNat since 1997. This is LONG overdue.

Others: Most equitable way to have all constituents represented; these splits make sense geographically and community - wise.

A, B, and C are gerrymandered to help the incumbents. Yuck.

I am most concerned that the maps and representatives clearly represent the populations in the district. I am a little confused at the details of the maps so I didn't choose any. I am a white person and I feel very strongly that the kids in our district and all of their cultures and relative concerns and needs should be represented and

considered. I want my kid to be exposed to as much diversity as we can bring him and I want every kid to feel that they have the same chance at learning as the next. This world needs diversity and we need to take full advantage of the diversity that we have in our district.

I don't like how Natomas Park West is divided in A. Honestly, our children go to a charter school outside our immediate area no matter how it's sliced, so I'm not sure that any of this makes a personal difference to us. I just want to see more equal representation across the whole district, especially since the children at our kids' school (NP3) come from all over the district.

Mostly even and level from a stacked perspective.

I think the boundaries are clean and clear. No gerrymandering.

I feel like map E best represents South Natomas and the older areas of Natomas.

B seems to more equitably distribute power across income levels. C seems to accomplish a similar goal, but perhaps less effectively.

Keeps a strong South Natomas area

Although I don't feel entirely educated about the situation, those maps seem to ensure representation.

Nearly every section is represented.

I don't like any of them. I trust the educated trustee that get to the board to serve all Natomas

I would like to see every area represented well.

Would like for the North Natomas area to be sheltered

I would like for north Natomas to stay intact

Best representation

Best representation with less cutting important demographics

Population balanced, and the areas are arranged logically - using natural boundaries such as the expressway when practical.

I used to work at Bannon Creek and I think someone who lives in that area needs to help make decisions for that area.

No

I have worked in south Natomas schools and see the importance of the our schools being represented by all school board members in the north or south.

It had the fewest breaks in the middle of a neighborhood and kept a good number of the current school board members.

Map E appears to provide the most diversity based on housing types. It avoids diluting the voice of voters in apartments. Ensuring socioeconomic diversity on the Board helps ensure all kids' needs are met and all voices are heard.

Visually it appears to cover equal areas and as we build more homes we do need to consider that.

It's more representative of the areas that should have Trustees that actually know their particular community's needs. Having three trustees from the Westlake area is probably why our highest poverty school communities are IB instead of AVID...they have no idea what the actual needs of American Lakes, Bannon Creek and Jefferson elem students are.

Evenly distributed

Seems simpler and makes the denser areas smaller.

I liked all the maps

It's very clarity for my side

Seems like the best grouping

This should have never happened in the first place.

Evenly divided.

I don't feel I am knowledgeable enough about the boundaries to answer this question.

I just feel it should be fair and equal distribution.

Every one needs to be represented.

It seems to have a more equal concentration of neighborhoods in each section.

Looks more even

Too many choices and too confusing.

Need more representation from different areas and socioeconomic status. Trustees have served for too long and have become complacent and "yes men." Need trustees who are going to question more and who go out into the community and listen to the needs of the community and what is best for the students who reside in the community.

I didn't because I did not exactly understand what I was looking at

I like E for shared and concentrated focus.

I like F for it's directed focus and both for covering entire NUSD mapping and not leaving open areas slated for 2024.

Note: that's if I am reading it right?

Why do all 6 maps split up the Natomas Park Neighborhood. It is insulting that there was not one map that did not devide our neighborhood and weaken our influence. We do not have a representative currently on the board.

Provided areas with more representation.

I don't understand what the maps are showing me

South Natomas needs representation. This socioeconomic discrimination and bias has existed on the board for decades.

E looks like it gives more representation to South Natomas. The others look like disenfranchisement of the South Natomas community by splitting their representation with the North

the representation is the most spread out

More representation

South Natomas NEEDS REPRESENTATION AND ALL AREAS NEED TO BE BROKEN UP AS EVENLY AS POSSIBLE!!

Based on the knowledge I have and read, that is what I think is the best choice.

I really didn't like the way any were district but Mario D was the closest. I don't believe that North Natomas and by the River should be in the same district but I do agree with other neighborhoods for the most part. I do not believe the three reps in three same area should be in different boundaries. They are all in the same boundary as far as I am concerned. Also Erika does not represent South if 80 for South Natomas. That area needs its own rep. We are really underserved in this area.

I didn't really understand the maps so didn't choose.

It spreads the current trustees out most equitably to represent all areas of Natomas. With the opportunity of a trustee living in each particular area it would provide more diversity and knowledge in regards to that specific area with the trustee living in that area. The three trustees currently living in one area but trying to represent an area they do not live in, does not provide first hand knowledge of the needs in that area. Diversity is having a represented who lives in the particular area represented.

no idea

I choose these two maps (E and F) because they seem to ensure the best representation of our students and their families. The demographics seems most balanced and cohesive in both of these maps.

Best geographical representation

It appears to be the most equitable scenario.

We live in Davis, but I wanted to answer this to indicate that inclusion of all types of diversity is one thing that drew us here. DJUSD suffers greatly from a lack of such!

Please do not divide the district. Too many Chief's not enough Indians

Most balanced and most fair for the community as a whole.

Most time spent crafting and based on community feedback

being a resident of North Natomas for 16 years and teaching at NUSD for 15, I see the inequity in the other maps. I know the neighborhoods and have worked in 5 of our schools. I know the people and my community well and have history here and care about what happens to the people who they represent.

Unable to open attachments.

I feel that all of these maps have issues that need to be considered and dealt with. I would like more information about the house to apartment ratio on these maps as it does make a difference in equity. I like map C because it allows for me to be able to vote for the trustee and I am not just going to be told who it is. The whole point of this process is to be able to vote for a trustee that I feel will represent my community well. That will be taken away in all of the other options. I also liked map F because it appears

to have a more equitable division and the boundaries seem to take into consideration for future growth (upper westside project). However, this map would mean that I would lose the ability to vote for my trustee and that is not something that I would give up willingly.

We have one trustee from South Natomas and this map seems best at including the earlier Natomas residents in south and west Natomas.

Map E best represent the Natomas Community as a whole.

I don't think we should be basing the decision on whether or not the board gets to keep their job; I think the most important thing is that our students and families are represented.

This maps is more equitable and makes sense for representation.

More targeted representation and school based orientation.

Most representative.

I am in favor of any map that is equitable, fair and doesn't leave three representatives in Westlake.

More even areas

It seems the fairest way to divide the district for kids.

Although these seem like they will make for challenging elections in the short term, they seem to make long term sense.

NTA recommendation

South Natomas is an extremely underrepresented and high needs area and we need people who live in our community on the school board so we have a voice. People think they understand our community but don't actually live in it and know.

Puts my neighborhood and its schools with similar neighborhoods and schools.

Map E areas are drawn with respect to boundaries that make sense to our community.

Monday, October 25, 2021

Estimated Apartment Population					
Scenario A - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,456	11,712	17,168	31.8%	68.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,564	6,403	9,967	35.8%	64.2%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	5,628	11,333	16,961	33.2%	66.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,119	6,665	9,784	31.9%	68.1%
4					
2020 Population	2,813	14,963	17,776	15.8%	84.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,111	8,849	10,960	19.3%	80.7%
5					
2020 Population	3,041	14,032	17,073	17.8%	82.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,807	8,037	9,844	18.4%	81.6%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario B - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	2,662	14,147	16,809	15.8%	84.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,741	7,847	9,588	18.2%	81.8%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	6,531	10,491	17,022	38.4%	61.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,483	5,734	9,217	37.8%	62.2%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	15,455	17,810	13.2%	86.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	9,103	10,821	15.9%	84.1%
5					
2020 Population	5,390	11,947	17,337	31.1%	68.9%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,659	7,270	10,929	33.5%	66.5%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario C - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,349	12,051	17,400	30.7%	69.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	6,870	9,778	29.7%	70.3%
2					
2020 Population	6,423	10,770	17,193	37.4%	62.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,427	7,623	12,050	36.7%	63.3%
3					
2020 Population	6,017	11,461	17,478	34.4%	65.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,287	6,661	9,948	33.0%	67.0%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	14,845	17,200	13.7%	86.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	8,712	10,430	16.5%	83.5%
5					
2020 Population	4,328	13,306	17,634	24.5%	75.5%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	7,714	10,622	27.4%	72.6%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario D - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	4,989	13,048	18,037	27.7%	72.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,744	7,668	10,412	26.4%	73.6%
2					
2020 Population	6,423	10,770	17,193	37.4%	62.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,427	7,623	12,050	36.7%	63.3%
3					
2020 Population	6,377	10,872	17,249	37.0%	63.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,451	6,281	9,732	35.5%	64.5%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	14,626	16,981	13.9%	86.1%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	8,541	10,259	16.7%	83.3%
5					
2020 Population	4,328	13,117	17,445	24.8%	75.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	7,467	10,375	28.0%	72.0%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario E - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Est. Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,665	11,175	16,840	33.6%	66.4%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,990	7,285	11,275	35.4%	64.6%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	4,847	12,628	17,475	27.7%	72.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,618	6,684	9,302	28.1%	71.9%
4					
2020 Population	3,182	14,626	17,808	17.9%	82.1%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,239	8,541	10,780	20.8%	79.2%
5					
2020 Population	3,244	13,611	16,855	19.2%	80.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,754	7,444	9,198	19.1%	80.9%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

POTENTIAL ELECTION SEQUENCING SCHEDULES

Below are the potential election sequencing schedules for each of the draft maps. In preparing these election sequencing schedules, consideration was given to, among other things, the fact that when a school board transitions to trustee area elections, each incumbent is afforded the right to serve out their four-year term, regardless of how the elections are sequenced. (Education Code section 5021.)

Currently the Board's elections are sequenced so that two seats are up for election in 2022 and three seats are up for election in 2024. The options provided below maintain this sequencing.

SCENARIO MAP A

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)	Heredia (2024)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5

SCENARIO MAP B

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 5

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 4

SCENARIO MAP No. C

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 5

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 4

SCENARIO MAP No. D

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Vacant	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022) Heredia (2024)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5

ALTERNATIVE SEQUENCING SCENARIO MAP D

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 5

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 4

SCENARIO MAP E

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Vacant	Vacant	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	Vacant	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 2; or
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5
- Plus one of either Trustee Area 1, Trustee Area 2 or Trustee Area 4

Scenario Map F

Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5
Vacant	Harden (2024)	Grant (2024)	Vacant	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

Sequencing

2022 election (2 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5

POSIBLES CICLOS ELECTORALES

A continuación se presentan los posibles ciclos electorales para cada uno de los borradores de mapas. En la preparación de estos calendarios de secuencia de las elecciones, se tuvo en cuenta, entre otras cosas, el hecho de que cuando un consejo escolar hace la transición a las elecciones de área de fideicomisarios, cada titular tiene el derecho de cumplir su término de cuatro años, independientemente de cómo se secuencien las elecciones (Código de Educación sección 5021).

Actualmente, las elecciones de la Directiva están secuenciadas de manera que dos puestos se eligen en 2022 y tres en el año 2024. Las opciones que se presentan a continuación mantienen esta secuencia.

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO
A

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)	Heredia (2024)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 4 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 5

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO B

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 5 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 4

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO C

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 5 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 4

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO D

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Vacante	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022) Heredia (2024)

SECUENCIA

Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)

- Área de fideicomisarios 2
- Área de fideicomisarios 4

Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)

- Área de fideicomisarios 1
- Área de fideicomisarios 3
- Área de fideicomisarios 5

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO DE SECUENCIACIÓN ALTERNATIVO D

SECUENCIA
<p>Eleción de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 5 <p>Eleción de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 4

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO E

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Vacante	Vacante	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	Vacante	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 2, O• Área de fideicomisarios 4 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 5• Más uno de los siguientes: Área 1 de los Fideicomisarios, Área 2 de los Fideicomisarios o Área 4 de los Fideicomisarios

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO F

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Vacante	Harden (2024)	Grant (2024)	Vacante	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA

Eleción de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)

- Área de fideicomisarios 1
- Área de fideicomisarios 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Área de fideicomisarios 2
- Área de fideicomisarios 3
- Área de fideicomisarios 5

ਸੰਭਾਵੀ ਚੋਣ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਸਮਾਂ-ਸਾਰਣੀ

ਹੇਠਾਂ ਹਰੇਕ ਡਰਾਫਟ ਨਕਸੇ ਲਈ ਸੰਭਾਵੀ ਚੋਣ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਸਮਾਂ-ਸਾਰਣੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਚੋਣ ਕ੍ਰਮ-ਸੂਚੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਤਿਆਰ ਕਰਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ, ਹੋਰ ਗੱਲਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ-ਨਾਲ, ਇਸ ਤੱਥ ਨੂੰ ਵੀ ਧਿਆਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਜਦੋਂ ਇੱਕ ਸਕੂਲ ਬੋਰਡ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਤਬਦੀਲ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਹਰੇਕ ਅਹੁਦੇਦਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਆਪਣੀ ਚਾਰ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਮਿਆਦ ਪੂਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਦਾ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਚਾਹੇ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਕਿਵੇਂ ਵੀ ਹੋਣ। ਕ੍ਰਮਬੱਧ (ਸਿੱਖਿਆ ਕੋਡ ਸੈਕਸ਼ਨ 5021)

ਵਰਤਮਾਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਬੋਰਡ ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਕ੍ਰਮਵਾਰ ਹਨ ਤਾਂ ਜੋ 2022 ਵਿੱਚ ਦੋ ਸੀਟਾਂ ਲਈ ਚੋਣ ਹੋਣ ਅਤੇ 2024 ਵਿੱਚ ਤਿੰਨ ਸੀਟਾਂ ਲਈ ਚੋਣ ਹੋਣ। ਹੇਠਾਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਵਿਕਲਪ ਇਸ ਕ੍ਰਮ ਨੂੰ ਕਾਇਮ ਰੱਖਦੇ ਹਨ।

ਫਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਏ A

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)	Heredia (2024)

ਕੁਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

ਦਿੱਸ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ B

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕੁਮਖਾਂ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

2024 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸਾ ਬੀ C

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕੁਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ D

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022) Heredia (2024)

ਕੁਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

ਵਿਕਲਪਿਕ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਦਿਸ਼ਾ ਦਾ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ D

ਕ੍ਰਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ E

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਖਾਲੀ	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2; ਜਾਂ
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
- ਨਾਲ ਹੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1, ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2 ਜਾਂ
ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4 ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਇੱਕ

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ F

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਖਾਲੀ	Harden (2024)	Grant (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

Sequencing

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)


ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5


NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

2020 CENSUS DATA - STATEWIDE REDISTRICTING FILE



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO A



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO A

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	5.8%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
Population Variance	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
Hispanic/Latino	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
White	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
Black/ African American	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Asian	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
Hispanic/Latino	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
White	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
Black/ African American	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Asian	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
Hispanic/Latino	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
White	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
Black/ African American	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
Asian	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS

ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO A

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	5.8%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
Variación de población	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
Hispano/Latino	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
Blanco	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Asiático	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
Hispano/Latino	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
Blanco	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Asiático	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
Hispano/Latino	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
Blanco	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
Negro/ Afroamericano	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
Asiático	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸਾ ਏ (Scenario A)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਰਿਵਰਤਨ:	5.8%
--------------------	---------------	---------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,168	17,948	16,940	17,776	17,073
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-213	567	-441	395	-308
	-1.2%	3.3%	-2.5%	2.3%	-1.8%
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	18.8%	19.8%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.7%	22.9%	24.8%	25.9%	34.7%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.2%	18.3%	15.5%	14.1%	12.2%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.5%	14.2%	30.0%	32.1%	23.8%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਡਰ	1.7%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.4%	6.7%	7.0%	7.2%	7.4%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,252	13,679	12,680	13,202	13,309
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	20.7%	32.2%	18.6%	17.2%	17.6%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	28.7%	26.6%	27.3%	27.7%	38.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.5%	18.2%	15.3%	14.4%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.7%	14.7%	31.1%	33.4%	24.3%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਡਰ	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%

ਵੋਟਿੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਰਿਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,967	12,284	9,773	10,960	9,844
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੋ	19.0%	33.9%	15.7%	12.8%	21.0%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	36.0%	29.3%	35.7%	35.4%	44.7%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	19.1%	18.5%	19.0%	15.8%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	21.9%	10.9%	24.0%	29.8%	18.4%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫਿਕ ਆਈਲੋਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	2.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO B



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO B

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
Population Variance	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
Hispanic/Latino	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
White	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
Black/ African American	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
Hispanic/Latino	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
White	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
Black/ African American	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
Other	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
Two or More Races	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
Hispanic/Latino	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
White	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
Black/ African American	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO B

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.4%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
Variación de población	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
Hispano/Latino	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
Blanco	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
Hispano/Latino	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
Blanco	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
Otro	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
Dos o más razas	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
Hispano/Latino	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
Blanco	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO B)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.4%
-------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,809	17,927	17,022	17,810	17,337
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	-572	546	-359	429	-44
	-3.3%	3.1%	-2.1%	2.5%	-0.3%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	20.6%	35.2%	20.3%	19.3%	20.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	24.7%	22.9%	24.2%	25.5%	36.6%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.4%	18.3%	15.8%	14.2%	13.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	30.7%	14.2%	31.0%	31.6%	19.1%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.2%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	12,725	13,664	12,772	13,065	13,896
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	19.2%	32.2%	18.7%	17.5%	18.6%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	27.4%	40.0%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.9%	18.1%	15.7%	14.5%	13.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	31.5%	14.7%	31.8%	33.1%	19.6%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.5%	5.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.9%

ਵੇਂਟੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,588	12,273	9,217	10,821	10,929
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤਿਨੇ	19.1%	33.9%	17.1%	13.0%	19.2%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	36.2%	29.3%	35.8%	33.6%	45.4%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.6%	18.5%	19.2%	15.9%	16.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸੀਆਈ	27.3%	10.9%	23.0%	30.9%	13.9%
ਮਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	2.5%	4.8%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	2.5%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Population Variance	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
White	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Black/ African American	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
White	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Black/ African American	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispanic/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
White	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Black/ African American	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO C

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	2.5%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Variación de población	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
Blanco	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
Blanco	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispano/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
Blanco	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO C)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ:	2.5%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟਾ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO D



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO D

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.1%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
Population Variance	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
White	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
Black/ African American	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
White	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
Black/ African American	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
Hispanic/Latino	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
White	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
Black/ African American	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
Asian	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO D

Población total:	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.1%
------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
Variación de población	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
Blanco	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
Blanco	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
Hispano/Latino	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
Blanco	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
Asiático	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਸਿਦਾਂ 12 ਨਵੰਬਰ 2020 ਵੇ (SCENARIO D)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ::	6.1%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	-----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	18,037	17,193	17,249	16,981	17,445
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	656	-188	-132	-400	64
	3.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	-2.3%	0.4%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.5%	19.0%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	23.2%	24.3%	24.9%	25.6%	35.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.2%	19.0%	15.6%	14.2%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.2%	12.8%	30.1%	31.4%	23.5%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	7.1%	6.2%	6.4%	7.5%	7.4%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,647	13,265	12,907	12,471	13,832
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.7%	17.1%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.7%	28.3%	27.4%	27.4%	39.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	14.9%	18.7%	15.5%	14.5%	12.4%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.2%	13.4%	30.9%	33.0%	23.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	10,412	12,050	9,732	10,259	10,375
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	18.5%	33.4%	17.7%	12.8%	19.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.5%	30.4%	37.5%	33.8%	44.3%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.3%	20.1%	18.3%	15.9%	14.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	26.6%	9.3%	21.8%	31.0%	16.9%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.0%	4.8%	3.1%	5.7%	4.1%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.3%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Population Variance	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
White	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
Hispanic/Latino	21.2%	32.2%	18.5%	17.9%	16.4%
White	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
White	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Black/ African American	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asian	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO E

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.3%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Variación de población	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispano/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
Blanco	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
Hispanic/Latino	21.2%	32.2%	18.5%	17.9%	16.4%
Blanco	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Otro	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
Blanco	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asiático	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਫਿਲਡ 12 ਨਕਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ (SCENARIO E)

ਕਲੁਹ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	17,381	ਵਿਧੁਰਵਰਤਨਾਂ::	6.3%
ਕਲੁਹ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))					
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
ਪਿੰਹਸਪੈਲੀਂਨ ਨਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨ੍	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
ਪਿੰਚੱਟਾ	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਅਨਾਰਾਜਕ	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
ਭਾਰਤ / ਮੁੱਲ ਵੀ ਅਲਾਸਕਾ	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
ਮੁੱਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦਰੋਜ਼ ਵਲੋਂ ਰਾਹੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
ਪਿੰਹਸਪੈਲੀਂਨ/ਲਾਤੀਨ੍	21.2%	32.2%	18.5%	17.9%	16.4%
ਪਿੰਚੱਟਾ	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੁੱਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
ਮੁੱਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਫਿਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦਰੋਜ਼ ਵਲੋਂ ਰਾਹੇਸ	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

ਵੋਟਿੰਗ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਲ ਗਰੜ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
ਪਿੰਹਸਪੈਲੀਂਨ/ਲਾਤੀਨ੍	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
ਪਿੰਚੱਟਾ	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੁੱਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Public Hearing and Action on Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish ਪੈਸੀਫਿਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change 401 0.2% 0.9% 0.8% Action on Resolution No. CC 22-01 0.5%				
					NUSD0417

हेर	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
दरै ज़फ वँच रोस	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

November 1, 2021

Dear NUSD Community,

The first ‘map consideration’ hearing for the district’s transition to by-trustee areas was held on October 27, 2021. At that meeting 5 draft maps were shared with the public. Today, a 6th map, Map F, is being posted for you to review and comment on. Here are some of the major elements of this map that you should know:


Element 1: This still maintains two predominantly south area Natomas focused trustee areas. Trustee area #2 meets state and federal law by maintaining a majority/minority coalition of Hispanic/Black and African American voters. This is a major requirement of the California Voting Rights Act. This map adds a third school to Trustee area #1. This map provides two Trustees to represent the traditional south natomas area in Trustee area #1 and Trustee area #2. Trustee area #2s configuration is the only option, after hours of time and analysis, that allows us to maintain the majority/minority coalition. In fact, we attempted to include Bannon Creek/Meeks Academy in one attempt. In another we tried Jefferson. Only the inclusion of American Lakes to Trustee area 1 did NOT eliminate the majority/minority coalition (which is unacceptable). Attempts were also made to include a charter school in Trustee area #2, in particular STAR Academy, however, any map configuration attempt to accomplish that resulted in the elimination of the majority/minority coalition and therefore was unacceptable.

Why create a Map F... because E has some positives and some fundamental serious flaws. The major problem with Map E is that it is the only map that creates three vacant by-Trustee areas, with only two seats up for election in 2022. This means Map E would leave Trustee areas 1, 2, and 4 without a direct representative who lived within the boundaries. The Natomas Unified Board of Trustees would have to pick two of the three areas for election in 2022, thus **leaving one area without a direct representative until 2024**. Map F provides another map for consideration that accomplishes much of what we heard is wanted, includes one more school in Trustee Area 1 and creates two vacant areas, both up for election in about a year's time. All Trustee areas would have a representative living with the areas by December 2022 (the earliest possible date). Maps A, B, C and D also address what Map F does. Only Map E creates an impossible situation where one Trustee area is directly unrepresented for 3 more years.



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
Population Variance	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
White	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
Black/ African American	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
Other	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
Hispanic/Latino	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
White	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
Black/ African American	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Other	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
White	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
Black/ African American	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Asian	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

1ro de noviembre del 2021

Estimada comunidad del NUSD,

La primera audiencia de "consideración de mapas" para la transición del distrito a áreas por fideicomisario se realizó el 27 de octubre del 2021. En esa reunión se compartieron con el público 5 borradores de mapas. Hoy en día, un sexto mapa, el mapa F, se publica para que usted pueda revisar y comentar. Aquí están algunos de los principales elementos de este mapa que usted debe saber:


Elemento 1: Esto aún mantiene dos áreas de fideicomisarios enfocadas predominantemente en el área sur de Natomas. El área fideicomisaria #2 cumple con la ley estatal y federal al mantener una coalición mayoritaria/minoritaria de votantes hispanos/negros y afroamericanos. Este es un requisito importante de la Ley de Derecho al Voto de California. Este mapa agrega una tercera escuela al área de fideicomisarios #1. Este mapa proporciona dos fideicomisarios para representar el área tradicional del sur de Natomas en el área del fideicomisario #1 y el área del fideicomisario #2. La configuración del área #2 es la única opción, después de horas de tiempo y análisis, que nos permite mantener la coalición de mayoría/minoría. De hecho, intentamos incluir Bannon Creek/Meeks Academy en un intento. En otro lo intentamos con Jefferson. Sólo la inclusión de American Lakes al área fideicomisario 1 NO eliminó la coalición mayoría/minoría (lo cual es inaceptable). También se intentó incluir una escuela charter en el área de fideicomisario #2, en particular la Academia STAR, sin embargo, cualquier intento de configuración del mapa para lograrlo resultó en la eliminación de la coalición mayoritaria/minoritaria y por lo tanto fue inaceptable.

Por qué crear un Mapa F... porque el mapa E tiene algunos aspectos positivos y algunos defectos fundamentales serios. El mayor problema con el Mapa E es que es el único mapa que crea tres áreas vacantes por Fideicomisario, con sólo dos plazas a elegir en 2022. Esto significa que el Mapa E dejaría a las áreas 1, 2 y 4 de los Fideicomisarios sin un representante directo que viviese dentro de los límites. La Mesa Directiva del Distrito de Natomas tendría que elegir dos de las tres áreas para la elección en 2022, **dejando así un área sin representante directo hasta 2024**. El mapa F proporciona otro mapa para su consideración que logra mucho de lo que oímos que se quiere, incluye una escuela más en el Área de Fideicomisarios 1 y crea dos áreas vacantes, ambas para la elección en un año aproximadamente. Todas las áreas de los Fideicomisarios tendrían un representante que viva en las áreas para diciembre del 2022 (la fecha más temprana posible). Los mapas A, B, C y D también contemplan lo que hace el mapa F. Sólo el mapa E crea una situación imposible en la que una área de los fideicomisarios queda directamente sin representación durante un período de 3 años más.



NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F



DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO F

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
Variación de población	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
Blanco	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
Otro	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
Hispanic/Latino	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
Blanco	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Otro	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 6
Población	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
Blanco	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Asiático	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਦਿ੍ਹਨ ਨਕਸਾ ਏ (Scenario F)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਰਿਵਰਤਨ:	6.4%
--------------------	---------------	--------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%



► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

November 8, 2021



**COOPERATIVE
STRATEGIES**
ASSESS • PLAN • FUND • BUILD

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

Natomas
Unified School District
411
NUSD0427
Connecting students to their future

► Objectives

1. Briefly review 5 original maps
2. Spend time on Map F (first time shared at public meeting)
3. Explain consequences of maps and potential election sequencing
4. Review 4th survey feedback
5. Try to narrow Maps from 6 to 3/4

► TRUSTEE AREA PROCESS

DATE	ACTIVITY
August 4, 2021	Board meeting: First Pre-Map Public Hearing and Presentation
September 1, 2021	Board meeting: Second Pre-Map Public Hearing
September – October 2021	Preparation of draft trustee area scenarios
October 27, 2021	Board Meeting: First Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
November 8, 2021	Board Meeting: Second Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios
November 17, 2021	Board Meeting: Third Public Hearing on Trustee Area Scenarios Board Selection of Trustee Area Map
January / February 2022	County Committee on School District Organization Holds a Public Hearing and Considers Approval of Change in Election Method and Trustee Area Map
November 8, 2022	First Election Held Utilizing Trustee Areas

► CONSIDERATIONS IN TRUSTEE AREAS



Each area shall contain nearly equal number of inhabitants



Follow man-made and natural geographic features, as much as possible



Drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act



Respect incumbency, if possible



Compact and contiguous, as much as possible




Other local considerations (i.e., school boundaries, locations of school sites)



Respect communities of interest, as much as possible

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO A



415

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO A

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	5.5%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	17,168	9,967	17,927	12,273	16,961	9,784	17,776	10,960	17,073	9,844
Population Variance	-1.2%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	-2.4%	N/A	2.3%	N/A	-1.8%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	22.2%	19.0%	35.2%	33.9%	20.4%	15.7%	18.8%	12.8%	19.8%	21.0%
White	25.7%	36.0%	22.9%	29.3%	24.8%	35.7%	25.9%	35.4%	34.7%	44.7%
Black/African American	16.2%	19.1%	18.3%	18.5%	15.5%	19.1%	14.1%	15.8%	12.2%	12.4%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	26.5%	21.9%	14.2%	10.9%	30.0%	23.9%	32.1%	29.8%	23.8%	18.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.7%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.5%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.4%	3.7%	6.7%	4.8%	7.0%	4.1%	7.2%	5.1%	7.4%	2.8%

*Total Population; Source: Redistricting Database for California, Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP); Source: American Community Survey, 2015–2019 Data

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

416

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO B



DISTRICTWIDE
Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

417

NUSD0433
Natomas Unified School District | Trustee Area Process

6

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO B

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	16,809	9,588	17,927	12,273	17,022	9,217	17,810	10,821	17,337	10,929
Population Variance	-3.3%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	-2.1%	N/A	2.5%	N/A	-0.3%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	20.6%	19.1%	35.2%	33.9%	20.3%	17.1%	19.3%	13.0%	20.9%	19.2%
White	24.7%	36.2%	22.9%	29.3%	24.2%	35.8%	25.5%	33.6%	36.6%	45.4%
Black/African American	14.4%	14.6%	18.3%	18.5%	15.8%	19.2%	14.2%	15.9%	13.7%	16.7%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%
Asian	30.7%	27.3%	14.2%	10.9%	31.0%	23.0%	31.6%	30.9%	19.1%	13.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.6%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	1.1%	0.4%
Other	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	2.5%	6.7%	4.8%	6.3%	3.2%	7.6%	5.6%	7.2%	4.3%

*Total Population; Source: Redistricting Database for California, Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP); Source: American Community Survey, 2015–2019 Data

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

418

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO C



419

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	2.6%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	17,400	9,778	17,193	12,050	17,478	9,948	17,200	10,430	17,634	10,622
Population Variance	0.1%	N/A	-1.1%	N/A	0.6%	N/A	-1.0%	N/A	1.5%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	17.9%	34.7%	33.4%	20.5%	17.9%	19.3%	12.9%	19.3%	20.4%
White	22.6%	34.4%	24.3%	30.4%	24.6%	36.4%	25.6%	34.2%	36.5%	44.8%
Black/African American	15.8%	16.5%	19.0%	20.1%	15.5%	18.3%	14.3%	15.8%	12.1%	14.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%
Asian	28.6%	27.1%	12.8%	9.3%	30.6%	22.7%	31.4%	30.5%	22.7%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	0.1%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	3.1%	6.2%	4.8%	6.5%	3.2%	7.6%	5.7%	7.5%	3.8%

*Total Population; Source: Redistricting Database for California, Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP); Source: American Community Survey, 2015–2019 Data

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

420

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO D



► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO D

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.1%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	18,037	10,412	17,193	12,050	17,249	9,732	16,981	10,259	17,445	10,375
Population Variance	3.8%	N/A	-1.1%	N/A	-0.8%	N/A	-2.3%	N/A	0.4%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	18.5%	34.7%	33.4%	20.5%	17.7%	19.5%	12.8%	19.0%	19.9%
White	23.2%	34.5%	24.3%	30.4%	24.9%	37.5%	25.6%	33.8%	35.8%	44.3%
Black/African American	15.2%	16.3%	19.0%	20.1%	15.6%	18.3%	14.2%	15.9%	12.4%	14.1%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
Asian	28.2%	26.6%	12.8%	9.3%	30.1%	21.8%	31.4%	31.0%	23.5%	16.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.9%	0.2%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	7.1%	3.0%	6.2%	4.8%	6.4%	3.1%	7.5%	5.7%	7.4%	4.1%

*Total Population; Source: Redistricting Database for California, Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP); Source: American Community Survey, 2015–2019 Data

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

422

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO E



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

423

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.2%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	16,840	11,275	17,927	12,273	17,475	9,302	17,808	10,780	16,855	9,198
Population Variance	-3.1%	N/A	3.1%	N/A	0.5%	N/A	2.5%	N/A	-3.0%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	21.4%	35.2%	33.9%	20.1%	15.0%	19.6%	12.6%	18.2%	19.0%
White	33.7%	43.3%	22.9%	29.3%	22.7%	36.2%	25.9%	34.4%	29.2%	37.1%
Black/African American	13.7%	16.4%	18.3%	18.5%	16.0%	18.8%	14.2%	16.6%	14.1%	14.5%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	13.8%	14.2%	10.9%	32.2%	25.7%	31.1%	30.0%	29.1%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	0.3%	1.5%	1.9%	1.4%	0.8%	0.9%	0.2%	1.0%	0.5%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	4.7%	6.7%	4.8%	6.4%	2.7%	7.5%	5.6%	7.2%	2.3%

*Total Population; Source: Redistricting Database for California, Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP); Source: American Community Survey, 2015–2019 Data

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

424

► CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS

SCENARIO F



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

► DEMOGRAPHICS

SCENARIO F

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Trustee Area Size:	17,381	Total Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------	-----------------	------

TRUSTEE AREA	Trustee Area 1		Trustee Area 2		Trustee Area 3		Trustee Area 4		Trustee Area 5	
TP* vs. CVAP**	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP	TP	CVAP
Population	17,505	11,912	17,932	11,721	16,848	9,289	16,828	10,163	17,792	9,743
Population Variance	0.7%	N/A	3.2%	N/A	-3.1%	N/A	-3.2%	N/A	2.4%	N/A
Hispanic/Latino	23.8%	21.4%	34.2%	33.1%	20.3%	15.0%	19.5%	12.9%	18.5%	19.9%
White	33.6%	42.6%	22.4%	29.9%	23.7%	36.9%	25.6%	33.9%	28.5%	36.1%
Black/African American	15.2%	18.2%	16.8%	16.8%	16.3%	19.7%	14.2%	15.8%	14.0%	14.5%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Asian	17.9%	12.4%	17.0%	13.2%	30.9%	23.7%	31.4%	30.9%	29.6%	26.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	0.4%	1.6%	1.9%	1.3%	0.8%	0.9%	0.3%	1.2%	0.5%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Two or More Races	6.9%	5.0%	6.8%	4.5%	6.4%	3.0%	7.6%	5.7%	7.1%	2.2%

*Total Population; Source: Redistricting Database for California, Published by Statewide Database on September 27, 2021

**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP); Source: American Community Survey, 2015–2019 Data

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

426

- ▶ Why another map? Map F was legally posted for 7 days
Here's the process and thinking

Staff and the demographer looked at other possible options for new maps. With every move except for what became Map F, changes in maps either increased the variance near the cap and eliminated a majority/minority coalition of Hispanic/Black voters in Trustee Area 2. Neither of those elements were legally justifiable. We looked at apartments, Punjabi, and the odd shaped precincts in Natomas.




- ▶ Why another map? Map F was legally posted for 7 days
Here's the process and thinking

Map F eliminates the open Trustee Area until 2024 (more on that later)

- Keeps 2 predominately South Natomas seats
- Adds more schools and their families to Trustee Area 1
- Does not let South Natomas' vast majority of representation just rely on 1 Trustee
- Keeps a majority-minority coalition in Trustee Area 2

- ▶ Map F expands American Lakes representation
Map below shows where ALS students reside



- ▶ ELECTION SEQUENCING

When transitioning to trustee area elections, an election cycle must be established. The draft maps included potential election sequences. In reviewing election sequencing schedules, consideration is given to, among other things, the fact that when a school board transitions to trustee area elections, each incumbent is afforded the right to serve out their four-year term, regardless of how the elections are sequenced. (Education Code section 5021.)

Currently the Board's elections are sequenced so that two seats are up for election in 2022 and three seats are up for election in 2024. The potential election sequences maintain this sequencing.

► Sequencing
The difference in Maps

In 2022, NUSD has only 2 seats open: Trustees Grant, Harden and Heredia's terms run until 2024.

Maps A, B & C have:

- two sitting Trustees run against each other in 2022
- one vacant seat

Note: All Trustee areas will be represented in 2022

Maps D and F have:

- two vacant seats
- two sitting Trustees unable to run into 2024 (they will be out of office in 2022 without being able to run again for 2 years)


Note: All Trustee areas will be represented in 2022

Map E has:

- 3 vacant seats - which means 1 of the Trustee areas will have to wait until 2024 to be represented
 - **Board must determine which area is not chosen or defer to SCOE's Board**
- two sitting Trustees unable to run into 2024 (they will be out of office in 2022 without being able to run again for 2 years)

- ▶ 4th Stakeholder Engagement Survey
Launched Thursday, November 4 and open for just over 24 hours

The Good News! 653 total responses (English, Spanish & Punjabi combined)




The Not So Good News - voter inflation for one map was evident (estimate 100 examples of vote loading) as evident by:

- Shortly after the 1 hr. mark we observed a trend - a number of unusual submissions for map scenario E emerged. For example:
 - 14 responses submitted within 60 seconds indicating support for map scenario E, and no other questions were answered
 - Minutes later 14 more responses indicating support for map scenario E were submitted within less than 4 minutes, and no other questions were answered
 - Other "bursts" of submissions indicating support for only map scenario E were also observed



Are you interested in providing feedback on the creation of By Trustee Area Maps or is that not an interest for you. If you mark “Not interested” you are done but still helped us.


592 responses





What degree does having all NUSD neighborhoods and/or school communities represented with the Board of Trustees matter to you?


536 responses





Does having a strong likelihood of 2 predominately South Natomas Trustee Areas matter to you to make sure all students and communities are represented?


528 responses





Are you okay if two Trustees cannot run again in 2022 because a map may be chosen that forces two incumbents off the Board until they can run again in 2024?

534 responses




- I am not ok with this and would rather voters decide who is elected to the Board
- I am ok with this possibility
- I have no opinion



All maps except Map E allow for every Trustee area to have a Trustee representing each area by the next election (2022). Either South Natomas, Southwest Natomas, or Heron/Creekside/etc al. would have to wait until 2024 with Map E. How important is it to you to have all five areas represented by 2022?


528 responses





Have you looked at the 6 maps proposed to reorganize the Natomas Unified School Board (this is required to be considered by federal and state law every decade)?


526 responses





Please click on the hyperlink at the end of this question to look at the draft maps, which will open in a new tab. Then pick which one(s) you feel...ve/folders/1MmGDuHvhPBewUPrQpuhKqzAbXXLCglKq

421 responses



About 100 voter inflation for Map E

Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

439



QUESTIONS

ITEM IV - Public Hearing - CVRA Map Consideration Public Hearing #2

#1 - Dharia McGrew

Dear Natomas Unified Trustees -

As a resident and parent in South Natomas, I am writing to comment on the proposed school maps. Despite the creation of new Map Option F dated 11/1/21, Map C remains the map that respects the natural boundaries of South Natomas, keeps our communities whole, and allows voters to have the most choice in their representatives moving forward. Additionally, Map C has far less variance in population than Maps D,E, or F. For these reasons I support Map C.

While I appreciated that an attempt was made to more equitably distribute the number of schools and still maintain integrity of Latinx and Black voting groups, this map does so at the expense of one school and one neighborhood. Map F is unacceptable because it quite obviously divides the American Lakes School neighborhood between two trustee areas, splitting representation of the neighborhood. Carving American Lakes into District 1 using Stonecreek Drive, the front door of the school itself, splits half the residents of the neighborhood off from the trustee district of their neighborhood school. This boundary clearly divides a low socioeconomic neighborhood away from the school they attend and will have an adverse impact on those families.

I urge your support for Map C.

thank you,
Dharia McGrew (she/her)
1450 Buckridge Way
Sacramento CA 95833

#2 - Mario Guerrero

Greetings,

On behalf of Sacramento Stonewall Democrats of Greater Sacramento, I write in support of Map C. We believe that the district should adopt a map that allows voters to choose their trustees. Trustees should not decide which board members

retire. We also support possible alterations of the lines in Map C that promote equity in the wealth divide by making sure each trustee area has roughly the same percentage of residences vs. apartments.

We have concerns with maps D and E. Maps D & E promote wealth inequity between North and South Natomas because both Trustee areas 1 & 2 have a significant higher percentage of the population living in Apartments. Further, these maps remove the ability of the voters to choose who their elected representative should be and give the power to play politics to Board members to approve a map that automatically retires two experienced board members.

For the reasons stated above, we strongly urge the Trustees to adopt Map C or a slightly altered Map C (as described above).

best,

Mario Guerrero
President
Stonewall Democratic Club of Greater Sacramento

#3 - Rosalyn Bell

I wanted to correct my comment below, I do not support Scenario A (I read the maps out of order). I no longer have a second choice.

I support map D. Also, 3 trustees live in the Westlake area. That area is one area & should not be divided.

Roslyn Bell

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bell Family <thebells916@gmail.com>
Date: October 20, 2021 at 6:55:48 PM PDT
To: PUBLIC COMMENT <publiccomment@natomasunified.org>
Subject: Proposed Maps

I believe that Scenario A & D most reflect our community. While the district transitions to trustee-area, what happens when several trustees live in one area?

Roslyn Bell

#4 - Michael Ferguson

Do disparity and disproportionality really matter? It is time to honor this district core belief with action. Map E is the only map that truly empowers South Natomas, and allows it to have a substantive voice within the district. Let's inject this power-point platitude with life, and enact Map E for the future of our learners.

--

Sincerely,

Michael J. Ferguson
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 19625
Sacramento CA 95819
(916) 524-6377
michael.fergusonesq@gmail.com

#5 - Virginia FairAmitani

Dear Natomas Unified School Board:

I support Map E for the census redistricting.

Thank You

Virginia FairAmitani

#6 - Sandee Smith

Good Afternoon

Map F is the only appropriate map that legally meets all requirements. As a South Natomas resident of 35 plus years I'm offended at how we are being manipulated into Map E.

Sandee Smith

#7 - Helen James

Dearest Trustees,

I'm saddened that the survey didn't go until at least Nov 16, less than 24 hours is ridiculous. I liked Map E but your board can't be trusted to make the best decisions. So, I must select Map F because it will cover all and seems to be cover all areas equally as possible as can be under these circumstances.

Sincerely,

Helen James (Bannon Creek Grandma)

#8 - Rob Schopen

I support Map E.

Thank you,

Rob Schopen

ELD Teacher on Assignment

Natomas Unified School District

1901 Arena Blvd Sacramento, Ca. 95834

#9 - Natomas Black Parents United

We would like to see a map that is equitable to all residents of Natomas. With that in mind, we believe it is critical that South Natomas have two trustees.

Natomas Black Parents United.

#10 - Noel Mora

I support map E as it is the only map that supports Democracy and a true representative for South Natomas. I urge the NUSD board to do the right thing for the community and children of South Natomas. This process started 10 years ago, It is time for equity in South Natomas.

#11 - Jeff Bryan

Greetings,

I am a teacher at Natomas High School and after reviewing the various map proposals, I support Map E because it is the most representative and ensures long-term equity to a greater extent when compared to the other map choices. I want my students and their families to be fairly represented.

Thank you,

Jeff Bryan

#12 - Eric Branner

I want MAP F for SN

Eric Branner

#13 - A Smith

Hi, I'm a mother of four and the only map that makes sense is Map F!

#14 - Sachiko Konatsu (on behalf of the Natomas Community Association)

I am commenting on the behalf of Natomas Community Association. We are in support of map E as it is the only map that gives South natomas true representation. We support map E as it is the only map that supports Democracy and a true representative for South Natomas. I urge the NUSD board to do the right thing for the community and children of South Natomas. This process started 10 years ago, It is time for equity in South Natomas.

Sachiko Konatsu

NCA President

#15 - Sachiko Konatsu

I support map E as it is the only map that supports Democracy and a true representative for South Natomas. I urge the NUSD board to do the right thing for the community and children of South Natomas. This process started 10 years ago, It is time for equity in South Natomas. As you know and have stated numerous times we are a very diverse district, with a very diverse board. All of the trustee areas in Map E represent diverse students, residents, and future potential candidates. Natomas has shown that we will vote for the best candidate regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or age. Give South Natomas its equal rights to representation.

Sachiko Konatsu

NUSD Parent

#16 - Angela Hearring

I am a parent, resident as well as a social justice advocate in Natomas. My vote is for **Map E** since this map reflects the least number of inequities and will highlight the diversity of the communities of South and North Natomas. It is paramount to establish and maintain equitable school boundaries in Natomas.

I request for my three sentences to be read into the record.

Thank you,

Angela E. Hearring

Monday, October 25, 2021

Scenarios A - E

Estimated Apartment Population					
Scenario A - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,456	11,712	17,168	31.8%	68.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,564	6,403	9,967	35.8%	64.2%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	5,628	11,333	16,961	33.2%	66.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,119	6,665	9,784	31.9%	68.1%
4					
2020 Population	2,813	14,963	17,776	15.8%	84.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,111	8,849	10,960	19.3%	80.7%
5					
2020 Population	3,041	14,032	17,073	17.8%	82.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,807	8,037	9,844	18.4%	81.6%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario B - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	2,662	14,147	16,809	15.8%	84.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,741	7,847	9,588	18.2%	81.8%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	6,531	10,491	17,022	38.4%	61.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,483	5,734	9,217	37.8%	62.2%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	15,455	17,810	13.2%	86.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	9,103	10,821	15.9%	84.1%
5					
2020 Population	5,390	11,947	17,337	31.1%	68.9%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,659	7,270	10,929	33.5%	66.5%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario C - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,349	12,051	17,400	30.7%	69.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	6,870	9,778	29.7%	70.3%
2					
2020 Population	6,423	10,770	17,193	37.4%	62.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,427	7,623	12,050	36.7%	63.3%
3					
2020 Population	6,017	11,461	17,478	34.4%	65.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,287	6,661	9,948	33.0%	67.0%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	14,845	17,200	13.7%	86.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	8,712	10,430	16.5%	83.5%
5					
2020 Population	4,328	13,306	17,634	24.5%	75.5%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	7,714	10,622	27.4%	72.6%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario D - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	4,989	13,048	18,037	27.7%	72.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,744	7,668	10,412	26.4%	73.6%
2					
2020 Population	6,423	10,770	17,193	37.4%	62.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,427	7,623	12,050	36.7%	63.3%
3					
2020 Population	6,377	10,872	17,249	37.0%	63.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,451	6,281	9,732	35.5%	64.5%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	14,626	16,981	13.9%	86.1%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	8,541	10,259	16.7%	83.3%
5					
2020 Population	4,328	13,117	17,445	24.8%	75.2%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,908	7,467	10,375	28.0%	72.0%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Estimated Apartment Population

Scenario E - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Est. Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	5,665	11,175	16,840	33.6%	66.4%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,990	7,285	11,275	35.4%	64.6%
2					
2020 Population	7,534	10,393	17,927	42.0%	58.0%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,647	7,626	12,273	37.9%	62.1%
3					
2020 Population	4,847	12,628	17,475	27.7%	72.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,618	6,684	9,302	28.1%	71.9%
4					
2020 Population	3,182	14,626	17,808	17.9%	82.1%
2015-2019 CVAP	2,239	8,541	10,780	20.8%	79.2%
5					
2020 Population	3,244	13,611	16,855	19.2%	80.8%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,754	7,444	9,198	19.1%	80.9%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

Tuesday, November 2, 2021

Scenario F

Estimated Apartment Population					
Scenario F - Trustee Area	Est. Apartment Population	Est. Non-Apartment Population	TOTAL Population	Percent Apartment Population	Percent Non-Apartment Population
1					
2020 Population	7,020	10,485	16,840	41.7%	62.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	4,986	6,926	11,275	44.2%	61.4%
2					
2020 Population	6,179	11,753	17,927	34.5%	65.6%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,651	8,070	12,273	29.7%	65.8%
3					
2020 Population	5,674	11,174	17,475	32.5%	63.9%
2015-2019 CVAP	3,139	6,150	9,302	33.7%	66.1%
4					
2020 Population	2,355	14,473	17,808	13.2%	81.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,718	8,445	10,780	15.9%	78.3%
5					
2020 Population	3,244	14,548	16,855	19.2%	86.3%
2015-2019 CVAP	1,754	7,989	9,198	19.1%	86.9%
Total 2020 Census Population	24,472	62,433	86,905	28.2%	71.8%
Total 2015-2019 CVAP	15,248	37,580	52,828	28.9%	71.1%

POTENTIAL ELECTION SEQUENCING SCHEDULES

Below are the potential election sequencing schedules for each of the draft maps. In preparing these election sequencing schedules, consideration was given to, among other things, the fact that when a school board transitions to trustee area elections, each incumbent is afforded the right to serve out their four-year term, regardless of how the elections are sequenced. (Education Code section 5021.)

Currently the Board's elections are sequenced so that two seats are up for election in 2022 and three seats are up for election in 2024. The options provided below maintain this sequencing.

SCENARIO MAP No. C

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Harden (2024)	Vacant	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 5

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 4

SCENARIO MAP E

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3	AREA 4	AREA 5
Vacant	Vacant	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	Vacant	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SEQUENCING

2022 election (2 trustees areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 2; or
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5
- Plus one of either Trustee Area 1, Trustee Area 2 or Trustee Area 4

Scenario Map F

Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5
Vacant	Harden (2024)	Grant (2024)	Vacant	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

Sequencing

2022 election (2 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5

POSIBLES CICLOS ELECTORALES

A continuación se presentan los posibles ciclos electorales para cada uno de los borradores de mapas. En la preparación de estos calendarios de secuencia de las elecciones, se tuvo en cuenta, entre otras cosas, el hecho de que cuando un consejo escolar hace la transición a las elecciones de área de fideicomisarios, cada titular tiene el derecho de cumplir su término de cuatro años, independientemente de cómo se secuencien las elecciones (Código de Educación sección 5021).

Actualmente, las elecciones de la Directiva están secuenciadas de manera que dos puestos se eligen en 2022 y tres en el año 2024. Las opciones que se presentan a continuación mantienen esta secuencia.

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO C

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Harden (2024)	Vacante	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 2• Área de fideicomisarios 5 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 4

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO E

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Vacante	Vacante	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	Vacante	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA
<p>Elección de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 1• Área de fideicomisarios 2, O• Área de fideicomisarios 4 <p>Elección de 2024 (se necesitan 3 áreas de fideicomisarios)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Área de fideicomisarios 3• Área de fideicomisarios 5• Más uno de los siguientes: Área 1 de los Fideicomisarios, Área 2 de los Fideicomisarios o Área 4 de los Fideicomisarios

MAPA DEL ESCENARIO F

Zona 1	Zona 2	Zona 3	Zona 4	Zona 5
Vacante	Harden (2024)	Grant (2024)	Vacante	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

SECUENCIA

Eleción de 2022 (se necesitan 2 áreas de fideicomisarios)

- Área de fideicomisarios 1
- Área de fideicomisarios 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Área de fideicomisarios 2
- Área de fideicomisarios 3
- Área de fideicomisarios 5

ਸੰਭਾਵੀ ਚੋਣ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਸਮਾਂ-ਸਾਰਣੀ

ਹੇਠਾਂ ਹਰੇਕ ਡਰਾਫਟ ਨਕਸੇ ਲਈ ਸੰਭਾਵੀ ਚੋਣ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਸਮਾਂ-ਸਾਰਣੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਚੋਣ ਕ੍ਰਮ-ਸੂਚੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਤਿਆਰ ਕਰਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ, ਹੋਰ ਗੱਲਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ-ਨਾਲ, ਇਸ ਤੱਥ ਨੂੰ ਵੀ ਧਿਆਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਜਦੋਂ ਇੱਕ ਸਕੂਲ ਬੋਰਡ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਤਬਦੀਲ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਹਰੇਕ ਅਹੁਦੇਦਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਆਪਣੀ ਚਾਰ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਮਿਆਦ ਪੂਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਦਾ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਚਾਹੇ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਕਿਵੇਂ ਵੀ ਹੋਣ। ਕ੍ਰਮਬੱਧ (ਸਿੱਖਿਆ ਕੋਡ ਸੈਕਸ਼ਨ 5021)

ਵਰਤਮਾਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਬੋਰਡ ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਕ੍ਰਮਵਾਰ ਹਨ ਤਾਂ ਜੋ 2022 ਵਿੱਚ ਦੋ ਸੀਟਾਂ ਲਈ ਚੋਣ ਹੋਣ ਅਤੇ 2024 ਵਿੱਚ ਤਿੰਨ ਸੀਟਾਂ ਲਈ ਚੋਣ ਹੋਣ। ਹੇਠਾਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਵਿਕਲਪ ਇਸ ਕ੍ਰਮ ਨੂੰ ਕਾਇਮ ਰੱਖਦੇ ਹਨ।

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸਾ ਬੀ C

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024)	Heredia (2024)	Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕੁਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ E

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਖਾਲੀ	ਖਾਲੀ	Grant (2024) Harden (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

ਕਮਬੱਧ

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2; ਜਾਂ
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)

- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3
- ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
- ਨਾਲ ਹੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1, ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2 ਜਾਂ
ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4 ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਇੱਕ

ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ ਬੀ F

ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਖਾਲੀ	Harden (2024)	Grant (2024)	ਖਾਲੀ	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

Sequencing

2022 ਦੀਆਂ ਚੋਣਾਂ (2 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ)

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4

2024 ਚੋਣਾਂ (3 ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਹਨ)


ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3

ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO C

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	2.6%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Population Variance	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispanic/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
White	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Black/ African American	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Other	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispanic/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
White	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Black/ African American	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispanic/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
White	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Black/ African American	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asian	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO C

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	2.6%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
Variación de población	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
Hispano/Latino	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
Blanco	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
Otro	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
Hispano/Latino	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
Blanco	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
Otro	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
Hispano/Latino	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
Blanco	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
Asiático	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਨਿਵਾਰਣ 12 (SCENARIO C)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਿਰਵਰਤਨ:	2.6%
--------------	--------	--------------	--------	----------	------


ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,400	17,193	17,478	17,200	17,634
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ਼	19	-188	97	-181	253
	0.1%	-1.1%	0.6%	-1.0%	1.5%
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	23.1%	34.7%	20.5%	19.3%	19.3%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	22.6%	24.3%	24.6%	25.6%	36.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.8%	19.0%	15.5%	14.3%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	28.6%	12.8%	30.6%	31.4%	22.7%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%	7.5%

18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸੂਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,143	13,265	13,076	12,612	14,026
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	21.6%	31.4%	18.8%	17.5%	17.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	25.1%	28.3%	27.0%	27.5%	39.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	29.4%	13.4%	31.5%	32.8%	23.0%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%
ਹੋਰ	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.7%	5.3%	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%

ਵੇਖਿੰਟਾ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਗਿਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	9,778	12,050	9,948	10,430	10,622
ਹਿੱਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	17.9%	33.4%	17.9%	12.9%	20.4%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	34.4%	30.4%	36.4%	34.2%	44.8%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.5%	20.1%	18.3%	15.8%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.9%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	27.1%	9.3%	22.7%	30.5%	16.3%
ਮੂਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਨਿਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	3.1%	4.8%	3.2%	5.7%	3.8%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO E

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.2%
-------------------	--------	------------------	--------	-----------	------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Population Variance	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispanic/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
White	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
Hispanic/Latino	21.2%	32.2%	18.5%	17.9%	16.4%
White	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Black/ African American	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
White	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Black/ African American	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asian	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO E

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.2%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
Variación de población	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
Hispano/Latino	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
Blanco	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Otro	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
Hispanic/Latino	21.2%	32.2%	18.5%	17.9%	16.4%
Blanco	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Otro	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
Blanco	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Asiático	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Native de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.3%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਫਿਲਡ 12 ਨਕਾਰ 2001 ਦੇ (SCENARIO E)

ਕਲੁਹ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ਼ ਆਬਾਦੀ::	17,381	ਵਿਧੁਰਵਰਤਨਾਂ::	6.2%
--------------	--------	---------------	--------	---------------	------

ਕਲੁਹ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	16,840	17,927	17,475	17,808	16,855
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ	-541	546	94	427	-526
	-3.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.5%	-3.0%
ਪਿੰਹਸਪੈਲੀਂਡ ਨਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	23.2%	35.2%	20.1%	19.6%	18.2%
ਪਿੰਚੋਟਾ	33.7%	22.9%	22.7%	25.9%	29.2%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.7%	18.3%	16.0%	14.2%	14.1%
ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੁੱਲ	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	19.8%	14.2%	32.2%	31.1%	29.1%
ਮੁੱਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
ਦੱਸੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰਹੇਸ	6.9%	6.7%	6.4%	7.5%	7.2%


18 ਸਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,285	13,664	13,141	13,162	12,870
ਪਿੰਹਸਪੈਲੀਂਡ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	21.2%	32.2%	18.5%	17.9%	16.4%
ਪਿੰਚੋਟਾ	37.1%	26.6%	25.1%	27.7%	32.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	13.7%	18.1%	15.6%	14.5%	13.9%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੁੱਲ	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	19.9%	14.7%	33.2%	32.5%	29.8%
ਮੁੱਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸੀਓਂਡਕ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%
ਹੋਰ	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%
ਦੱਸੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰਹੇਸ	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	5.6%

ਵੋਟਿੰਗ ਟੈਕਨੋਲੋਜੀ ਉਮਰ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਅਨੁਮਾਨ (2015-2019) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਨਾਲਾਗਰਕ					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,275	12,273	9,302	10,780	9,198
ਪਿੰਹਸਪੈਲੀਂਡ/ਲਾਤੀਨੀ	21.4%	33.9%	15.0%	12.6%	19.0%
ਪਿੰਚੋਟਾ	43.3%	29.3%	36.2%	34.4%	37.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	16.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.6%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੁੱਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	13.8%	10.9%	25.7%	30.0%	26.3%
Public Hearing and Action on Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish ਪੱਤੇ ਵਿਖੇ ਵਾਲੇ ਪੱਤੇ ਵਿਖੇ ਅਤੇ ਸ਼ਾਖਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਆਈਲ@ਡਰ	Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change 475 40.2% 1.9% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% No. CC-22-01 NUSD0491	Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change 475 40.2% 1.9% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% No. CC-22-01 NUSD0491	Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change 475 40.2% 1.9% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% No. CC-22-01 NUSD0491	Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change 475 40.2% 1.9% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% No. CC-22-01 NUSD0491	Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change 475 40.2% 1.9% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% No. CC-22-01 NUSD0491

हेर	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
दरै ज़फ वँच रोस	4.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.6%	2.3%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change
Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
Population Variance	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
White	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
Black/ African American	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
Other	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
Hispanic/Latino	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
White	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
Black/ African American	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Other	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
White	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
Black/ African American	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Asian	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO F

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
Variación de población	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
Blanco	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
Otro	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
Hispanic/Latino	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
Blanco	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Otro	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 6
Población	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
Blanco	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Asiático	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਦਿ੍ਹਨ ਨਕਸਾ ਏ (Scenario F)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਰਿਵਰਤਨ:	6.4%
--------------------	---------------	--------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੇ	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫ਼ਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫ਼ਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

November 17, 2021 eComment

ITEM X.a. - Public Hearing - California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) Map Adoption Public Hearing

#1 - Mindy Walker

Hello,

I would like to provide feedback on the options available for the new Trustee Areas. After reviewing the Options C,E and F believe option E makes the most sense and should be adopted. This breakdown accurately reflects the neighborhoods within our Natomas Community.

Thank you,

Mindy Walker

#2 - Michael Ferguson

With respect, there does not appear to be a rational basis for the top center triangle of Map C that carefully navigates around the residences of existing trustees. Maps C raises significant concerns, as other stakeholders have noted, and for this reason it should be summarily rejected, or amended to place the "Westlake Triangle" squarely within District 5. The integrity of the Board, past, present, and future, mandate such a result.

Sincerely, Michael Ferguson

#3 - Navpreet Gill

Dear board of trustees,

My name is Navpreet Gill and I am a resident of the Natomas area, in Sacramento CA. As a member of the Punjabi-American community living in Natomas, I would like to extend my support towards Map F, as this map allows for a greater and more fair representation of the Punjabi community living in Natomas within the Natomas Unified School District Board.

I hope you will consider this request and adopt Map F. Thank you!

Best,
Navpreet Gill, MPH

#4 - Roop Singh

Dear Board of Trustees,

My name is Roop Singh and I am a resident of the Natomas Area, in Sacramento CA. As a member of the Punjabi-American Community living in Natomas, I would like to extend my support towards MAP F, as this Map allows for a greater and fairer representation of the Punjabi Community living in Natomas within the Natomas Unified School District Board.

Hope you will consider this request and adopt Map F.

Thank you,

Roop Singh

#5 - Sachiko Konatsu (on behalf of the Natomas Community Association)

Map E is supported by the Natomas Community Association as it is the only map that ensures equity for voters. In addition, the voting sequencing does not matter and can be changed to suit the needs of the voters in the open areas. Since we have always had a year where there were 3 open seats the years can be altered by the board to meet the needs of the community. This has taken too long for the parents and voters to have representation in South Natomas.

Sachiko Konatsu

NCA Preident

#6 - Sachiko Konatsu

The Natomas community Association is in support of map E as this is the only map that ensures equity for the voters of Natomas. In addition, the sequencing of seats can easily be changed to meet the needs of the newly created

vacancies. Due to the change these seats can be switched as needs to meet the needs of the community.

Sachiko Konatsu

NUSD Parent

#7 - Carlos Alcala

Hello Natomas Board,

Thank you for receiving my opinion. I support Map E as the most Democratic solution for single member Districts in Natomas. Map E creates a Black /Latino majority district that will be most representative of South Natomas.

Carlos Alcala

Chair Chicano Latino Caucus, California Democratic Party*

President Northern California Latino Democratic Club

- Title for identification purposes only

#8 - Andrew Jones

Good Afternoon,

I am a teacher in NUSD and I ask that you choose Map E as it is the most equitable representation of under-served communities.

Thank you,

Andrew Jones

#9 - John Virtue

As an educator in this district I feel Map E is the most equitable of the options.

#10 - Tyler Heminger

Hello,

My name is Tyler Heminger and I am a teacher in the Natomas Unified School District. I believe that Map E is the best choice for the new district map for election purposes. Please take this email as my vote for Map E.

Thank you

Tyler Heminger

#11 - Sean Hanners

I am a teacher a Natomas Unified and I support Map E.

Thanks.

#12 - Sean Cox

I am a teacher in Natomas Unified and I believe that Map E is the most equitable to best have all parts of Natomas represented.

Shawn Cox

#13 - Erin Juneau

I am a teacher in Natomas Unified and I want to share input that Map E is the best choice for our district.

--

Erin Juneau

Visual Arts Educator

Leroy Greene Academy || NUSD

#14 - Daniel Lingenfelter

I'm a teacher and know that equity is really important in representation for educational purposes.

I feel Map E would be the best option.

Sincerely,

Dan Lingenfelter

--

Mr.L - Dan Lingenfelter

Leroy Greene Academy

Performing Arts Department

#15 - Michael Bradford

Please vote for Map E. It's the most equitable representation of under-served communities.

Thank you.

#16 - Sage Knutson

I am a teacher in NUSD and Map E is the most equitable map for proper representation for all our students.

The gerrymandering has to stop.

#17 - Kellen Miller

I am a teacher in NUSD and Map E is the most equitable map for proper representation for all our students.

Stop gerrymandering for board seats, actually have people who live in the neighborhoods represent their/our students

#18 - Mary Neese

I'm a teacher within Natomas Unified and think that Map E is the most equitable representation of under-served communities.

--

Mary Neese :)

she/they

Math Teacher

Leroy Greene Academy

#19 - Amy Bostick

I am a teacher in Natomas and believe that Map E is the most equitable map to represent the Natomas community.

Ms. Amy Bostick

#20 - Carl Siegel

Dear School Board,

I am a teacher with Natomas, and I believe that Map E is the only acceptable choice to be sure our community is represented.

Thank you,

Mr. Siegel

#21 - Ross Roadruck

Hello,

As a teacher in Natomas Unified School District, I am writing to support the adoption of Map E for the Board By-Area Elections.

Map E represents the most equitable representation of under-served communities in the district and I urge the district to continue to pursue their message of equity.

Thank you,

--

Ross Roadruck

#22 - Kristy Coehn

I vote for Map E.

Map E is currently the most equitable representation for our students and their families throughout ALL of Sacramento.

Thank you for your time.

Kristy Cohen

LGA

#23 - Shawna Fadden

I am a teacher and I feel it is important that all areas are represented on the board, south Natomas is and has been underrepresented for a long time. Map E is the most equitable as making sure all areas of Natomas are represented fairly and appropriately.

Shawna Fadden

Leroy Greene Academy

Business Teacher

Varsity Softball Coach

sfadden@natomasunified.org

#24 - Ben Wickenden

Hello,

My name is Ben Wickenden, I am a teacher at LGA. I believe that map E is the most acceptable.

#25 - Magen Ayres

I am a NUSD MOTHER OF 3.I support map E. We want and NEED TRUE Representation!

#26 - Rina Thiara

Dear Board of Trustees,

My name is Ranjot and I am a resident of Natomas. I am writing you today in support of Map F for the Natomas Unified School District Board redistricting. As a Punjabi-American living in Natomas, who has nieces and nephews who will soon be attending schools within NUSD, I truly believe Map F gives a chance for my Punjabi community to have fairer and a more accurate representation within our school district. A large portion of students within the Natomas Unified School District are of Punjabi background, sharing the same cultural, linguistic and historical background, and as such it is a must that the new maps that are adopted for the school district ensure this sort of representation.

More and more Punjabi families are moving from other parts of California like the Bay Area into Natomas, and this type of increase will certainly continue in the upcoming years. With this sort of influx, there are going to be more students from Punjabi background that will need a more robust support by the school district board. Adopting Map F paves the way for this sort of support in the future and I sincerely hope that you will consider my request.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Warmly,

Ranjot

#27 - Manjeet Thiara

Dear Board of Trustees,

My name is Manjit and I am a resident of Natomas. I am writing you today to voice my support for Map F for the Natomas Unified School District Board. As a Punjabi-American who has grandchildren currently attending NUSD schools, Map F allows for a fairer and more accurate representation for my kids.

I hope you will consider my request, and adopt Map F.

Best Regards,

Manjit

#28 - Chatenveer Singh

Dear Board of Trustees,

My name is Chatenveer and I am writing you in support of Map F. As a Punjabi-American and resident of Natomas, I believe Map F allows for a more accurate and fairer representation for children who come from a Punjabi background and attend NUSD.

I hope you will sincerely consider my request and adopt map F.

Thank you for your time.

Best,

Chatenveer

#29 - Jasvir Kaur

Dear Board of Trustees,

My name is Jasvir and I am writing in support of Map F. I am Punjabi-American, resident of Natomas. I have grandchildren who currently enrolled in NUSD. Along my grandkids there are many other Punjabi families I know who have kids that attend the same schools as my grandchildren.

It is important our Punjabi children are given a fair and more accurate representation within the Natomas Unified School District Board and I believe Map F allows for that.

I hope you will consider my request and adopt Map F.

Thank you,

Jasvir

#30 - Angela Herring

Good Evening Board Members,

My name is Angela E. Herring and I am a parent, resident and a social justice advocate. I submitted my public comment at the last board meeting on November 8th, for my vote to be casted for Map E and I wish to submit my public comment for this board meeting for Map E again.

I appreciate the words of Trustee Lisa Kaplan

“...I believe as trustees we should not be approving anything that takes away the voter's ability to choose trustees, but I'm also here to listen...”

I request that all of the board members listen to the residents and parents of Natomas that have participated in this process, not take away or infringe on the voting process and what they feel is best for Natomas Unified School District.

I also appreciate the words of Trustee Micah Grant as well when he stated, That he was

“...open minded about Map C, but there appears to be from my perspective and maybe the public perspective, I don't want to give off the appearance of a gerrymander...”

Unfortunately, one of the maps presented, Map C, visibly represents an example of the distasteful and disrespectful tradition of gerrymandering.

Map E that was presented by the board reflects the least number of inequities. As I have stated in my previous public comment, I will state again that Map E highlights the diversity of the communities of South and North Natomas, equitable school boundaries, and provides a trustee seat or two located in the district, which will truly reflect and represent what makes up Natomas Unified School Board.

Thank you for taking my public comments into consideration.

Angela E. Hearring

"I am no longer accepting the things I cannot change. I am changing the things I cannot accept." —Angela Davis

#31 - Heather Fargo

Dear Chair and Trustees:

I am writing again to offer my **full support for Scenario E** for future trustee areas. It is the only map of the 3 left that offers South Natomas residents a fair shot at fair representation in the future. Map C and F are drawn in ways that appear to violate the criteria. On the other hand Map E respects neighborhood and community boundaries, creates compact and contiguous areas, follows natural and manmade, and conforms with the Voters Right Act.

Thank you for considering my comments. Since my last letter was not shared with you during the last meeting, I am including it again today.

Sincerely,

Heather Fargo

South Natomas Resident

On Oct 27, 2021, at 1:31 PM, Heather Fargo <h-fargo@comcast.net> wrote:

Dear Chair and Trustees:

I am writing to support Scenario/Map E for the new NUSD trustee areas.

I believe it best meets the criteria for fair representation of all areas of the district. It respects neighborhood and community boundaries, creates compact and contiguous areas, follows natural and manmade, conforms with the Voters Right Act, and establishes trustee areas within the 10% deviation limit.

Maps A-C clearly violate the criteria and should be rejected out right. Map D is a possibility but not as good for South Natomas residents as Map E.

I want to thank you the Board for committing to this change to create trustee areas. I appreciate each of your efforts on behalf of the students of Natomas, and recognize that this change is personally difficult for you. Establishing trustee areas is what is best for the overall community. Thank you for doing this.

Sincerely,

Heather Fargo

South Natomas resident

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Resolution No. 21-44


IN THE MATTER OF: The Board of Trustees Initiating a Proposal to the Sacramento County Committee on School District Organization for the Adoption of By-Trustee-Area Elections

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Trustees of the Natomas Unified School District, at a regular meeting held on the 17th day of November 2021, by the following roll call vote:

Jag Bains
Micah Grant
Ericka Harden
Susan Heredia
Lisa Kaplan


aye
aye
aye
aye
aye

Signed and approved by me after its passage:



Susan Heredia, President

Attest:



Jag Bains, Clerk

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees ("Board") of the Natomas Unified School District ("District") is elected under an "at-large" election system where trustees are elected by voters of the entire District;

WHEREAS, on January 20, 2021, the Board adopted Resolution No. 21-03 (attached hereto as Exhibit No. 1), signaling its intent to transition to "by-trustee-area" elections, where each trustee must reside within the designated trustee-area boundary and is elected only by the voters in that trustee-area;

WHEREAS, Cooperative Strategies ("Demographer") was retained to prepare several by-trustee-area election system map options for the Board and public's consideration;

WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021, the District launched a survey to the Natomas community to gather initial input on the proposed transition;

WHEREAS, on July 21, 2021, legal counsel representing the Board of Trustees presented a proposed timeline for the transition to by-trustee-area elections;

WHEREAS, on July 26, 2021, the District launched a second community survey to gather input about the possibility of the District seeking a waiver of the election requirement for implementing the by-trustee-area elections from the State Board of Education;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Elections Code section 10010, subdivision (a)(1), the Board held public hearings on August 4, 2021, and September 1, 2021 (which was continued to September 14, 2021), to consider community input and comment regarding the potential composition of trustee-areas prior to draft maps being drawn;

WHEREAS, on August 9 the district launched a dedicated webpage and a dedicated email address specific to the transition to by-trustee area elections, both of which have been widely communicated through various platforms;

WHEREAS, from August 5, 2021, to August 31, 2021, the District met with key stakeholders, including the California School Employees Association, Natomas Teachers Association, District English Learner Advisory Committee ("DELAC"), Community Advisory Council ("CAC"), Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council, Natomas Chamber of Commerce, and the Natomas Schools Foundation;

WHEREAS, on September 23, 2021, the District launched a third community survey to gather additional input prior to the map hearings;

WHEREAS, on October 13, 2021, the District presented information on stakeholder engagement, highlighting how Natomas Unified had gone above and beyond with stakeholder engagement efforts, and also provided an update on census data at a regular Board meeting;

WHEREAS, during the week of October 18, 2021, the District published population density maps;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Elections Code section 10010, subdivision (a)(2), the Board published draft trustee-area map scenarios on October 20, 2021, and November 1, 2021, and held public hearings on October 27, 2021, and November 8, 2021, to gather public input on the proposed trustee-area map scenarios and sequence of elections;

WHEREAS, the District utilized a fourth and final survey in English, Spanish and Punjabi that resulted in 653 responses regarding draft maps, elements of the draft maps and potential election sequences;

WHEREAS, the District communicated these draft map scenarios were available for viewing through multiple platforms, including but not limited to: announcements on the main district webpage and dedicated webpage for the transition to by-trustee area elections, direct emails and phone calls home to families, community newsletters, and making the content available in multiple languages;

WHEREAS, the administration shared publicly that the estimated total number of potential engagements was over 59,000 households and/or stakeholders as of October 25, 2021;

WHEREAS, the Board has considered various map scenarios and election sequencing schedules identified as Map Scenario A, Map Scenario B, Map Scenario C, Map Scenario D, Map Scenario E, and Map Scenario F;

WHEREAS, the District held a special board meeting solely focusing on the by-trustee area transition on November 8, 2021 at Natomas High School in south Natomas;

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2021, the Board directed staff to consider Map Scenario C, Map Scenario E, and Map Scenario F for final consideration on November 17, 2021;

WHEREAS, Education Code sections 5019 and 5030 authorize the Sacramento County Committee on School District Organization ("County Committee"), upon application from a school district's governing board, to change the method of election in a school district under its jurisdiction;

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 442 (2021) amends Education Code section 5020 as of January 1, 2022, to allow school districts to transition to by-trustee-area elections upon approval by the county committee, without the need to seek voter approval or a waiver of the election requirement from the State Board of Education;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Trustees hereby resolves as follows:

The above recitals are correct and true.

1. The Board hereby approves and recommends the adoption of by-trustee-area elections, and the adoption of the trustee-area map identified as Map Scenario E set forth in Exhibit No. 2.
2. The Board hereby proposes that each of the trustee areas identified in Exhibit No. 2 be assigned for election in 2022 or in 2024, as set forth in the election sequencing in Exhibit No. 2.
3. The Superintendent or designee is hereby authorized and directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the County Committee, and to work with the County Committee and the County Election's Office to conduct all legally required hearings and other acts necessary so that by-trustee-area elections can be implemented in the election cycles scheduled in 2022 and 2024.

Exhibits 1 and 2.

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Resolution No. 21-03

IN THE MATTER OF: Initiate a Transition to a By-Trustee Area Election System
Commencing with the 2022 Governing Board Election

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Trustees of the Natomas Unified School District, at a regular meeting held on the 20th of January 2021, by the following roll call vote:

Jag Bains	aye
Micah Grant	aye
Ericka Harden	aye
Susan Heredia	aye
Lisa Kaplan	aye

Signed and approved by me after its passage:


Susan Heredia, President

Attest:




Ericka Harden, Clerk

WHEREAS, California Education Code sections 5019 and 5030 authorize the Sacramento County Committee on School District Organization ("County Committee"), upon application of a school district's Governing Board, to change the method of election of governing board members in a school district under its jurisdiction;

WHEREAS, the California Voting Rights Act ("CVRA") disfavors the use of an "at-large" election system for governing board members of a school district if the "at-large" election system may impair the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election;

WHEREAS, board members of the Natomas Unified School District ("District") are currently elected using an "at-large" election system (i.e., election system in which registered voters of the entire jurisdiction elect candidates to the Governing Board);

WHEREAS, the Board desires to promote meaningful voter involvement in the election of Board members and increase the ability of candidates to seek elected office;

WHEREAS, it is the considered view of the Board that the public interest will be better served by election of its board members using a "by-trustee area" election system (i.e., elections in which one candidate residing in each trustee area is elected by only the registered voters in that particular trustee area);

WHEREAS, the boundaries for trustee areas in a by-trustee area election system are established based on population counts and demographics from the most recent United States' census; and

WHEREAS, the United States' census count occurs every ten (10) years with the last census count occurring in 2010 ("2010 Census") and the next census count scheduled to take place on April 1, 2020 ("2020 Census"), with the results to be made available to state and local agencies on or after March, 2021;

WHEREAS, due to the Coronavirus pandemic the results of the 2020 Census will be delayed and are not expected to be released until on or after July 1, 2021;

WHEREAS, if the District transitioned to by-trustee area elections prior to the release of the 2020 Census, the trustee areas would be established based on the 2010 Census, which (1) may not fairly and accurately reflect the current voter population distribution and demographics of the District, and (2) would require the District to incur additional, duplicative costs to adjust the trustee areas based on the 2020 Census as required by Education Code Section 5019.5;

WHEREAS, further due to the Coronavirus pandemic Governor Newsom issued Executive Orders N-34-20 and N-38-20 which toll the public hearing requirements and safe harbor provisions of the CVRA while social distancing measures remain in place;

WHEREAS, the adoption of "by-trustee area" elections will not affect the terms of any Board members serving or elected during this transition, each of whom will serve out his or her full term; and

WHEREAS, the Board, cognizant of its need to be fiscally responsible, desires to implement this change in the manner of electing board members in a cost effective and efficient manner but with all deliberate speed following release of the 2020 Census data.


NOW, THEREFORE, the Board hereby resolves, orders and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct;
2. Trustee area boundary lines shall be developed based on the most updated federal decennial census data following its release in 2021 to provide for "by-trustee areas" elections to be implemented in the 2022 and 2024 election cycles;
3. After the availability of the 2020 Census, pursuant to Education Code sections 5019, 5030 and other applicable provisions of law, the Board directs District staff to transmit this resolution to the County Committee so that the County Committee will be on notice of the District's intent, to adopt a change in the method of electing members of the Board from "at-large" elections to "by-trustee area" elections commencing with the 2022 Board elections;
4. Before submitting a final proposal to the County Committee for trustee area maps using the 2020 federal census data, multiple public hearings in accordance with Elections Code section 10010 and other applicable laws shall be scheduled to obtain public input on the draft maps and proposals;

5. The Board shall apply to the County Committee for establishment of trustee areas pursuant to Education Code section 5019 in a timely manner and as soon as feasible to have the 2022 elections for the Board conducted within the new trustee areas;
6. The Superintendent, or designee, is hereby directed to contract with National Demographics Corporation or other reputable demographer as soon as possible following adoption of this resolution to ensure that the District is able to move with all deliberate speed following release of the 2020 census data;
7. The Superintendent, or designee, is hereby directed to prepare additional Board resolutions and documents, as needed, to meet all applicable legal requirements in a timely manner acting with all deliberate speed, and to seek a waiver from the State Board of Education of the election requirement imposed by Education Code section 5020;
8. The Superintendent, or designee, shall consult with legal counsel to take all steps necessary to implement and give effect to this resolution; and
9. The foregoing resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F



COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES
ASSESSMENT PLANNING FUND, INC.

Scenario Map F

Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5
Vacant	Harden (2024)	Grant (2024)	Vacant	Heredia (2024) Bains (2022) Kaplan (2022)

Sequencing

2022 election (2 trustee areas needed)


- Trustee Area 1
- Trustee Area 4

2024 election (3 trustee areas needed)

- Trustee Area 2
- Trustee Area 3
- Trustee Area 5

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F



Public Hearing and Action on Natomas Unified School District's Proposal Under Education Code Section 5019 to Change Election Methods, Adopt Trustee Areas Map, and Establish Sequence of Elections; Action on Resolution No. CC-22-01

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONCEPTUAL TRUSTEE AREAS - SCENARIO F

Total Population:	86,905	Ideal Popultion:	17,381	Variance:	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Total Population (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
Population Variance	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
White	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
Black/ African American	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
Other	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Two or More Races	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
Hispanic/Latino	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
White	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
Black/ African American	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Other	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Two or More Races	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	Trustee Area 1	Trustee Area 2	Trustee Area 3	Trustee Area 4	Trustee Area 5
Population	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
White	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
Black/ African American	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Asian	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE NATOMAS
ÁREAS CONCEPTUALES DE FIDEICOMIRIOS - ESCENARIO F

Población total::	86,905	Población ideal:	17,381	Variación	6.4%
-------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------

Población total: (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
Variación de población	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
Blanco	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
Otro	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Población de 18 años o más (2020 Census)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 5
Población	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
Hispanic/Latino	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
Blanco	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
Negro/ Afroamericano	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Asiático	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Otro	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Dos o más razas	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Ciudadanos en edad de votar Estimación de la Población (2015-2019)					
	Área 1	Área 2	Área 3	Área 4	Área 6
Población	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
Hispanic/Latino	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
Blanco	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
Negro/ Afroamericano	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
Indio americano/ nativo de Alaska	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Asiático	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
Nativo de Hawái/otras islas del Pacífico	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
Otro	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dos o más razas	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ਸੰਕਲਪ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ - ਦਿ੍ਹਨ ਨਕਸਾ ਏ (Scenario F)

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	86,905	ਆਦਰਸ ਆਬਾਦੀ:	17,381	ਪਰਿਵਰਤਨ:	6.4%
--------------------	---------------	--------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------

ਕੁੱਲ ਆਬਾਦੀ (2020 ਦੀ ਮਰਦਮਸ਼ੁਮਾਰੀ))					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	17,505	17,932	16,848	16,828	17,792
ਆਬਾਦੀ ਆਦਰਸ	124	551	-533	-553	411
	0.7%	3.2%	-3.1%	-3.2%	2.4%
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੋ	23.8%	34.2%	20.3%	19.5%	18.5%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	33.6%	22.4%	23.7%	25.6%	28.5%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.2%	16.8%	16.3%	14.2%	14.0%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	17.9%	17.0%	30.9%	31.4%	29.6%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	6.9%	6.8%	6.4%	7.6%	7.1%

Population 18 and Over (2020 Census)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	13,834	13,697	12,705	12,363	13,523
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੋ	21.7%	31.4%	18.6%	17.7%	16.7%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	37.1%	25.9%	26.2%	27.4%	31.4%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	15.1%	16.6%	15.9%	14.5%	13.7%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	18.1%	17.6%	31.8%	32.9%	30.3%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
ਹੋਰ	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.6%	5.6%	4.9%	5.5%	5.6%

Citizens by Voting Age Population Estimate (2015-2019)					
	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 1	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 2	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 3	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 4	ਟਰੱਸਟੀ ਖੇਤਰ 5
ਆਬਾਦੀ	11,912	11,721	9,289	10,163	9,743
ਹਿਸਪੈਨਿਕ/ਲਾਤੀਨੋ	21.4%	33.1%	15.0%	12.9%	19.9%
ਚਿੱਟਾ	42.6%	29.9%	36.9%	33.9%	36.1%
ਕਾਲਾ / ਅਫਰੀਕੀ ਅਮਰੀਕੀ	18.2%	16.8%	19.7%	15.8%	14.5%
ਅਮਰੀਕੀ ਭਾਰਤੀ/ਅਲਾਸਕਾ ਮੂਲ	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
ਏਸ਼ੀਆਈ	12.4%	13.2%	23.7%	30.9%	26.4%
ਮੁਲ ਹਵਾਈ/ਹੋਰ ਪੈਸ਼ਾਫਕ ਆਈਲਡਰ	0.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
ਹੋਰ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ਦੋ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਧ ਰੇਸ	5.0%	4.5%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%

