

2022 Petaluma Fairgrounds Advisory Panel Demographic Profile (Apr. 14)	% of Petaluma Population			% of Pop. with Equity Lens	Panelist Target ⁵	Corrected Target	Responded to Mailing	% of All Replies	Initial (Apr. 13) Selected
	of All Ages	Aged 16+	Aged 5-17						
Age Range ¹									
16-24		12.1%		15.0%	3-6	-	4	1.2%	3
25-34		15.4%		15.0%	4-6	-	27	8.2%	5
35-44		15.7%		15.2%	4-6	-	48	14.5%	6
45-54		16.4%		15.9%	5-7	-	45	13.6%	5
55-64 ⁷		18.3%		17.8%	5-7	-	75	22.7%	7
65-74		13.4%		13.0%	4-6	-	80	24.2%	6
75+		8.7%		8.5%	2-4	-	51	15.5%	4
Council District ^{1 3}									
District 1	16.6%			-	5-7	-	49	14.8%	5
District 2	16.8%			-	5-7	-	50	15.2%	7
District 3	16.9%			-	5-7	-	45	13.6%	5
District 4	16.5%			-	5-7	-	54	16.4%	7
District 5	16.9%			-	5-7	-	66	20.0%	5
District 6	16.4%			-	5-7	-	66	20.0%	7
Disability ²									
Yes	9.3%			-	2-4	-	28	8.5%	2
No	90.7%			-	32-34	-	302	91.5%	34
Housing Status ¹									
Own	64.9%			50.2%	22-24	17-19	257	77.9%	23
Rent	34.6%			49.3%	11-13	17-19	73	22.1%	13
Unhoused	0.5%			0.5%	0-2	0-2	0	0.0%	0
Gender ¹									
Female ⁸	49.8%			-	16-18	-	186	56.4%	18
Male ⁸	50.2%			-	16-18	-	144	43.6%	18
Another gender identity ^{4 6}	~3%			-	0-2	-	0	0.0%	0
Race/Ethnicity ²									
Asian / Pacific Islander ⁶			4.2%	4.2%	2-3	-	11	3.3%	2
Black / African American ⁶			1.2%	1.2%	2	-	2	0.6%	2
Hispanic/Latina/o/x			34.2%	45.2%	14-16	-	21	6.4%	14
Multiracial ⁶			5.4%	5.4%	2-3	-	24	7.3%	2
Native American / Alaska Native ⁶			0.4%	0.4%	2	-	9	2.7%	2
White ⁸			54.7%	43.7%	14-16	-	263	79.7%	14
Educational Attainment ¹									
Some schooling; no diploma		13.4%		-	4-6	-	8	2.4%	4
High school diploma or equivalent		16.7%		-	5-7	-	24	7.3%	5
Some college or Associate's degree		33.5%		-	11-13	-	100	30.3%	13
Bachelor's degree or higher		36.4%		-	12-14	-	198	60.0%	14
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	36	36	330	100%	36

Notes on the Panel Demographic Profile

revised 15 April 2022

The preceding demographic profile describes the Petaluma Fairgrounds Advisory Panel, a body selected to reflect the population of the city of Petaluma on seven demographic categories:

- age,
- location of residence,
- experience of a disability,
- housing status,
- gender,
- race/ethnicity, and
- educational attainment.

The Panel is composed of 36 members, selected from among a pool of 268 who expressed willingness to participate in an in-person Panel process. These residents responded to an [invitation](#) that was sent to 10,000 randomly-selected residential addresses and distributed to unhoused Petalumans via social service agencies.

The initial Panel of 36 was selected at a public Lottery Selection Event on April 13, a recording of which is available [here](#).

For more information about this project, please visit healthydemocracy.org/petaluma.

This notes document may be updated throughout the reselection / alternate selection process preceding the Panel's seating on May 13.

Reselection & Alternates

On April 27, an additional Reselection Event will be held via live stream (and recorded), to reselect for any Panelists who may have dropped out by that point. In addition, a group of Alternate Panelists will be selected at this point. Should any further Panelists decline to participate between April 27 and the day of the Panel's first seating (May 13), an Alternate will be called up – decided by how closely their demographics match the demographic deficiencies of the Panel at that point. Any Alternates not selected before May 13 will be paid to attend the first session of the Panel in case of any no-shows.

In the rare instance where a Panelist drops off the Panel before the completion of the Panel's work, it is our standard policy to not replace that Panelist. This is due to the difficulty for any new Panelist to get up to speed on the intensive work of the Panel. This policy (and other Panel policies), however, may be subject to change by the Panel's own Process Subcommittee.

Sample Population

At the Petaluma City Council meeting on February 28, 2022, when this project was authorized, the Council decided that residential addresses should be drawn from within the boundaries of the city of Petaluma.

Healthy Democracy identified several options for selecting a sample population, from which residential addresses would be drawn. See these and other selection design options in our Project Proposal (now pg. 50 of [our contract with the City](#)).

This Panel was open to any resident aged 16 or up, who either

- lives at an address, as their primary residence, to which an invitation letter was sent or
- does not live at a typical residential address and received an invitation letter through a social service agency

and who is not

- a current employee of the City of Petaluma,
- a current or former elected official in any political office, or
- one of the 14 members of the project's Informational Advisory Committee.

How Targets Are Calculated

The target ranges for each subcategory are calculated in the following manner:

1. We start with the total number of Panelists (36) and multiply this by the relevant population percentage.
2. Then, we subtract one (1) to get the lower bound, and add one (1) to get the upper bound.

Exceptions to this are mentioned in the notes that follow.

Panelist Pool & In-Person vs. Online Decision

In total, 342 residents responded to the [invitation letter](#). For respondents who were missing critical information on their response forms, attempts were made – by phone, text, and/or email (depending on contact info available) – to request these missing data. In the end, 12 respondents were removed from the pool of potential Panelists due to missing data.

Each respondent to the mailing stated – in light of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic – their willingness to participate in an online process, an in-person process, or either. Of those 330 qualifying potential Panelists:

- 81% were comfortable participating if the Panel were held in person; 19% were not, and
- 85% were comfortable participating if the Panel were held online; 15% were not.

As noted on the response form, we used these responses to help decide between holding an online and an in-person process. Given that they were nearly equal and that there are numerous benefits to an in-person process – in terms of accessibility, deliberative quality, Panel cohesion, and transparency – we decided to move forward with an in-person process.

In the two days before the Lottery Selection Event, the 19% of respondents who were only comfortable with an online process were given a chance to reconsider their choice before being taken out of the pool of potential Panelists. Several did so.



Equity Adjustments to Demographic Targets

At the Petaluma City Council meeting on February 28, 2022, when this project was authorized, the Council decided that two equity adjustments should be utilized in creating the demographic targets for the Panel. These adjustments were chosen from a list of potential adjustments (including no adjustment) prepared by Healthy Democracy and included in our Project Proposal (now pgs. 50-51 of [our contract with the City](#)).

Note that any given equity adjustment can rarely be made to all demographic categories – either because they are not applicable to that category or because relevant data to make the adjustment is not available.

City Council decided the project would use the following two adjustments:

Use K-12 Demographics

To capture the “K-12 population,” demographic targets were based on US Census data for Petaluma city residents aged 5 to 17, where possible. Eighteen-year-olds could not be captured in this population data, unfortunately, due to limitations of Census age ranges. (See the “Sources” section below for further details on data sources.)

This adjustment was used to set targets within the Race/Ethnicity category only. Note that, while data were available for the Experience of a Disability or Gender categories for residents aged 5-17, they were not used because they would not have had positive equity impacts on these categories.

Fully Correct for Disparities in Previous Engagement Rates

To compensate for previous disparities in rates of participation, additional equity adjustments were layered onto the population data used, where possible. The only demographic data available from the City regarding prior rates of participation in City public engagement were related to [participation in the City's General Plan Update](#). Among these data, targets within the following demographic categories could be adjusted: Age, Housing Status, and Race/Ethnicity.

Specifically, the subcategories Ages 16-24, Rents, and Hispanic/Latina/o/x were adjusted to compensate for discrepancies in past participation based on these data. Here's how this worked:

1. We calculated the difference between the percentage among those who had previously engaged and the percentage among the general population.
2. That discrepancy, in percentage points, was then added to the Panelist target in order to compensate for prior underrepresentation of those groups in City processes.¹
3. In one case, the prior demographic data (“18 and Under”) did not match up exactly with the relevant demographic subcategory on the Panel (“16-24”). In this case, we calculated the proportion of the general 18-and-under population that is 16-18 years of age (using Census data), then found the proportion of the 18-and-under discrepancy that could be

¹ For example, given that the past participation rate for renters was 19%, but renters' proportion of the population was 34%, the proportional representation of renters on the Panel was boosted by 15 percentage points, from 34% to 49%.

attributed to 16-to-18-year-olds, then applied this to the 16-24 age subcategory using the method described in Step 2 above.

4. Finally, we adjusted the other subcategories in Age and the other majority subcategories in Housing Status and Race/Ethnicity downward, in order to bring the total sum of all targets within each category back to 100%. Then, these new adjusted percentages were used to create the target ranges for selection of the Panel.

Fall-Back Population Data

Per our standard procedures, where data for residents aged 5-17 was unavailable or inapplicable, we fell back to matching the Panel's ages – i.e., using data for residents 16 and over. This was done for two categories: Age and Educational Attainment.

Where data was only available for Petaluma residents of all ages – or where age-limited data would not actually have had an equity impact – we fell back to using general population data. This was done for four categories: Location of Residence, Experience of a Disability, Housing Status, and Gender.

Policy for Small Demographic Subcategories

The follow policy was instituted by Healthy Democracy in 2019 for all future programs:

All target ranges have an absolute floor of two Panelists, where possible (given available respondents). This is to prevent tokenization of any Panelist belonging to a small minority subcategory and ensure that every Panelist has "someone else like them" on the Panel for each demographic category.

Therefore, whenever a target range would otherwise allow for the potential selection of fewer than two people in any subcategory, its target range will automatically have a lower bound of "2," with the upper bound for that subcategory unchanged. If the upper bound for the subcategory was previously equal to or less than "2," then the target for the category will simply be "2," with no upper or lower bounds.

Where the presence of one or more small-minority subcategories is boosted by this policy, the other subcategory/ies must be reduced in order for the selection software to form a Panel. In order for a Panel to be selected, the sum of all lower bounds of all target ranges in a category must total no more than the total number of Panelists to be selected. To achieve this:

1. All small-minority subcategory ranges are changed per this policy.
2. Their lower bounds are added together.
3. The lower bounds of larger subcategory/ies (i.e., those unaffected by this policy) are calculated proportionally from the remaining Panel seats, such that the lower bounds of all subcategories equal the total number of Panelists to be selected.
4. The larger subcategory/ies' upper bounds are formed by adding two to the lower bound.

In this project, this policy affected four Race/Ethnicity subcategories, as well as one subcategory each within Housing Status and Gender. (In the latter two cases, however, the target was zero for reasons detailed in "Adjustments Due to Respondent Pool" below.)

Adjustments Due to Respondent Pool

In three subcategories, the lower bounds of the Panelist target number had to be lowered in order to select a Panel, due to a lack of qualified respondents in that subcategory.

1. No respondents self-identified as "**currently unhoused**," forcing a change in the lower bound of this category from two to zero. Although this subcategory is a very small proportion of the Petaluma population, this was still a disappointing result. A significant effort was made by two local social service agencies to hand-distribute special invitation letters to unhoused Petalumans. We are grateful to Petaluma People's Services and the SAFE team for distributing invitation letters to around three-dozen houseless individuals whom they serve. And we are grateful to COTS for distributing several dozen letters to all residents at their shelter, at their front desk, and with to-go meals served in their kitchen. This was the first instance of such a distribution as part of one of our projects and will be a learning experience for us going forward.
2. No respondents self-identified as "**another gender identity**," forcing a change in the lower bound of this category from two to zero. As noted in the "Sources" section, the population in this subcategory is unknown, but this is likely another very small demographic subcategory.
3. Four respondents self-identified as **aged 16-24**, but these four respondents came from just three households. Given our rule that no two Panelists may come from the same household, only three Panelists could be selected for this subcategory. This forced a change in the lower bound of this category from four to three. A Panel with three Panelists in this subcategory would have satisfied the target range if no equity adjustment had been made, so this fall-back to three Panelists means, in effect, that the Age category unfortunately was not able to receive its equity adjustment.

Sources

Most of the demographic targets for this project were based on 2020 estimates by the US Census for the city of Petaluma.² This is the most recent data available as of April 2022. Despite issues identified by the Census Bureau itself with the 2020 Census, we believe the US Census continues to be the most trustworthy source of general population data in most cases.

In three cases, however, we used data sources other than the US Census:

1. Location of Residence (Council District)

We used population data supplied as part of the City Council District GIS shapefiles by the City of Petaluma. Since Districts were only recently drawn and must by law include near-equal populations, the slight variations in population between each District did not impact the targets for this category.

² Specifically, we used 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Using an estimate over the past five years helps to improve data accuracy, particularly among small population groups, and is standard practice in many research applications.

2. Housing Status > Unhoused

For the “Unhoused” subcategory, we used data for Petaluma from the 2020 [Sonoma County Homeless Count Report](#).

3. Gender > Another Gender Identity

Data for this subcategory is spotty at best on a national and state level and is typically nonexistent at the local level. For this project, figures for this subcategory were based on several studies.

A [2021 UCLA study](#) found that approximately 1.2 million LGBTQ adults in the United States (aged 18-60) identify as nonbinary. This is about 11% of the US LGBTQ population aged 18-60, according to the study, or about 0.7% of the total US population aged 18-60 (using the Census' 2020 ACS 5-Year Estimate).

A different [2020 UCLA study](#) found that 1.7 million adults in California (aged 18+) identified as LGBTQ. Taking in combination (albeit imperfectly, given the age mismatch) with the previous study, we can estimate a potential population of about 187,000 LGBTQ Californian adults who identify as nonbinary, or about 0.6% of the 18+ California population (using the same Census Estimate). It should be noted, however, that it may be problematic to assume that all individuals identifying as “another gender identity” would also identify as LGBTQ; therefore, LGBTQ-specific surveys may systematically undercount this population.

In addition, there appear to be major age disparities in nonbinary identification. For example, a [2017 UCLA study](#) found that approximately 27% of California youth aged 12 to 17 reported that they were “viewed by others as gender nonconforming at school.” This would extrapolate to about 796,000 Californian youth. (Note, however, that once again, the match to our demographic categorization is imperfect: “viewed by others as gender nonconforming” may or may not match with those who would self-identify as “another gender identity” on our response form.)

Despite the many issues with these data, if we take the youth number above in combination with the previous 187,000 count for nonbinary Californian LGBTQ adults, this yields an estimate of 2.8% of Californians aged 12+ who *may* identify as nonbinary or gender nonconforming. Hence: our 3% estimation in the Demographic Profile.

Errata

Due to a formula error, the targets initially calculated for the Housing Status category and used during the April 13 Lottery Selection Event were based on the % of Population of All Ages, rather than the % of Population with Equity Lens (which compensates for disparities in prior engagement). This error was discovered the following day and will be factored into the Panelist Reselection on April 27 and the selection of Alternate Panelists at that time. Depending on the attrition rate, this error should be able to be at least partially (and perhaps fully) corrected through the process of replacing Panelists who drop out before the Panel is seated May 13.