



AGENDA SUBMITTAL TO SOLANO COUNTY SUPERVISORS

ITEM TITLE Continue Board Study Session on three Supervisorial Redistricting Alternatives prepared by staff and presented at public workshops		BOARD MEETING DATE June 14, 2011	AGENDA NUMBER 21
Dept: Contact: Phone:	County Administrator Birgitta Corsello (707) 784-6100	Supervisorial District Number All	
Published Notice Required		Yes	No X
Public Hearing Required?		Yes	No X

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Continue discussion on three Supervisorial Redistricting Alternatives (Alternatives A, B and C), each of which could achieve the previous Board direction to bring each supervisorial district's population close to the desirable mean population of 82,669; and
2. Receive verbal report on additional public comments received on June 13, provide any further direction to staff on the Redistricting Alternatives submitted, and; provide direction for staff to prepare refined alternatives which will be brought back to the Board for additional review at a public hearing scheduled for 9:00 am on June 22, 2011.

SUMMARY

On January 25, 2011 the Board established the process and adopted a tentative timeline for undertaking the 2011 Supervisorial Redistricting in response to the 2010 Decennial Census. After the census data was released further direction was given to staff at the Board's April 12 meeting to prepare alternative scenarios, each of which attain as close as is practicable the ideal district population of 82,669. Three alternative redistricting scenarios were created that could attain the population objective pursuant to the January 25 approved process. On June 7 direction was given to staff to hold an additional public workshop on June 13 to receive public input on the three alternative scenarios. Public comments received at the workshops will be reported to the Board as an oral report. All other comments received from prior public workshops and via email are compiled as Redistricting Public Comments (Attachment A). The Board continued the study session to review the Redistricting Public Comments. Staff is requesting direction to proceed to the next phase of the approved redistricting process and timeline (Attachment B).

FINANCING

The County Administrator has included funding for consultant services in the FY2010/11 Budget to assist in the County's efforts to develop a redistricting plan that meets the requirements of law and

addresses Board and Community concerns. A contract has been executed with Environmental Stewardship & Planning, Inc. for consultant services for \$49,000, of which \$30,000 has been appropriated for redistricting services. Some incidental costs that may be experienced in performing public outreach will be expected to be absorbed within existing budgeted resources.

DISCUSSION

Federal and state law requires counties to undergo an adjustment to their Supervisorial District boundaries to reflect the outcome of the Census, conducted every ten years. The 2000 Census counted a total of 394,542 residents in Solano County and resulted in a desired number of residents in each district of 78,908, or 394,542 divided by 5. The 2010 Census reports a total of **413,344** persons living in Solano County as of April 1, 2010. Using the same criteria to determine the mean population for each district, (i.e., divide the total population by the number of supervisorial districts) a desirable mean population of **82,669** results.

Staff has loaded the census data onto a computer with mapping capability. Using the Maptitude GIS mapping program with a redistricting module, staff has identified which of Solano County’s over 10,000 Census Blocks are in which Supervisorial District. Based upon the mapping work performed to date, staff has determined the populations for each district to be as shown in the Table 1 below:

Table 1

Supervisorial District	2001 Pop After Redistricting	2010 Population	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	78,535	79,484	82,669	-3,185	-3.85%
District 2	78,875	81,598	82,669	-1,071	-1.30%
District 3	78,845	86,870	82,669	4,201	5.08%
District 4	79,026	79,461	82,669	-3,208	-3.88%
District 5	79,261	85,931	82,669	3,262	3.95%
Total	394,542	413,344		0	0

Alternatives A, B and C each meet the numeric goal of having each district having a population close to the ideal mean of 82,669.

Alternative A

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "A" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	82,849	3,365	82,669	180	0.22%
District 2	81,598	82,557	959	82,669	-112	-0.14%
District 3	86,870	82,546	-4,324	82,669	-123	-0.15%
District 4	79,461	82,768	3,307	82,669	99	0.12%
District 5	85,931	82,624	-3,307	82,669	-45	-0.05%
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative B

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "B" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	82,667	3,183	82,669	-2	-0.0%
District 2	81,598	82,739	1,141	82,669	70	0.08%
District 3	86,870	82,546	-4,324	82,669	-123	-0.15%
District 4	79,461	82,391	2,930	82,669	-278	-0.34%
District 5	85,931	83,001	-2,930	82,669	332	0.4%
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative C

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "C" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	82,730	3,246	82,669	61	0.07%
District 2	81,598	82,676	1,078	82,669	7	0.01%
District 3	86,870	83,154	-3,716	82,669	485	0.59%
District 4	79,461	82,421	2,980	82,669	-248	-0.3%
District 5	85,931	82,363	-3,568	82,669	-306	-0.37%
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative A, B and C narrative descriptions provided at public workshops can be found at the County's website <http://www.solanocounty.com/redistricting/>

ALTERNATIVES

Your Board may choose not to receive a report at this time; however, the Board's approved public process anticipates a set of targeted actions and dates so it is desirable to receive further guidance on the development of supervisorial districts at this time in order to keep the public process moving forward.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The County Administrator's Office has been assisted in this effort by County Counsel, Department of Information Technology, Registrar of Voters, Resource Management and the Consultant.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:


 Birgitta E. Corsello
 County Administrator

Attachment A: Redistricting Public Comments
 Attachment B: 2011 Redistricting Process and Timeline

Redistricting Public Comments

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C
May 24, 2011	6	2	4
May 25, 2011	2	2	2
May 26, 2011	No Comments Received that Night		
June 13, 2011			

Alternative A Comments

May 24, 2011

This scenario splits the middle Green Valley Specific Plan Area; this seems ill advised. Much work has been done in the past several years to merge Green Valley into a single, consolidated community. It should exist in a single district, in its entirety. Nancy Nelson

Unfortunately, the district plan under Scenario A breaks up an established community of interest shared by the residents of Green Valley. It also bisects the middle Green Valley Specific Plan, with 400 residents, the product of over 2 years of work by our community residents. Bill Mayben

1. There are more government workers and elected people than citizens at this meeting. Not good! 2. Many more supervisors are needed to truly represent the public. One supervisor does not need and cannot represent 82,000 people. Furthermore, when a supervisor raises over \$200K to run for office, special interest is almost guaranteed to run the show. 3. I think the alternatives presented are going to be more of the same of the present broken system. George Gynn, Jr.

I object to Scenario A. This cuts Fairfield into five districts, whereas the other cities have only two or one Supervisor. Also, the reason cited is to give Dist 1 more unincorporated area, but this does so by adding significant land from Fairfield. Scenario A also seems inferior to Scenarios B and C insofar as it maintains District Two's reach from the Napa lien all the way down to Mare Island. Jack Batson

General Comment: If +/- 5% is allowed, legally there is no need to change the lines. Is that an option? Given there is more leeway than <1%, then there should be strong effort to make lines "not odd." Maybe 2-3% variation would allow much better lines. It would be good to look at other options at least. Rick Wood

The lines for District 4 & 5 are ideal in this scenario, as are the lines for District 3. I would not select this scenario's realignment for District 1 & 2, as District 1 should grow south into more of Vallejo, not north

Attachment A

into Green Valley. I prefer a modified Scenario B here. Exception: consider moving Fairfield population along Peabody from Dist 5 to District 4. No name

May 25, 2011

Only comment I have is the area give to Sup # 4, north of I-80 needs to remain in Sup # 5. And if Suisun can be moved into Sup 3 it would make more sense. No name

Don't split Green Valley! Combine Suisun City. Move 5th District west to I-505 and possibly Allendale to 1st ridge line. No name

Online Comments

The Green Valley Landowner's Association does not support the proposed redistricting "Scenario 'A' for several reasons:

- This Scenario seriously, unnecessarily, and arbitrarily divides and interrupts "an identifiable community of interest" by proposing to impose Supervisorial District #1 onto Middle Green Valley, violating a redistricting goal.
- This scenario fails to take into account the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan completed by residents of Middle Green Valley, and the Green Valley Landowners Association, under the sponsorship of the Board of Supervisors, over the past two years, working with Hart-Howerton Architects and Planners to create a master plan for the 2000 acre study area. Not only did the Specific Plan identify the focus of a new community of 400 homes; the process emphasized the fact that all of Green Valley represents a fabric of identifiable community interest which cannot purposefully be divided. Scenario "A" described this area simply as "agricultural".
- The integrity of the Specific Plan requires the participation of the surrounding community of interest, in order to succeed.
- Scenario A fails to minimize the scope of boundary changes to two established Districts, violating a redistricting goal.
- We believe that the concept of each supervisorial district containing an equal share of unincorporated county area imposes artificial constraints on the districting exercise regarding the overarching need to maintain coherent representational districts, and should be a secondary consideration.
- Scenario A requires major adjustments to voter precincts.
- Scenario A makes the effort of Green Valley community planning and coordination more than twice as difficult, and represents a purposeful interruption of our community-based political process.
- We feel it appropriate to pull areas of District #2 back from Vallejo, allowing District #1 to gain voters, as expressed variably in Scenario "B" and "C".

Very Truly Yours,
Bill Mayben
President, GVLA

EXCELLENT, Bill, I'm glad you submitted this! Scenario A inexplicably divides the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan between two districts. Clearly the consultant drawing the maps had no knowledge of the Plan's existence.

Nancy Nelson

Alternative B Comments

May 24, 2011

General comment – is it good to split Suisun Valley? On one hand, good to have two Supes representing Valley. On the other one Supe might be able to give more attention. I guess I prefer 2 Super, but that’s assuming they both care about SV, not neither. Rick Wood

District 1 & 2 are most ideal in this scenario, although the Sand Beach area should not be isolated into Dist 1. Keep District 3 as you have it. There appears to be no logic in a different 4/5 boundary in Vacaville in this scenario than for Scenario A. Use Scenario A instead. The line along I-80 makes sense. Anna M. Imous (No name)

May 25, 2011

Move western 5th boundary at least to I-505 so Dixon Fire, School, & Library District are united. Put Suisun City all in 3rd. Anna N. Imus (No name)

Possibly the best. Least interruption to the existing districts. No name

Online Comments

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the issue of redistricting of Vallejo, these potential changes are crucial to Vallejo's future.

I start out by asking you to support Alternative B.

The goal of this process is to make the districts as equal and compact as possible. District 1 is the County's poorest district. By changing the district boundaries as indicated in Alternative A, and especially C, would further concentrate the poverty in District 1. As a Vallejo resident I can say that this would hurt many communities of interest in our city. We need a diversity of people in our County districts, reflecting the wide scope of our socio-economic and racial make-up.

Thank you
Wendell Quigley Mare Island Ca

Dear Supervisors, I attended your May 26, 2010 Redistricting community meeting. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input as these potential changes are critical to Vallejo's future.

I will start out by asking you to **support Alternative B.**

The goal of this process is to make the districts as equal and compact as possible. District 1 is the County's poorest district. By changing the district boundaries as indicated in Alternatives A, and especially C, you would be further concentrating the poverty into District 1. Living in and representing Vallejo residents, I can say that this would hurt many communities of interest in our city. We need a diversity of people in our County districts, reflecting the wide breadth of our socio-economic and racial make-up.

While not perfect, **Alternative B is the best of the three alternatives**, and provides for a more balanced socio-economic District that would be more fair and best serve the many communities of interest in Vallejo. It would also ensure that a broad swath of Vallejo would be represented by somebody who lives in and best knows Vallejo -- which is important to those of us who live here.

Alternative A: this alternative makes no sense and cuts Vallejo up too much -- it maintained Hiddenbrooke in D-1, but moved D-1 into lower Green Valley; it would also keep Mare Island in D-2

Alternative B: this is the best of the three alternatives; it would maintain Hiddenbrooke in D-1 and put Sandy Beach and Mare Island into D-1 (currently D-2)

Alternative C: this alternative is the absolute worst of the three, and provides no fair representation whatsoever to the communities of interest in Vallejo

Thank you for your consideration.

/s/ Stephanie Gomes

Dear Supervisors: I have reviewed the alternatives from your May 26, 2010 Redistricting community meeting. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input as these potential changes are critical to Vallejo's future.

I support Alternative B.

The goal of this process is to make the districts as equal and compact as possible. District 1 is the County's poorest district. By changing the district boundaries as indicated in Alternatives A, and especially C, you would be further concentrating the poverty into District 1. Living in and representing Vallejo residents, I can say that this would hurt many communities of interest in our city. We need a diversity of people in our County districts, reflecting the wide breadth of our socio-economic and racial make-up.

While not perfect, **Alternative B is the best of the three alternatives**, and provides for a more balanced socio-economic District that would be more fair and best serve the many communities of interest in Vallejo. It would also ensure that a broad swath of Vallejo would be represented by somebody who lives in and best knows Vallejo -- which is important to those of us who live here.

Alternative A: this alternative makes no sense and cuts Vallejo up too much -- it maintained Hiddenbrooke in D-1, but moved D-1 into lower Green Valley; it would also keep Mare Island in D-2

Alternative B: this is the best of the three alternatives; it would maintain Hiddenbrooke in D-1 and put Sandy Beach and Mare Island into D-1 (currently D-2)

Alternative C: this alternative is the absolute worst of the three, and provides no fair representation whatsoever to the communities of interest in Vallejo

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Boyce
133 Kentucky St
Vallejo, CA 94590

Dear Representatives:

The redistricting issues have been brought to my attention recently and I'm writing this letter as a voter and resident of Solano County. I feel the fairest and best option is OPTION B since this will provide the best possible outcome.

I feel strongly about this issue and the effect it may have on me and my neighbors. Please do what is right and in the best interests of all the voters of this county by placing your support on OPTION B.

Most sincerely,

Collette Sweeney
Teacher

Alternative C Comments

May 24, 2011

The Fairfield-Airbase Parkway inset to Alternative C is totally unacceptable. This is a community of military and military retired citizens who are closely connected to Travis AFB. We do much of our business in Suisun. Patronizing businesses, library and public functions in Suisun. Diana Ricketts (email address omitted)

The unification of Green Valley and the consistency of Vallejo is compelling. No name

Messy, pointless, and illogical. Dump this scenario. No name

Did you notice that Districts 1, 2 & 3 combined have almost exactly 3 x 82,669? And 4 & 5 almost exactly 2 x 82,669? What that means is you could leave the line between 1-3 and 4-5 alone. Not sure that's good, but interesting. Rick Wood

May 25, 2011

Appears too much moving of lines to accommodate current incumbents. No name

Suisun City should be in ONE district with Fairfield. District Five should move western Boundary at least to I-505 – include Allendale and Lake Solano & state Prison (in that order – as needed). Those rural areas are in the Dixon School District, Fire District, Library District, and have 4-H, FFA & other

organizational/social common interests. Less of Vacaville should be in the Fifth – so it doesn't overwhelm OUR communities interest. Another alternative would be to have All of Suisun in the 5th – put more of FFlD in the 3rd & move none of Vacaville in the 4th. Anonymous

Online Comments

As a Vacaville resident, I am very disappointed with the outreach you have done on this important subject. The website with its descriptions and maps is a poor job in itself and does not give those of us depending on the use of our computers to get information on the committee's work. You are unable to tell from the maps what is what or where cities even have their boundaries. There are no main streets to follow. The maps are useless and there is no way to compare them to the alternatives. Kathy Freeman

There's a rumor the board is thinking about splitting Dixon between two districts.

I can tell you that will NOT set well with anyone up here. In fact it would be resented.

My view is that Suisun City should be consolidated into one district, and that district 5 should extend to the hill crests west of Allendale. That whole area is in the Dixon School District, Library District, Fire District and I believe SID district. The kids are in the same FFA and 4-H clubs as Dixon kids.

That commonality of interest is important.

The Pleasants Valley rural area should stay in the 4th - because that area is more connected to Vacaville.
Dave (via email)

Approved Process and Timeline (Amended on June 7, 2011)

The following timeline sets forth those activities that are required under the Elections Code and those that are optional but may assist in the development of alternatives. The targeted completion date of this process is no later than the end of September 2011 in order to meet the practical deadlines imposed by the November 2011 election and the yet to be determined 2012 Presidential Primary.

Date	Required	Optional	Activity
January 25, 2011		X	Board receives overview of redistricting process via this memorandum and presentation, adopts recommended procedure, appoints Ad Hoc Advisory Committee and Technical Group
April 1, 2011	X		Census data is released and made available to County
April		X	Census data and maps loaded onto County GIS system; using mapping program with a redistricting module Tech Group identifies which Census Blocks are in which Supervisorial District and accordingly, the current population and the respective characteristics within each District. The desired Mean population per district will be determined and the resultant Deviation from that Mean will be identified, i.e., the number that will need to be either increased or reduced for each district to achieve relative parity.
April 12		X	Briefing to full Board identifying results of Census, including appropriate adjustments, and the status of each district vis-a-vis the Mean. Provide direction regarding Town Hall meetings.
Week of May 23		X	Develop 3-5 scenarios depending on Census data and conduct "Town Hall" meetings in Fairfield, Dixon, and Vallejo – to receive community feedback on alternatives.
June 7		X	Full BOS conducts Study Session on three Redistricting Alternatives and directs staff regarding any changes to further refine preferred choice to be brought back on June 22, 2011
June 13		X	Conduct "Town Hall" meeting in Vacaville – to receive community feedback on the three alternatives presented at previous town hall meetings.
June 14		X	Full BOS continues Study Session on three Redistricting Alternatives and directs staff regarding any changes to further refine preferred choice to be brought back on June 22, 2011
Recommended June 22		X	Full BOS conducts Public Hearing on Redistricting Alternatives; BOS to determine a Preferred Alternative to be brought back for first public hearing on Preferred Alternative.
Recommended June 28	X		BOS conducts first public hearing on preferred alternative and directs staff to schedule final hearing on the selected redistricting map for July 26, 2011. Board also directs staff to bring back an ordinance for introduction on July 26, 2011
Recommended July 26	X		BOS conducts final public hearing on selected redistricting map and introduces ordinance setting boundaries for supervisorial districts.
Recommended August 9	X		BOS adopts ordinance.