

Placer County Redistricting

Public Submitted Maps B.2 and D overview

October 18th, 2021
by Amber Beckler

Presentation Sections

- Map Design Guiding Principles
- Executive Overview
- Draft Alternative Maps
- Voting Rights Act Criteria Matrix
- County staff Criteria Matrix

Map Design Guiding Principles

- Align to Voting Rights Act Criteria (1-5)
- Reach population parity with a 5% or less standard deviation
- Adhere to County driven Criteria to the extent possible
- Take a regional focus that represents the diverse mix of rural and suburban along with planned growth in the next 10 years
- Leveraged boundaries where possible from staff's map alternatives A, B and C
- Better align communities of interest and census designated areas
- Create more compact districts and correct nonstandard carve-outs and peninsulas
- Integrate public survey themes

Executive Overview

- Map B.2 was created as a hybrid to better align communities of interest leveraging County staff Map B as a starting point.
- Map D was created as a final proposal to further align communities of interest and take a regional approach to western Placer County. County staff Map C was leveraged especially for the District 5 boundary following the Auburn census designated place.
- Map D balances rural and suburban areas in District 3 since Rocklin as a singular incorporated entity has separate representation. Integration of unincorporated communities of interest creates a more balanced popular representation and balances population with District 4.
- Overall, maps B.2 and D provide the following attributes in common:
 - ✓ Does not exceed deviation of five percent between smallest and largest district.
 - ✓ Retains existing communities of interest and urban cores (i.e., downtown areas) within a single district boundary.
 - ✓ City of Roseville continues to be represented by multiple district boundaries, with the majority of the residential, urban core and downtown remaining in District 1; new Sunset Area Plan area growth in District 2 combined with northern Roseville with dense communities and industrial area; eastern Roseville and commercial areas remain represented by District 4 except the removal of the peninsula along E. Roseville Pkwy that is not consistent with the Community of Interest of Granite Bay and surrounding area.
 - ✓ Granite Bay CDP and community plan area remains intact and combined with similar communities of shared interests.
 - ✓ District 5 grows further to the west based on population growth in western Placer County.

Map D Highlights

District 1 – District preserves downtown and old Roseville together with the majority of west Roseville, align boundaries of neighboring districts along major roadways and existing precincts for example along HWY 65, Pleasant Grove, Harding and Galleria Blvd. Partitioned some of the new subdivisions and Specific Plans like Amoruso and Industrial Rd with District 2 due to the planned growth north of Roseville with the approved Sunset Area Plan. Includes the existing boundary of unincorporated area along Baseline Rd.

District 2 – District comprised of western region and is a mosaic of planned growth and the ag/rural communities and a majority of the Placer County Conservation Program (PCCP) reserve area. Contains City of Lincoln and North Roseville based on the synergy of planned development in this part of the County. Preserves the Sheridan MAC and most of the rural Lincoln MAC except for a small portion near Hidden Falls. Boundary is based on one of the other map alternative boundaries to get equal population for District 5. The district is now much more compact than in other alternatives.

District 3 - District comprised of the central corridor region and contains most of Rocklin and follows HWY 65 and I-80 primarily as a natural break. To gain a balance of rural and urban and to account for the communities of interest and census designated areas of Penryn and Newcastle along this central corridor, these were brought in as well. The shared boundary with District 5 follows the census designated areas of Auburn and North Auburn similar to staff's map boundaries.

District 4 – District comprised of the eastern region relative to I-80. It contains the Granite Bay Community Plan area, Town of Loomis and portion of East Rocklin and some of unincorporated Placer, all of which share similar interests and community identity regarding growth patterns and preserve the feel of the rural/suburban interface. East Roseville is included to better align to HWY 80 and the areas outside of downtown Roseville.

District 5 – District comprised of eastern Placer County with Tahoe and the Auburn area. Staff's map boundaries are leveraged here and this version includes Hidden Falls. A simple adjustment could always be made in order to preserve the east side of the rural Lincoln MAC boundary. Like the other alternatives, City of Auburn is included along with the census designated areas of North Auburn. District includes area along both sides of the HWY 49 corridor.

Voting Rights Act Criteria

		Map B.2	Map D
1	Contiguity	Yes	Yes
2	Integrity of Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest	Yes to the extent possible. Focused on communities of shared or like interest especially in the unincorporated areas to balance heavy population centers with rural areas as noted in the survey themes. See district overview highlights grid for more detail.	Yes to the extent possible. Focused on communities of shared or like interest especially in the unincorporated areas to balance heavy population centers with rural areas as noted in the survey themes. See district overview highlights grid for more detail.
3	Integrity of Cities and Census Designated Places	Yes to the extent possible. All census designated places are wholly contained in one District . All cities except Roseville are wholly contained in one district. This shift was to achieve population parity and adhere to VRA Criteria #2. Therefore a portion of North Roseville . The boundary closely followed roadways where possible consistent with VRA #4. and is supported by a county requirement to align to specific plans in this case planned development and mixed used industrial Sunset Area Plan. A portion of Roseville along E. Roseville PKWY was included in District 3 consistent with VRA criteria #4. A portion of East Roseville was included with District 4 following existing Supervisor boundary for Cirby area but removed the odd-shaped existing peninsula from District 4.	Yes to the extent possible. All census designated places are wholly contained in one District . All cities except Roseville and Rocklin are wholly contained in one district. This shift was to achieve population parity and adhere to VRA Criteria #2. Therefore a portion of North Roseville was included in District 2. The boundary closely followed roadways where possible consistent with VRA #4. and is supported by a county requirement to align to specific plans in this case planned development and mixed used industrial Sunset Area Plan. A portion of Roseville along HWY 65 was included in District 3 consistent with VRA criteria #4. A portion of East Roseville was included with District 4 following existing Supervisor boundary for Cirby area but removed the odd-shaped existing peninsula from District 4.
4	Natural and Artificial Barriers, including streets	Yes where other existing city, community or CDP boundaries were not present.	Yes where other existing city, community or CDP boundaries were not present.
5	Geographic Compactness	Yes. Any boundaries that are perceived to be jagged followed existing census blocks and precinct boundaries to maintain continuity.	Yes. Any boundaries that are perceived to be jagged followed existing census blocks and precinct boundaries to maintain continuity. The more narrow center in District 3 that binds City of Rocklin with more rural parts of Newcastle, Penryn to balance representation is bound by the Clover Valley natural feature consistent with VRA criteria #4 as well as the Town of Loomis. This connection avoids splitting the Town of Loomis into 2 districts consistent with VRA criteria #2.
	Population parity*	Yes, 5.0%	Yes, 4.05%

County based criteria

	Map B.2	Map D
To the extent practicable, minimize changes to existing districts	Yes, where practical.	Yes, where practical.
Respect continuity of Community Plan boundaries	Yes, to the fullest extent possible.	Yes, to the fullest extent possible.
Consider entitled Specific Plan areas when evaluating potential map boundaries	Yes, where relevant and not in conflict with other VRA criteria.	Yes ,where relevant and not in conflict with other VRA criteria.
Minimize segmentation of cities (i.e., no city represented by more than 2 districts)	Yes, to the extent possible. However, due to population parity and other VRA criteria this was minimized in a fashion similar to the County proposed alternatives maps	Yes, to the extent possible. However, due to population parity and other VRA criteria this was minimized in a fashion similar to the County proposed alternatives maps
Each district represents a balance of rural & urban constituents	Yes in all districts except District 3 where Rocklin is the majority and would have the Supervisor and City governance.	Yes in all cases. District 3 was modified to balance more urban Rocklin with the unincorporated portions of shared communities including Penryn and Newcastle .
Follow existing voter precinct lines where possible	Yes, where possible.	Yes, where possible.
NEW - MAC Boundaries and # per District 10/18/21	Followed the existing MAC boundaries to the extent possible.	Followed the existing MAC boundaries to the extent possible.