Current Timeline

Compressed map review due to data delays

First Advisory Commission Meeting
Public Forums
Census Data Delivered
Draft Maps Published
Adoption Hearing

Public Outreach and Education
Community Meetings
Public Hearings
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Under the current timeline, Placer had approx. **6 weeks** from October 14th to adopt maps and present them for BOS approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEPTEMBER 2021</th>
<th>OCTOBER 2021</th>
<th>NOVEMBER 2021</th>
<th>DECEMBER 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MON TUE WED THU FRI SAT SUN</td>
<td>MON TUE WED THU FRI SAT SUN</td>
<td>MON TUE WED THU FRI SAT SUN</td>
<td>MON TUE WED THU FRI SAT SUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
<td>15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td>29 30</td>
<td>27 28 29 30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sept. 21, 2021**
Placer received adjusted Census data

**Oct. 14, 2021**
ARC Meeting

**Nov. 4, 2021**
ARC Meeting

**Nov. 10, 2021**
ARC Meeting

**Nov. 30, 2021**
BOS Meeting

**Dec. 15, 2021**
Map approval deadline
# Population Changes

## Population Change by Supervisorial District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>72,534</td>
<td>97,638</td>
<td>25,104</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>67,720</td>
<td>83,453</td>
<td>15,733</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>68,802</td>
<td>76,991</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>72,691</td>
<td>78,472</td>
<td>5,781</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>66,685</td>
<td>68,752</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>348,432</strong></td>
<td><strong>405,306</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population Changes

- Population increase in **City of Rocklin** (71,603) by **25.7%**.
- Population increase in the **City of Roseville** (147,971) by **24.4%**.
- Population increase in **City of Lincoln** by (49,939) **16.6%**.
- **Limited growth** in the **Town of Loomis, City of Auburn, and City of Colfax**.
- **Minor population losses in Tahoe Basin** around .02%, for a total 13,837 people.
- **Limited growth in the large unincorporated area of D5**, excluding the Tahoe Basin.
- **Limited increase in total population within unincorporated county** from 107,988 to 113,179 people for a total percent change of 4.8%.
Equal representation in voting follows “One person, one vote” principle.

### Population Adjustments by District - 0% Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>72,534</td>
<td>97,638</td>
<td>(16,037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>67,720</td>
<td>83,453</td>
<td>(1,852)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>68,802</td>
<td>76,991</td>
<td>4,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>72,691</td>
<td>78,472</td>
<td>3,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>66,685</td>
<td>68,752</td>
<td>12,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>348,432</strong></td>
<td><strong>405,306</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total required to achieve parity = 81,061</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legal Criteria

- CA Elections Code provides basic criteria and process
- Aligns with Voting Rights Act
- Must consider in this priority order:
  1. contiguity
  2. integrity of neighborhoods and communities of interest
  3. integrity of cities and census designated places
  4. natural and artificial barriers, including streets
  5. geographic compactness
Additional Factors

- Utilize existing supervisorial districts as basis (i.e., minimize drastic impacts to existing boundaries)
- Consider community plan boundaries
- Consider entitled Specific Plan areas
- Minimize segmentation of incorporated cities
- Each district represents a balance of rural and urban constituents
- Follow existing voting precinct boundaries where possible
Process

- District 1 increased in population by 35%, which results in the need to reduce the district by **16,037 people**. The reduction is achieved by moving portions of District 1 into Districts 2 and 4.

- District 5 needs to add **12,849 people** to achieve parity, into populated areas of Districts 2 and 3.

- Consideration for communities of interest, cities, CDPs.

- Minimize changes to existing districts as starting point.
Define Your Community Survey

- What bonds your community?
- Where is your community located?
- Why should the community be kept together or separate from another area?
- Draw your community using the mapping tool.
Community Survey Results

- Top issues bonding communities of interest:
  - Community character (All geographies)
  - Recreation (East Placer/Tahoe)
  - Amenities (e.g., proximity to shopping, parks, entertainment) (West Placer)
  - School district (All geographies)
  - Development patterns (Unincorporated areas)
  - Demography (e.g., race, age, housing) (All geographies)
  - Issues in district diverse (District 5)
Current Supervisorial Districts

City Limits
Current Supervisorial Districts
City Limits
MAC Boundaries
Census Designated Places
Specific Plans
Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations
Map Alternative Progression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 14</th>
<th>November 4</th>
<th>November 10</th>
<th>November 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Deana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B2-P1C Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A**: Staff Generated Map Alternatives
- **B**: Commission Directed Map Alternatives
- **C**: Public Generated Map Alternatives
- **C2**: Advisory Redistricting Commission Alternative Map Recommendations
Public Comment Highlights

- Emphasis on Communities of Interest in priority rank
- Rural communities of interest in lower foothill area was common theme (e.g., Loomis, Penryn, Newcastle, Granite Bay)
- City of Rocklin constituents desire to keep the city within a district
- Elimination of northwestern portion of D4 along Hwy 65
- COIs in Roseville, logical division at Fiddyment Road
- Concern over residences of candidates/incumbents for Alt C/C2
- Support for public generated maps (i.e., D, B2, P1-C, B2-P1C Hybrid)
## 2021 Alternatives Assessment (Nov. 30)

### Table: Alternative A vs. Alternative C2 vs. Alternative E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative C2</th>
<th>Alternative E</th>
<th>52-PSIC Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Deviation (between largest and smallest district) deviation max</td>
<td>Largest: 01, Smallest: 03</td>
<td>Largest: 01, Smallest: 03</td>
<td>Largest: 01, Smallest: 03</td>
<td>Largest: 01, Smallest: 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cham/Zone within District</td>
<td>01-1</td>
<td>02-3</td>
<td>02-3</td>
<td>01-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cities within single district except Rocklin (J) and Roseville (L)</td>
<td>01-1</td>
<td>02-3</td>
<td>02-3</td>
<td>01-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MACs within District</td>
<td>01-1</td>
<td>02-3</td>
<td>02-3</td>
<td>01-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram: Alternative E vs. 52-PSIC Hybrid

- City of Rocklin is divided into three districts, 01 includes the operaion along Highway 65 and the nearest districts, 02 includes all of the city of Rocklin to the west level of Highway 65, and 04 includes the east part of Rocklin. 01 includes the city of Lincoln divided in two districts (02, 04).
- All MACs in single districts except North Auburn, Newcastle-Ophir (L), Newcastle-Ophir (M), Roseville (N), and the hidden district part of Shingle State.

---

**Note:** The diagrams and tables above provide a glimpse into the assessment of alternatives for the Redistricting in Placer, including the distribution of districts and the number of MACs. The data helps in understanding the diversity and size of districts, and how they are divided for the consecutive years.
Alt. B2-P1C Hybrid

Deviation - 4.61%

Draft Map B2/P1-C Hybrid

NOTE: These are draft maps and are subject to minor changes prior to final map adoption.
Alt. E

Deviation – 20.43%

Proposed District Boundaries
- District 1
- District 2
- District 3
- District 4
- District 5

Area of Boundary Change
- District 1
- District 2
- District 3
- District 4
- District 5
- Current District Boundary
- City Limit

NOTE: These are draft maps and are subject to minor changes prior to final map adoption.
Net Changes

[Graph showing net changes in acreage and population across different regions labeled A, C2, B2/P1-C Hybrid, and E.]
Proposed District Boundaries

- **District 1**
- **District 2**
- **District 3**
- **District 4**
- **District 5**

**Current District Boundary**

*NOTE: These are draft maps and are subject to minor changes prior to final map adoption.*
1. Which alternative best represent communities of interest, neighborhoods, census designated places, and city integrity?

2. What are the notable features that drive the alternative you choose (e.g., community of interest, limits division of incorporated city, specific issue raised in public comment, etc.)?
Recommendation

Staff recommends the Board of Supervisors:

1. Tentatively approve a map alternative defining the new County supervisorial district boundaries pursuant to the requirements set forth in Elections Code section 21500, subdivision (c).

2. Introduce and waive oral reading of an ordinance amending Placer County Code Chapter 1, Article 1.08 to adopt new County supervisorial district boundaries, with insertion of the tentatively approved map as Figure 1.08 in the ordinance.