

## **Redistricting Map Overview**

We have a total of nine maps, five alternatives and four additional information maps. We prepared them keeping in mind the guidelines laid out by the Board of Supervisors in their March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. We tried to maintain geographic, community and special district boundaries while keeping equal populations for each district as required. Please note that the alternatives we have are along census blocks and not down to the parcel level. Census blocks can and do split actual property parcels. So the lines on these map alternatives do not always fit actual parcel lines at this point.

## **Map Summaries**

### **Current Supervisorial District Boundaries**

The map shows the current boundaries and populations of each district as determined by the 2010 census. We have 2 districts that are too large and 3 districts that are too small "population" wise.

Here are the numbers:

Each District should have 36,212 residents.

Dist 1 - Has 38,670 needs to shrink by 2,458

Dist 2 - Has 44,434 needs to shrink by 8,222

Dist 3 - Has 32,010 needs to grow by 4,202

Dist 4 - Has 35,198 needs to grow by 1,014

Dist 5 - Has 30,746 needs to grow by 5,466

### **County Density Map**

This map shows population density by persons per acre. The light brown being zero, going to darker brown being zero to one then purple, yellow and red each with an increasing density. This map is a back drop to help show how moving geographical lines can create changes in the population numbers. There are areas where moving a line a large distance does not make very much difference in population. Then there are areas where moving a line just a small distance can cause a large shift in population numbers.

### **Alternatives 1 and 2**

The current districts are used as a "Core" then the lines are adjusted for population and community. The most obvious change is how large "geographically" District 5 has to be to capture all the required population. This will cause Districts 2 and 3 to shrink dramatically.

# Surveyor's Summary

## Pg. 2 of 3

### **Alternative 1**

District 2 loses area and some population in the east with the expansion of Districts 5 toward the west and District 3 toward the east.

District 4 loses area and some population in the east with the expansion of Districts 5 toward the west, but picks it up in the west from District 1.

Districts 1 and 3 become more compact with District 3 growing to the east to pick up additional population from District 2.

### **Alternative 2**

District 2 loses area and some population in the east with the expansion of Districts 5 toward the west and District 3 toward the south.

District 4 loses area and some population in the east with the expansion of Districts 5 toward the west, but picks it up in the west from District 1.

Districts 1 and 3 become more compact with District 3 growing to the south to pick up additional population from District 2.

### **Alternative 3**

This map is a radical departure from the North / South and the Urban / Rural districts we have today. The number and color of the districts are for consistency with the legend on the other maps but the similarity stops there. The districts could be called any number or even described by the color since it is so different from any current boundaries. This alternative does meet the population requirements but it definitely creates districts that will represent both the Urban and Rural areas along with the North and South areas of the county. It does split West Placerville from East Placerville but keeps South Lake Tahoe whole.

### **Alternatives 4 and 5**

The districts follow the current basic North / South divisions with Highway 50 being the geographic dividing line between them. These alternatives are a little retro, taking us back to the districts of the 90's. Again, we use numbers and colors for consistency with the legend on the other maps but they have only a resemblance to the current lines.

### **Alternative 4**

The City of Placerville falls within the northeast district and the City of South Lake Tahoe falls in the southeast district. The remainder of the county maintains the North / South division.

### **Alternative 5**

The City of Placerville falls within the southwest district and the City of South Lake Tahoe falls in the northeast district. Again, the remainder of the county maintains the North / South division.

## **Surveyor's Summary**

### **Pg. 3 of 3**

#### **Illustrative 1 and 2**

These two maps show the large variation from the “equal populations” requirements when trying to maintain an El Dorado Hills or a Tahoe Basin defined district.

#### **Illustrative 1**

The El Dorado Hills Community Service District is used as the template for District 1. In this scenario, the population of District 1 pushes past the 36,212 equal population target by nearly 7% or 2,430. For this illustration, the rest of the population is divided equally between the remaining districts with the “Core” alignment used in Alternatives 1 and 2 as the basis to layout the other districts.

#### **Illustrative 2**

The Tahoe Basin Ridge Line is used as the template for District 5. The population falls under the 36,212 equal population target by nearly 15% or 5,484. For this illustration the rest of the population is divided equally between the remaining districts with the “Core” alignment used in Alternatives 1 and 2 as the basis to layout the other districts.