BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AGENDA LETTER

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:

Department Name:	Board of Supervisors
Department No.:	011
For Agenda Of:	August 2, 2011
Placement:	Departmental
Estimated Tme:	30 minutes
Continued Item:	No
If Yes, date from:	
Vote Required:	Majority

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Board Member Salud Carbajal, First District Supervisor (568-2186) S.C. for S.C.
Contact Info: Jeremy Tittle, Executive Staff Assistant (568-2182)

SUBJECT: **Additional Redistricting Map for Consideration**

County Counsel Concurrence
As to form: N/A

Auditor-Controller Concurrence
As to form: N/A

Other Concurrence:
As to form: N/A

Recommended Actions:

That the Board consider the attached proposed redistricting map as a potential alternative as we continue the public process concerning redistricting.

Summary Text:

I continue to support the proposed "2011 Revised Plan for Adoption" which complies with the applicable legal requirements while building on existing lines to maximize public participation in the electoral process. However, additionally I am proposing the attached alternative map for consideration in an effort to also address community of interest issues that were raised by my colleagues and the public during our July 12th hearing. I am filing this as a separate board agenda item because I have been advised by counsel that this is the recommended approach for sharing this concept with my colleagues and the public prior to the continuation of our discussion on redistricting at our August 2nd meeting.

In summary, this proposed map would account for the changes in County population over the past ten years by making the following adjustments to the exiting district lines – moving the Santa Barbara Waterfront (from East Beach to Stearns Wharf) and San Roque neighborhoods from the 2nd to 1st District, moving the Cuyama community from the 5th to 1st District, moving the Santa Barbara Airport and portions of the City of Goleta north of Highway 101 from the 3rd to 2nd District, moving the Mission Hills community, the Tanglewood tract, and the City of Guadalupe from the 4th to the 3rd District, and moving the southern portion of the City of Santa Maria from the 5th to 4th District.

Background:

This map proposes a nearly equal population distribution between all five districts. It has an average .33% population deviation between the districts and .98% maximum percentage population deviation between districts. This proposed map is also in compliance with the Voting Rights Act and the voting age Hispanic population in the 5th District would increase from 63.90% to 68.60%. Additionally this map addresses the permissive criteria of topography and geography and cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory.

Notably, this proposed map would maintain the existing district lines between the 3rd and 4th Districts in and around the City of Lompoc and would allow for the entire portion of the City that is currently in the 4th District to stay in that district. I believe this map addresses the concern raised by Supervisors Gray and Lavagnino, Mayor Linn, and other members of the Lompoc City Council that Lompoc not be divided as it is proposed to be in the "Revised Plan for Adoption."

In addition to maintaining the current City of Lompoc community of interest in one district, the following cities and communities of interest are also proposed to be in a single district – Carpinteria, Summerland, Montecito, Mission Canyon, Cuyama, the unincorporated Goleta Valley, Isla Vista, Gaviota, the Santa Ynez Valley (including the cities of Buellton and Solvang), Mission Hills, Vandenberg Village, Vandenberg Air Force Base, Guadalupe, and Orcutt. It would only divide the cities of Santa Barbara, Goleta, and Santa Maria between two districts. Each of these cities have either been historically divided and/or need to be divided because of the size of their population.

As is the case in the "2011 Revised Plan for Adoption" this proposed map minimizes disruption to the existing system of representation and voting cycles of County residents. Only 8,121 voters would be forced to wait 6 years between supervisorial elections, which is a significantly lower number than in many of the proposed maps. The number of residents moved between districts is also minimized.

Performance Measure:

N/A

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

Budgeted: N/A

Fiscal Analysis:

Funding Sources	Current FY Cost:	Annualized On-going Cost:	Total One-Time Project Cost
General Fund			
State			
Federal			
Fees			
Other:			
Total	$ -	$ -	$ -

Narrative:

Staffing Impacts: N/A

Legal Positions: **FTEs:**

Special Instructions:

N/A

Attachments:

Draft Map and Supporting Analysis

Authored by:

Jeremy Tittle

cc: