



November 4, 2021

TO: LOCSD Board of Directors
FROM: Ron Munds, General Manager
SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 2A- 11/04/2021 Special Board Meeting**
Provide Input into the County of San Luis Obispo's Redistricting Process

President
Christine M. Womack

Vice President
Matthew D. Fourcroy

Directors
Charles L. Cesena
Troy C. Gatchell
Marshall E. Ochylski

General Manager
Ron Munds

District Accountant
Robert Stilts, CPA

Unit Chief
Eddy Moore

Battalion Chief
Paul Provence

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 6064
Los Osos, CA 93412

Offices:
2122 9th Street, Suite 110
Los Osos, CA 93402

Phone: 805/528-9370
FAX: 805/528-9377

www.losososcsl.org

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Motion:

I move that the Board:

- 1. Provide Direction to staff regarding the County of San Luis Obispo's redistricting process as it effects the District; and***
- 2. Direct staff to prepare and submit a letter signed by the Board President to County of San Luis Obispo's Board of Supervisors summarizing the direction provided by the Board of Directors.***

DISCUSSION

Background

Every ten years, San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors supervisorial districts must be evaluated and potentially redrawn so that each district meets the requirements of the California Voting Rights Act. This process is called redistricting. Redistricting is done using US census data, which is usually released around March 31st of the year after the Census is conducted, but was delayed until September of 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The 2020 census data indicates that the population increased by a little less than 10,000 since 2010. For the County of San Luis Obispo, the redistricting procedures must be completed by December 15, 2021.

The schedule for completing the redistricting process is as follows:

Redistricting Hearing #3 – Draft Maps Hearing	11/19/21
Redistricting Hearing #4 – Final Map & Redistricting	11/30/21
Regular Board Meeting – Introduction of Ordinance	12/7/21
Redistricting Hearing #5 – Adoption of Ordinance	12/14/21

As you can see, the process is wrapping up quickly, therefore, if the Board desires to comment on the proposed maps or the redistricting process in general, comments should be submitted for consideration to the Board of Supervisors prior to Redistricting Hearing #3 on November 19th.

Redistricting Considerations

Under the California Elections Code (Chapter 6 Section 21500), new supervisorial districts must be redrawn using the following criteria, in order of priority:

- 1. To the extent practicable, districts must be geographically contiguous**
- 2. To the extent practicable, districts must maintain the geographic integrity of neighborhoods and communities of interest**
- 3. To the extent practicable, districts must minimize division of cities or census designated places**

- 4. Boundaries must be easily identifiable and understandable to the public and, if possible, bound by natural/artificial barriers
- 5. To the extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria, supervisorial districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness in a manner that nearby areas of population are not bypassed in favor of more distant populations.

At the October 26, 2021 Redistricting Hearing #2, draft maps and publicly submitted maps were presented for review. The County’s consultant prepared four map scenarios; the following is a brief summary of those maps.

Plan A. Keeps the current boundaries pretty much intact since the population change in the County since 2010 has not been significant.

Plan B. Puts all of Cal Poly into District 2, instead of the two districts which is the current situation.

Plan C. Removes both Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo from District 5, which is otherwise above the Cuesta Grade in North County but that plan also moves Cambria and San Simeon from District 2 to District 1.

Plan D. Tries to align the supervisorial boundaries with school district lines.

Some of the publicly submitted maps propose significant changes and are available, along with the four maps previously discussed, for review on the County’s redistricting website:

slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Clerk-Recorder/All-Services/Elections-and-Voting/Redistricting-Information.aspx

Staff Analysis

Staff’s review of the mapping scenarios was limited to the four plans presented by the County’s redistricting consultant since these maps would comply with the requirements of the California Voting Rights Act. The following tables show the change in population in each supervisorial district and the County’s total population deviation which is at 9.3%, which is within the required deviation range of the California Voting Rights Act. The decrease in population in District 2 is attributed to the change in the law that allocates a prison population, in this case CMC’s, to an inmate’s area of origin.

District	2020	2010	Change	
1	57,982	53,814	4,168	7.7%
2	52,753	57,733	-4,980	-8.6%
3	54,826	52,660	2,166	4.1%
4	57,646	52,797	4,849	9.2%
5	56,000	52,571	3,429	6.5%
Total	279,207	269,576	9,631	3.6%

District	Population	Deviation	
1	57,982	2,141	3.8%
2	52,753	-3,088	-5.5%
3	54,826	-1,015	-1.8%
4	57,646	1,805	3.2%
5	56,000	159	0.3%
Total Deviation			9.3%

- Keeping in mind the criteria and priorities which must be considered in establishing district boundaries, it is staff's opinion that Plan B best meets the community's requisites for representation on the Board of Supervisors. This is primarily based on criteria/priority number 2 which states "to the extent practicable, districts must maintain the geographic integrity of neighborhoods and communities of interest".
- Plan A would be the second choice since not much has changed in terms of population in the last ten years and would meet the criteria/priority requisites previously discussed.
- Plan C would move a large portion of the North Coast to District 1 and move the City of San Luis Obispo completely out of District 5, a change more sweeping than the data supports. The North Coast has been part of District 2 for the past 50 years and Los Osos and the other northern coastal communities share many of the same interest and concerns which should be a priority in keeping this region in the same district, therefore not recommended.
- Though Plan D meets criteria of the California Voting Rights Act, the resulting district boundary lines appear to divide communities of interest therefore not recommended.

In summary, staff recommends that the Board support Plan B since it realigns the Cal Poly campus in a way that makes geographic sense and keeps the Cal Poly campus housing in one supervisorial district. Plus, it makes other minor changes needed to equalize the population between districts. Of important note, this recommendation is consistent with the League of Women Voters position for the redistricting of District 2.

Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with the recommended action.