AGENDA SUBMITTAL TO SOLANO COUNTY SUPERVISORS

ITEM TITLE		**BOARD MEETING DATE**	**AGENDA NUMBER**
Public hearing to consider Supervisorial Redistricting Alternatives; and Provide direction on a preferred redistricting alternative		June 21, 2011	**6**
Dept: **Contact:** **Phone:**	County Administrator Birgitta Corsello (707) 784-6100	**Supervisorial District Number** All	
	Published Notice Required	**Yes**	**No X**
	Public Hearing Required?	**Yes X**	**No**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Conduct a public hearing on the proposed alternative redistricting plans and accept public testimony;
2. Provide direction on a preferred redistricting plan and direct staff to prepare a Preferred Alternative map for review at a public hearing scheduled for June 28, 2011.

SUMMARY

On June 7, 2011 and continued to the June 14th regular board meeting, the Board conducted a study session to review three alternative supervisorial redistricting scenarios that had been prepared by staff and were available for public review at four public workshops held in Fairfield, Vallejo, Dixon and Vacaville. Information on the three proposed alternatives was also available on the county's website. Direction was provided to staff to prepare additional redistricting scenarios for Board review at the Board meeting scheduled for June 21. The Board is asked to conduct the public hearing on the alternatives that have been reviewed, accept public testimony and decide on a preferred redistricting plan that will be the subject of a public hearing on June 28 as the Board's Preferred Supervisorial Redistricting Alternative. Barring any additional significant changes to the Preferred Alternative a public hearing will be scheduled for July 26, 2011 to approve the 2011 Supervisorial Redistricting Plan and to introduce the Redistricting Ordinance. Per the revised process and timeline adopted by the Board on June 14, 2011 the adoption of the Ordinance is scheduled to occur on August 9, 2011 (Attachment A).

FINANCING

The County Administrator has included funding for consultant services in the FY2010/11 Budget to assist in the County's efforts to develop a redistricting plan that meets the requirements of law and addresses Board and Community concerns. A contract has been executed with Environmental

Stewardship & Planning, Inc. for consultant services for $49,000, of which an initial allocation of $30,000 has been appropriated for redistricting services. Some incidental costs that may be experienced in performing public outreach will be expected to be absorbed within existing budgeted resources.

DISCUSSION

On January 25, 2011 the Board established the initial process and timeline for undertaking the 2011 Supervisorial Redistricting in response to the 2010 Decennial Census. After the census data was released further direction was given to staff at the Board's April 12, 2011 meeting to prepare alternative scenarios, each of which attain as close as is practicable the ideal district population of 82,669. Alternative's A, B, and C as potential redistricting scenarios were created to attain the population objective pursuant to the January 25 approved process (Attachment B). Staff conducted four public workshops to receive public input on the alternative scenarios. Public comments received at the workshops and via email through June 15th were compiled and made available to the Board (Attachment C). On June 7, 2011 and continued to the June 14th regular board meeting, the Board conducted a study session to review the three alternatives and provide further direction before staff proceeds to the next phase of the process.

On June 14th the Board's direction was to create two additional redistricting scenario(s) which have been developed by staff and are presented herewith as Alternative "D" and "E".

Federal and state law requires counties to undergo an adjustment to their Supervisorial District boundaries to reflect the outcome of the Census, conducted every ten years. The 2000 Census counted a total of 394,542 residents in Solano County and resulted in a desired number of residents in each district of 78,908, or 394,542 divided by 5. The 2010 Census reports a total of **413,344** persons living in Solano County as of April 1, 2010. Using the same criteria to determine the desirable mean population for each district, (i.e., divide the total population by the number of supervisorial districts) a desirable mean population of **82,669** results.

Supervisorial District Analysis and Discussion on Alternative Scenarios D and E

New Alternative(s) "D" and "E" have been prepared. Each of these alternatives reflects a distribution of the population among the supervisorial districts with the Overall Range increasing to 1.81% for Alternative Scenario "D" and 2.94% for Alternative Scenario "E" (compared to 0.37%, o.74% and 0.96% for Scenarios A, B and C respectively). At the Board's June 7th study session, general board discussion included the goal of achieving five districts with near equal population versus developing a plan that addresses a majority of the board member concerns but which may provide for a higher Overall Range than was reflected in Alternatives A, B and C. Staff understood the Board to suggest a slight increase in the Overall Range would be acceptable.

Alternative D

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "D" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	83,484	4,000	82,669	815	0.99%
District 2	81,598	82,960	1,362	82,669	230	0.28%
District 3	86,870	82,844	-4,026	82,669	236	0.29%
District 4	79,461	81,992	2,531	82,669	-677	-0.82%
District 5	85,931	82,064	-3,867	82,669	-605	-0.73%
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative "D" Results:

- Ideal Population: 82,669.
- Deviation: Lowest Population = -677 or -0.82%

  Highest Population = 815 or 0.99%
- Overall Range: 1.81%

Alternative "D" incorporates Board member input given at the end of the June 7 and 14, 2011 study session on redistricting to perform the following boundary adjustments:

- Between District 1 and District 2 the area bounded by Georgia Street on the south and Tennessee Street on the north currently in District 2 moves to District 1.
- Between District 2 and District 3 District 2 boundaries north of I-80 remain unchanged; instead the boundary moves east from I-680 through the Suisun Marsh to the common boundary with District 5 and north-east along the southern boundary of I-80 from Cordelia to Pennsylvania Avenue in Fairfield using Texas Street as the north boundary line.
- Between District 4 and District 5 the current boundary line shifts from Midway Road west to Midway road east to the county line. The City of Dixon and the area north-west of I-80 north of Midway all goes into District 4. District 5 picks up additional District 4 population near Travis Air Force Base east of Peabody and additional area within the City of Vacaville west of Peabody to Davis Street and south to include the correctional facilities.

- District 3 and District 5 exchange population within Travis Air Force Base (on-base housing) where the area and population moves from District 3 to District 5; and in Suisun City whereby area and population moves from District 5 to District 3.

Alternative E

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "E" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	83,484	4,000	82,669	815	0.99%
District 2	81,598	83,401	1,803	82,669	732	0.89%
District 3	86,870	81,067	-5,803	82,669	-1,602	-1.95%
District 4	79,461	82,778	3,317	82,669	119	0.13%
District 5	85,931	82,604	-3,327	82,669	-65	-0.08
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative "E" Results:

- Ideal Population: 82,669.
- Deviation: Lowest Population = -1,602 or -1.95%

  Highest Population = 815 or 0.99%
- Overall Range: 2.93%

Alternative "E" incorporates Board member input given at the end of the June 7 and 14, 2011 study session on redistricting to perform the following boundary adjustments:

- Between District 1 and District 2 the area bounded by Georgia Street on the south and Tennessee Street on the north currently in District 2 moves to District 1 (same as Alternative D).
- Between District 2 and District 3 District 2 boundaries north of I-80 continues along Green Valley Road and then goes east along Rockville Road to Suisun Valley Road and then north to the county line; in addition the boundary moves east from I-680 through the Suisun Marsh to the common boundary with District 5 and north-east along the southern boundary of I-80 from Cordelia to Pennsylvania Avenue in Fairfield using Texas Street as the north boundary line.
- Between District 4 and District 5 the current boundary line shifts from Midway Road west to Midway road east to the county line. The City of Dixon and the area north-west of I-80 north of Midway all goes into District 4. District 5 picks up additional District 4 population near

Travis Air Force Base east of Peabody and additional area within the City of Fairfield north of Airbase Parkway. District 5 gives up additional area and population to District 4 in the area south of I-80 west of Nut Tree Road to Marshall Road west to the current boundary line at Peabody Road.

- District 3 and District 5 exchange population in Suisun City whereby area and population moves from District 5 to District 3 in the Prosperity Lane, Pintail Dr., McCoy Creek area.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

Your Board may choose not to decide on preferred redistricting plan at this time and wait until a subsequent meeting to take the recommended action; however, the Board's approved public process anticipates a set of targeted actions and dates with a Redistricting Ordinance adoption no later than August 9, 2011. With fewer scheduling opportunities where all five Board members will be present it is desirable to receive direction on development of a preferred redistricting plan at this time in order to keep the public process moving forward.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The County Administrator's Office has been assisted in this effort by County Counsel, Department of Information Technology, Registrar of Voters, Resource Management and the Consultant.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:

Birgitta E. Corsello
County Administrator

Attachment A: 2011 Redistricting Process and Timeline
Attachment B: Supervisorial District Analysis and Discussion Scenarios A, B, and C
Attachment C: Redistricting Public Comments

Approved Process and Timeline (Amended on June 14, 2011)

The following timeline sets forth those activities that are required under the Elections Code and those that are optional but may assist in the development of alternatives. The targeted completion date of this process is no later than the end of September 2011 in order to meet the practical deadlines imposed by the November 2011 election and the yet to be determined 2012 Presidential Primary.

Date	Required	Optional	Activity
January 25, 2011		X	Board receives overview of redistricting process via this memorandum and presentation, adopts recommended procedure, appoints Ad Hoc Advisory Committee and Technical Group
April 1, 2011	X		Census data is released and made available to County
April		X	Census data and maps loaded onto County GIS system; using mapping program with a redistricting module Tech Group identifies which Census Blocks are in which Supervisorial District and accordingly, the current population and the respective characteristics within each District. The desired Mean population per district will be determined and the resultant Deviation from that Mean will be identified, i.e., the number that will need to be either increased or reduced for each district to achieve relative parity.
April 12		X	Briefing to full Board identifying results of Census, including appropriate adjustments, and the status of each district vis-a-vis the Mean. Provide direction regarding Town Hall meetings.
Week of May 23		X	Develop 3-5 scenarios depending on Census data and conduct "Town Hall" meetings in Fairfield, Dixon, and Vallejo – to receive community feedback on alternatives.
June 7		X	Full BOS conducts Study Session on three Redistricting Alternatives and directs staff regarding any changes to further refine preferred choice to be brought back on June 22, 2011
June 13		X	Conduct "Town Hall" meeting in Vacaville – to receive community feedback on the three alternatives presented at previous town hall meetings.
June 14		X	Full BOS continues Study Session on three Redistricting Alternatives and directs staff regarding any changes to further refine preferred choice to be brought back on June 21, 2011
June 21		X	Full BOS conducts Public Hearing on Redistricting Alternatives; BOS to determine a Preferred Alternative to be brought back for first public hearing on Preferred Alternative.
Recommended June 28	X		BOS conducts first public hearing on preferred alternative and directs staff to schedule final hearing on the selected redistricting map for July 26, 2011. Board also directs staff to bring back an ordinance for introduction on July 26, 2011
Recommended July 26	X		BOS conducts final public hearing on selected redistricting map and introduces ordinance setting boundaries for supervisorial districts.
Recommended August 9	X		BOS adopts ordinance.

Attachment A

Supervisorial District Analysis and Discussion Scenarios A, B, and C

Using the Maptitude GIS mapping program with a redistricting module, staff has identified which of Solano County's over 10,000 Census Blocks are in which Supervisorial District. Based upon the mapping work performed, staff has determined the populations for each district to be as shown in the Table 1 below:

Table 1

Supervisorial District	2001 Pop After Redistricting	2010 Population	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	78,535	79,484	82,669	-3,185	-3.85%
District 2	78,875	81,598	82,669	-1,071	-1.30%
District 3	78,845	86,870	82,669	4,201	5.08%
District 4	79,026	79,461	82,669	-3,208	-3.88%
District 5	79,261	85,931	82,669	3,262	3.95%
Total	394,542	413,344		0	0

Alternatives A, B and C that were reviewed by the Board on June 7th each meet the numeric goal of having each district having a population close to the ideal mean of 82,669. The specific population for each district under each redistricting alternative is reflected in Tables 1 through 3 below.

Alternative A

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "A" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	82,849	3,365	82,669	180	0.22%
District 2	81,598	82,557	959	82,669	-112	-0.14%
District 3	86,870	82,546	-4,324	82,669	-123	-0.15%
District 4	79,461	82,768	3,307	82,669	99	0.12%
District 5	85,931	82,624	-3,307	82,669	-45	-0.05%
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative "A" Results:

- Ideal Population: 82,669.
- Deviation: Lowest Population = -123 or -0.15%

  Highest Population = 180 or 0.22%
- Overall Range: 0.37%

Attachment B

Alternative B

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "B" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	82,667	3,183	82,669	-2	-0.0%
District 2	81,598	82,739	1,141	82,669	70	0.08%
District 3	86,870	82,546	-4,324	82,669	-123	-0.15%
District 4	79,461	82,391	2,930	82,669	-278	-0.34%
District 5	85,931	83,001	-2,930	82,669	332	0.4%
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative "B" Results:

- Ideal Population: 82,669.
- Deviation: Lowest Population = -278 or -0.34%

  Highest Population = 332 or 0.4%
- Overall Range: 0.74%

Alternative C

Supervisorial District	2010 Population	Alternative "C" Population	Net Population Gain/Loss	Mean	Deviation	% Deviation
District 1	79,484	82,730	3,246	82,669	61	0.07%
District 2	81,598	82,676	1,078	82,669	7	0.01%
District 3	86,870	83,154	-3,716	82,669	485	0.59%
District 4	79,461	82,421	2,980	82,669	-248	-0.3%
District 5	85,931	82,363	-3,568	82,669	-306	-0.37%
Total	413,344	413,344			0	0

Alternative "C" Results:

- Ideal Population: 82,669.
- Deviation: Lowest Population = -306 or -0.37%

  Highest Population = 485 or 0.59%
- Overall Range: 0.96%

Redistricting Public Comments

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C
May 24, 2011	6	2	4
May 25, 2011	2	2	2
May 26, 2011	No Comments Received that Night		
June 13, 2011	7	8	6

Alternative A Comments

May 24, 2011

This scenario splits the middle Green Valley Specific Plan Area; this seems ill advised. Much work has been done in the past several years to merge Green Valley into a single, consolidated community. It should exist in a single district, in its entirety. Nancy Nelson

Unfortunately, the district plan under Scenario A breaks up an established community of interest shared by the residents of Green Valley. It also bisects the middle Green Valley Specific Plan, with 400 residents, the product of over 2 years of work by our community residents. Bill Mayben

1. There are more government workers and elected people than citizens at this meeting. Not good! 2. Many more supervisors are needed to truly represent the public. One supervisor does not need and cannot represent 82,000 people. Furthermore, when a supervisor raises over $200K to run for office, special interest is almost guaranteed to run the show. 3. I think the alternatives presented are going to be more of the same of the present broken system. George Guynn, Jr.

I object to Scenario A. This cuts Fairfield into five districts, whereas the other cities have only two or one Supervisor. Also, the reason cited is to give Dist 1 more unincorporated area, but this does so by adding significant land from Fairfield. Scenario A also seems inferior to Scenarios B and C insofar as it maintains District Two's reach from the Napa lien all the way down to Mare Island. Jack Batson

General Comment: If +/- 5% is allowed, legally there is no need to change the lines. Is that an option? Given there is more leeway than <1%, then there should be strong effort to make lines "not odd." Maybe 2-3% variation would allow much better lines. It would be good to look at other options at least. Rick Wood

The lines for District 4 & 5 are ideal in this scenario, as are the lines for District 3. I would not select this scenario's realignment for District 1 & 2, as District 1 should grow south into more of Vallejo, not north

into Green Valley. I prefer a modified Scenario B here. Exception: consider moving Fairfield population along Peabody from Dist 5 to District 4. No name

May 25, 2011

Only comment I have is the area give to Sup # 4, north of I-80 needs to remain in Sup # 5. And if Suisun can be moved into Sup 3 it would make more sense. No name

Don't split Green Valley! Combine Suisun City. Move 5th District west to I-505 and possibly Allendale to 1st ridge line. No name

June 13, 2011

I don't like the way Districts 1 & 2 are split. Make a change to Vallejo District – *Anon*

District 2 area north of Hwy 80 should be moved to District 1 – District 1 needs more rural area – *Anon*

Move Dixon into District 4 and keep south Vacaville together – *Peggy Rollins*

This scenario splits Green Valley and takes Mare Island out of District 1. Mare Island has had a strong identity to District 1 – *Michelle Coleman*

Include area north of I-80 into District one. District one needs more rural – *Manuel Lopes*

District 1 should include some non-incorporated area of the county – *Gary Falati*

Dixon [should be] in 4th; FF out of 4th and [put] in 5th; [keep] Suisun in 3rd – *Anon*

Online Comments

The Green Valley Landowner's Association does not support the proposed redistricting "Scenario 'A' for several reasons:

- This Scenario seriously, unnecessarily, and arbitrarily divides and interrupts "an identifiable community of interest" by proposing to impose Supervisorial District #1 onto Middle Green Valley, violating a redistricting goal.
- This scenario fails to take into account the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan completed by residents of Middle Green Valley, and the Green Valley Landowners Association, under the sponsorship of the Board of Supervisors, over the past two years, working with Hart-Howerton Architects and Planners to create a master plan for the 2000 acre study area. Not only did the Specific Plan identify the focus of a new community of 400 homes; the process emphasized the fact that all of Green Valley represents a fabric of identifiable community interest which cannot purposefully be divided. Scenario "A" described this area simply as "agricultural".
- The integrity of the Specific Plan requires the participation of the surrounding community of interest, in order to succeed.
- Scenario A fails to minimize the scope of boundary changes to two established Districts, violating a redistricting goal.
- We believe that the concept of each supervisorial district containing an equal share of unincorporated county area imposes artificial constraints on the districting exercise regarding the overarching need to maintain coherent representational districts, and should be a secondary consideration.

- Scenario A requires major adjustments to voter precincts.
- Scenario A makes the effort of Green Valley community planning and coordination more than twice as difficult, and represents a purposeful interruption of our community-based political process.
- We feel it appropriate to pull areas of District #2 back from Vallejo, allowing District #1 to gain voters, as expressed variably in Scenario "B" and "C".

Very Truly Yours,
Bill Mayben
President, GVLA

EXCELLENT, Bill, I'm glad you submitted this! Scenario A inexplicably divides the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan between two districts. Clearly the consultant drawing the maps had no knowledge of the Plan's existence.

Nancy Nelson

Alternative B Comments

May 24, 2011

General comment – is it good to split Suisun Valley? On one hand, good to have two Supes representing Valley. On the other one Supe might be able to give more attention. I guess I prefer 2 Super, but that's assuming they both care about SV, not neither. Rick Wood

District 1 & 2 are most ideal in this scenario, although the Sand Beach area should not be isolated into Dist 1. Keep District 3 as you have it. There appears to be no logic in a different 4/5 boundary in Vacaville in this scenario than for Scenario A. Use Scenario A instead. The line along I-80 makes sense. Anna M. Imous (No name)

May 25, 2011

Move western 5th boundary at least to I-505 so Dixon Fire, School, & Library District are united. Put Suisun City all in 3rd. Anna N. Imus (No name)

Possibly the best. Least interruption to the existing districts. No name

June 13, 2011

Although I do not appreciate the fact that I am not able to access Alternative Scenarios D & E with regards to advance impact to the Dixon Hispanic population I am inclined to favor Alternative Scenario B for the following reasons:

1. It will have minimum impact on Hispanic population with regards to District 5
2. Also it keeps Mare Island together

3. I am very concerned that both libraries (VPL) are in the same district.
4. The Board of Supervisors need to allocate more funds to reach out to Vacaville and smaller communities as well as the Hispanic groups. – *Roberto V. Jr.*

Of the Maps A, B and C I prefer #B. I would hope that large size maps D & E be posted in Vacaville and the other cities and if possible hold additional hearings – they were very helpful. Thanks – *[cannot decipher name]*

Suisun pocket is part of Fairfield. Should move small pocket of District #4 north of TAFB into District 5 – *Peggy Rollins*

This scenario keeps the community of interest in Green Valley whole. This scenario is the best of the three A, B & C - *Michelle Coleman*

Dixon in 4th; FF out of 4th, in 5th; Suisun Valley in 3rd – *Anon*

District 2 north of Hwy 80 should be moved to District 1. District 1 needs more rural and less urban – *Anon*

Please try to connect the cities together near the center of the map – there are 3 districts that appear to included Lawler Ranch (5th District), Travis AFB (District 3) and TAFB Housing and all three of these areas are within a 4 mile radius. To me that's more political than people-effective. Thanks – *R. Chousis [sp of last name?]*

District one should include area north of 80; more rural less urban – *Manuel Lopes*

Online Comments

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provde input on the issue of redistricting of Vallejo, these potential changes are crucial to Vallejo's future.

I start out by asking you to support Alternative B.

The goal of this process is to make the districts as equal and compact as possible. District 1 is the County's poorest district. By changing the district boundaries as indicated in Alternative A, and especially C, would further concentrate the poverty in District 1. As a Vallejo resident I can say that this would hurt many communites of interest in our city. We need a diversity of people in our County districts, reflecting the wide scope of our socio-economic and racial make-up.

Thank you
Wendell Quigley Mare Island Ca

Dear Supervisors, I attended your May 26, 2010 Redistricting community meeting. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input as these potential changes are critical to Vallejo's future.

I will start out by asking you to **support Alternative B**.

The goal of this process is to make the districts as equal and compact as possible. District 1 is the County's poorest district. By changing the district boundaries as indicated in Alternatives A, and especially C, you would be further concentrating the poverty into District 1. Living in and representing Vallejo residents, I can say that this would hurt many communities of interest in our city. We need a diversity of people in our County districts, reflecting the wide breadth of our socio-economic and racial make-up.

While not perfect**, Alternative B is the best of the three alternatives**, and provides for a more balanced socio-economic District that would be more fair and best serve the many communities of interest in Vallejo. It would also ensure that a broad swath of Vallejo would be represented by somebody who lives in and best knows Vallejo -- which is important to those of us who live here.

Alternative A: this alternative makes no sense and cuts Vallejo up too much -- it maintained Hiddenbrooke in D-1, but moved D-1 into lower Green Valley; it would also keep Mare Island in D-2

Alternative B: this is the best of the three alternatives; it would maintain Hiddenbrooke in D-1 and put Sandy Beach and Mare Island into D-1 (currently D-2)

Alternative C: this alternative is the absolute worst of the three, and provides no fair representation whatsoever to the communities of interest in Vallejo

Thank you for your consideration.
/s/ Stephanie Gomes

Dear Supervisors: I have reviewed the alternatives from your May 26, 2010 Redistricting community meeting. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input as these potential changes are critical to Vallejo's future.

I **support Alternative B**.

The goal of this process is to make the districts as equal and compact as possible. District 1 is the County's poorest district. By changing the district boundaries as indicated in Alternatives A, and especially C, you would be further concentrating the poverty into District 1. Living in and representing Vallejo residents, I can say that this would hurt many communities of interest in our city. We need a diversity of people in our County districts, reflecting the wide breadth of our socio-economic and racial make-up.

While not perfect**, Alternative B is the best of the three alternatives**, and provides for a more balanced socio-economic District that would be more fair and best serve the many communities of interest in Vallejo. It would also ensure that a broad swath of Vallejo would be represented by somebody who lives in and best knows Vallejo -- which is important to those of us who live here.

Alternative A: this alternative makes no sense and cuts Vallejo up too much -- it maintained Hiddenbrooke in D-1, but moved D-1 into lower Green Valley; it would also keep Mare Island in D-2

Alternative B: this is the best of the three alternatives; it would maintain Hiddenbrooke in D-1 and put Sandy Beach and Mare Island into D-1 (currently D-2)
Alternative C: this alternative is the absolute worst of the three, and provides no fair representation whatsoever to the communities of interest in Vallejo
Thank you for your consideration.
Robert Boyce
133 Kentucky St
Vallejo, CA 94590

Dear Representatives:

The redistricting issues have been brought to my attention recently and I'm writing this letter as a voter and resident of Solano County. I feel the fairest and best option is OPTION B since this will provide the best possible outcome.

I feel strongly about this issue and the effect it may have on me and my neighbors. Please do what is right and in the best interests of all the voters of this county by placing your support on OPTION B.

Most sincerely,

Collette Sweeney
Teacher

Alternative C Comments

May 24, 2011

The Fairfield-Airbase Parkway inset to Alternative C is totally unacceptable. This is a community of military and military retired citizens who are closely connected to Travis AFB. We do much of our business in Suisun. Patronizing businesses, library and public functions in Suisun. Diana Ricketts (email address omitted)

The unification of Green Valley and the consistency of Vallejo is compelling. No name

Messy, pointless, and illogical. Dump this scenario. No name

Did you notice that Districts 1, 2 3 combined have almost exactly 3 x 82,669? And 4 & 5 almost exactly 2 x 82,669? What that means is you could leave the line between 1-3 and 4-5 alone. Not sure that's good, but interesting. Rick Wood

May 25, 2011

Appears too much moving of lines to accommodate current incumbents. No name

Suisun City should be in ONE district with Fairfield. District Five should move western Boundary at least to I-505 – include Allendale and Lake Solano & state Prison (in that order – as needed). Those rural areas are in the Dixon School District, Fire District, Library District, and have 4-H, FFA & other organizational/social common interests. Less of Vacaville should be in the Fifth – so it doesn't overwhelm OUR communities interest. Another alternative would be to have All of Suisun in the 5th – put more of FFld in the 3rd & move none of Vacaville in the 4th. Anonymous

June 13, 2011

Dixon in 4th; FF out of 4th, in 5th; Suisun Valley in 3rd - *Anon*

Move Suisun into District #3. We want public hearings on maps D & E – *Peggy Rollins*

This is the worst scenario for Fairfield and Suisun. There should be another scenario that takes Suisun completely out of District 5 and puts it into District 3 – *Michelle Coleman*

District 1 needs more rural and less urban. Area north of Hwy 80 should be moved to District 1 – *Anon*

More public hearings with additional alternatives. Alternatives D&E need to have input – *Anon*

Include area north of 80 into District one. Balance more rural and less urban – *Manuel Lopes*

Online Comments

As a Vacaville resident, I am very disappointed with the outreach you have done on this important subject. The website with its descriptions and maps is a poor job in itself and does not give those of us depending on the use of our computers to get information on the committee's work. You are unable to tell from the maps what is what or where cities even have their boundaries. There are no main streets to follow. The maps are useless and there is no way to compare them to the alternatives. Kathy Freeman

---

There's a rumor the board is thinking about splitting Dixon between two districts.

I can tell you that will NOT set well with anyone up here. In fact it would be resented.

My view is that Suisun City should be consolidated into one district, and that district 5 should extend to the hill crests west of Allendale. That whole area is in the Dixon School District, Library District, Fire District and I believe SID district. The kids are in the same FFA and 4-H clubs as Dixon kids.

That commonality of interest is important.

The Pleasants Valley rural area should stay in the 4th - because that area is more connected to Vacaville. Dave (via email)

Dear Chairman Reagan & Supervisors,

We reside at 770 Fallen Leaf Ct in the Green Valley Lakes Community and have talked with different neighbors throughout our community. The response has been over whelming that we wish to remain in supervisorial district 3, where we have been for the past decade. We identify with the City of Fairfield vs. the cities of Vallejo and Benicia.

Thank you for your consideration to remain in district 3 for the next decade.

Respectfully,

Gary & Tracie Falati

June 15, 2011

Chairman Mike Reagan &
Board of Supervisors
675 Texas Street, Suite 6500
Fairfield, CA 94533

Dear Chairman Reagan & Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of many grape growers and other farming families in Suisun Valley, we are requesting that Suisun Valley remain in district 3. We feel that the issues and concerns of our valley will be better served by the City of Fairfield (which is adjacent to Suisun Valley) than the cities of Benicia or Vallejo.

With the recent approval of the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan, Suisun Valley is entering a critical era that will determine the future of agriculture for our valley. We are very pleased with the work that Supervisor Spering has done for Suisun Valley and are confident that his predecessor from district 3 will also be committed to the plan that has been put in place. Thank you for your continued support of our agriculture community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ron Lanza
Vice President
Wooden Valley Winery

HEART OF SOLANO COUNTY
FAIRFIELD
CALIFORNIA

CITY OF FAIRFIELD Founded 1856 Incorporated December 12, 1903

Mayor Harry T. Price

COUNCIL

Mayor
Harry T. Price
707.428.7395

Vice-Mayor
Chuck Timm
707.429.6298

Councilmembers
707.429.6298

Catherine Moy

John Mraz

Rick Vaccaro

• • •

City Manager
Sean P. Quinn
707.428.7400

• • •

City Attorney
Gregory W. Stepanicich
707.428.7419

• • •

City Clerk
Arletta K. Cortright
707.428.7384

• • •

City Treasurer
Oscar G. Reyes, Jr.
707.428.7496

DEPARTMENTS

Community Development
707.428.7461

• • •

Community Resources
707.428.7465

• • •

Finance
707.428.7496

• • •

Fire
707.428.7375

• • •

Human Resources
707.428.7394

• • •

Police
707.428.7551

• • •

Public Works
707.428.7485

June 14, 2011

Mike Reagan, Chair
Solano County Board of Supervisors
675 Texas Street, Room 6500
Fairfield, CA 94533

Re: Potential Redistricting in Fairfield

Dear Supervisor Reagan:

I fully appreciate the challenges of preparing and approving a redistricting option. Fairfield, being in the center of Solano County, is currently split among three (3) supervisorial districts. While I appreciate the representation we receive, I would not want our community split any more among the districts. Therefore, I urge you to consider options that split Fairfield into no more than the current three (3) supervisorial districts. I recognize that the exact boundaries of each district will change, but I do not want the community to be divided among any more districts.

Thank you for considering my position on this issue.

Very truly yours,

Harry T. Price
Mayor

HTP/cma

c: Fairfield City Council
City Manager

Subj: **District 3**
Date: 6/15/2011 7:13:24 A.M. Pacific Standard Time
From: Falati@aol.com
To: mreagan@solanocounty.com

Dear Chairman Reagan & Supervisors,

We reside at 770 Fallen Leaf Ct in the Green Valley Lakes Community and have talked with different neighbors throughout our community. The response has been over whelming that we wish to remain in supervisorial district 3, where we have been for the past decade. We identify with the City of Fairfield vs. the cities of Vallejo and Benicia.

Thank you for your consideration to remain in district 3 for the next decade.

Respectfully,

Gary & Tracie Falati

784-6665

TO: SUPVR. SPERING

6/15/11

FROM: FALATI

REDISTRICTING ISSUE

JIM - RUN LANZA IS ALSO GOING TO E-MAIL A LETTER TO MIKE TODAY. AM GOING TO BE OUT OF THE COUNTRY ON THE 21ST. B.T WILL BE AT THE 28TH MEETING!

SAM

Board ✓