

REDISTRICTING – ALBEMARLE COUNTY – PROPOSED MAPS – 2022

For Albemarle County, the local decennial redistricting process for 2022 will require changes to the county magisterial district boundary lines, and changes to some of the county voting precinct boundary lines.

For the county magisterial districts, the legal requirements are to aim for equal total population in each of the 6 magisterial districts, but, as perfection is not possible, the permitted deviation from ideal district size (approximately 18,733 people, based on the 2020 census), is plus or minus 5%.

With the magisterial district lines as they are at present:

- both the Rio District and the White Hall District need to lose population in order to meet the acceptable $\pm 5\%$ deviation;
- both the Samuel Miller District and the Scottsville District need to gain population in order to meet the acceptable $\pm 5\%$ deviation; and
- both the Jack Jouett District and the Rivanna District can either lose some population or gain some population and still meet the acceptable $\pm 5\%$ deviation.

Working within these constraints, and aiming to relocate as few voters as possible to new magisterial districts and polling places, the redistricting staff has developed 3 alternative proposed redistricting maps – Option 1, Option 2, and Option 3. Each of the 3 Options moves the magisterial district lines so that all 6 of the magisterial districts will be within the acceptable $\pm 5\%$ deviation from ideal equal population.

Differences between the 3 Options:

Option 1:

- Moves some voters from Brownsville precinct (White Hall district) to Yellow Mountain (Samuel Miller district), to increase population of Samuel Miller district and decrease population of White Hall district;
- Moves some voters from Country Green precinct (Samuel Miller district) to Monticello precinct (Scottsville district) to even population and follow new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line;
- Moves some voters from Agnor Hurt precinct (Rio district) to Georgetown precinct (Jack Jouett district) to better align communities of interest;
- Moves some voters from Jack Jouett precinct (Jack Jouett district) to Ivy precinct (Samuel Miller district) in the Farmington area;
- Extends Free Bridge precinct (Rivanna district) north along the Rivanna River to conform to the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line;; this moves some voters from Pantops precinct (Rivanna district) into Free Bridge precinct (Rivanna district);
- Extends University precinct (Jack Jouett district) south to conform to the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line; this moves some voters from East Ivy precinct (Samuel Miller district) into University precinct (Jack Jouett precinct);
- Moves some voters in Stone-Robinson precinct (Scottsville district) into Mountain View precinct (Scottsville district) to conform to the the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line.

Pros: maintains most current voting precinct boundaries, except where necessary to achieve population parity among magisterial districts, or to prevent a voting precinct being split between two House of Delegates districts. Readjusts the precinct boundary line between the Agnor-Hurt precinct and the Georgetown precinct to be more consistent with communities of interest. In contrast to Option 2, no voters would be moved out of the Free Bridge Precinct in the Rivanna district into the Scottsville district.

Cons: some voters would see their voting precincts change, and for some the commute to their new polling place would be a bit longer than the commute to their present polling place, although staying within the 20 minute recommended commute under the redistricting guidelines.

Option 2:

- Moves some voters from the Free Bridge precinct (Rivanna district) into Mountain View precinct (Scottsville district), to increase population in Scottsville district;
- Moves some voters from Brownsville precinct (White Hall district) to Yellow Mountain precinct (Samuel Miller district), to increase population of Samuel Miller district and decrease population of White Hall district;
- Moves some voters from Mechums River precinct (White Hall district) to Yellow Mountain precinct (Samuel Miller district) to increase population in Samuel Miller district;
- Moves some voters from Mechums River precinct (White Hall district) to Brownsville precinct (White Hall district) to maintain contiguity;
- Moves some voters from Northside precinct (Rio district) on Rt. 29 N. to Baker-Butler precinct (Rivanna district), to reduce population of Rio district;
- Extends Free Bridge precinct (Rivanna district) north along the Rivanna River to conform to the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line;; this moves some voters from Pantops precinct (Rivanna district) into Free Bridge precinct (Rivanna district);
- Extends University precinct (Jack Jouett district) south to conform to the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line; this moves some voters from East Ivy precinct (Samuel Miller district) into University precinct (Jack Jouett district).
- Moves some voters in Stone-Robinson precinct (Scottsville district) into Mountain View precinct (Scottsville district) to conform to the the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line.
- Moves some voters in the Porters precinct (Samuel Miller District) to the Scottsville precinct (Scottsville district).

Pros: will affect the fewest number of voters of the 3 proposed Options. Maintains most current voting precinct boundaries, except where necessary to achieve population parity among magisterial districts, or to prevent a voting precinct being split between two House of Delegates districts.

Cons: moves a portion of the southern boundary line of the Free Bridge precinct from the Rivanna River and I-64 to to U.S. 250. Voters in the southern portion of what is

currently Free Bridge precinct would now vote at the Mountain View precinct at Mountain View Elementary School which will be a longer drive time.

Option 3:

- Moves some voters from Brownsville precinct (White Hall district) to Yellow Mountain (Samuel Miller district), to increase population of Samuel Miller district and decrease population of White Hall district;
- Moves some voters from Mechums River precinct (White Hall district) to new precinct -- “South Ivy” precinct -- in Samuel Miller district, with new precinct polling place to be determined, and splits remaining current Ivy precinct (Samuel Miller district) in half, and puts half of these voters in the new “South Ivy” precinct, to increase population of Samuel Miller district and decrease population of White Hall district;
- Moves some voters from Country Green precinct (Samuel Miller district) to Monticello precinct (Scottsville district) to even population and follow new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line;
- Moves some voters from Agnor Hurt precinct (Rio district) to Georgetown precinct (Jack Jouett district) to better align communities of interest;
- Moves some voters from Jack Jouett precinct (Jack Jouett district) to Ivy precinct (Samuel Miller district) in the Farmington area;
- Extends Free Bridge precinct (Rivanna district) north along the Rivanna River to conform to the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line,; this moves some voters from Pantops precinct (Rivanna district) into Free Bridge precinct;
- Extends University precinct (Jack Jouett district) south to conform to the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line; this moves some voters from East Ivy precinct (Samuel Miller district) into University precinct;
- Moves some voters in Stone-Robinson precinct (Scottsville district) into Mountain View precinct (Scottsville precinct) to conform to the the new House of Delegates 54th and 55th district boundary line.

Pros: will reduce the number of registered voters voting in the Mechums River precinct and the Ivy precinct. Otherwise maintains most other current voting precinct boundaries, except where necessary to achieve population parity among magisterial

districts, or to prevent a voting precinct being split between two House of Delegates districts.

Cons: would require creation of a new voting precinct and securing a new voting location/polling place. Voters assigned to this new precinct would in some cases have a longer commute than to their current polling place.

Factors common to all options:

The final redistricting maps adopted by the Virginia Supreme Court have 99% of Albemarle County placed in the 5th U.S. House of Representatives district. However, a tiny sliver of land in the northwest corner of Albemarle County is placed in the 7th U.S. House of Representatives district. This tiny sliver has only approximately 100 inhabitants, not all of whom are registered voters. The elections code prohibits the creation of a county voting precinct with less than 100 registered voters. At the same time, the elections code prohibits the creation of a voting precinct that is split between two election districts – *unless* it is simply not possible to avoid this, in which case the local governing body can apply to the State Board of Elections for a waiver of the prohibition against creation of split precincts. Because the “tiny sliver” is so small and sparsely inhabited that a separate voting precinct cannot be created for this spot, the sliver will be a part of the current Free Union voting precinct, under all 3 of the Options presented, and will require a request from the Board of Supervisors to the State Board of Elections for a split precinct waiver.

Other than this unavoidable split precinct, all 3 Options above would prevent creation of split voting precincts.