School Board Plans

ID Num	User Name	Title	Description	Percent Deviation			Notes
				Large	Small	Total	
1	Evan Millett	School Board-12	Here is my proposal for the redistricting of the State School Board.	3.44	-3.44	6.88	
2	Rep. Fred Cox	Draft 1	No description.	3.47	-3.32	6.79	
3	David Edward Garber	Garber SBs	This proposal recreates districts generally from their remotest towns along highways (avoiding impassable terrain) to their most appropriate cities, which it tries (but perhaps fails) to divide as sanely as possible. This technique produces notable readjustments in some rural counties and significant ones in every urban county. These changes may redistrict some state school board members, if not many of their constituents, out of their present respective districts.	2.41	-3.33	5.74	
4	David Edward Garber	Garber SBs B	This proposal recreates districts generally from their remotest towns along highways (avoiding impassable terrain) to their most appropriate cities, which it tries (but perhaps fails) to divide as sanely as possible. This technique produces notable readjustments in some rural counties and significant ones in every urban county. These changes may redistrict some state school board members, if not many of their constituents, out of their present respective districts.	2.41	-3.33	5.74	Presented by Rep. Sumsion at Vernal, July 26
5	Trevor Tidwell	LA ESCUELA BOARD	No description.	2.31	-3.12	5.43	Presented by Rep. Gibson at Ogden, July 13
6	David Thomas	Thomas 2	This plan is designed to minimize the division of local school districts, counties, and cities between state board districts.	2.93	-2.60	5.53	Presented by Rep. Sumsion at Logan, July 13
7	David Thomas	State School Board - Thomas	No description.	2.93	-2.60	5.53	
8	David Thomas	Thomas 3	Plan attempts to minimize the splitting of counties and cities within districts	2.93	-2.60	5.53	Presented by Rep. Sumsion at West Jordan, July 12
9	David Thomas	Thomas 1	The goal of the plan is to minimize the splitting of counties, cities and local school districts between multiple State Board districts. For example, District 7 is limited to Salt Lake City only. District 2 is limited to Ogden City and Weber County. District 5 is limited to Davis County. Hence, the influence of local counties, cities, and local districts is not diminished by having large numbers of State Board members representing the same area.	2.93	-2.60	5.53	
10	David Thomas	Thomas 5	Plan attempts to minimize splitting cities. Only So Salt Lake, Taylorsville, Kearns, West Valley City and Sandy are significantly divided. It also ensures that all State Board members represent at least two school districts. Finally, it allows for the smallest standard deviation in populations – all districts are about the same population size (184,000 – 184,999).	0.32	-0.14	0.46	
11	David Thomas	Thomas 6	The goal of this plan is to ensure that all 15 state board districts have both an urban and rural component. In order to make that work, the districts are irregular shapes.	2.09	-1.77	3.86	
12	Robert Horning	School Board Plan 57	My primary objective here was to aim for compact districts to avoid gerrymandering. It still wasn't completely successful, but I think a good stab at the issue happened. I started with the current district map and then made adjustments as I went along. Washington and Iron counties have sufficient population on their own to justify their own district, so I separated them from the rest of Southern Utah as a deliberate action. I started with the more rural districts to balance their population and then worked inward to the Wasatch Front, generally moving from the north to the south expanding the districts as necessary to balance the populations of each district. The old District 11 was completely eliminated in the process of using this method, although Utah county has been carved up about as harshly as Salt Lake County.	0.37	-0.48	0.85	Presented by Pres. Waddoups at Glendale, July 20
13	Martell Menlove	Martell 1	This plan is designed to minimize the size of the rural districts (1, 3, 14, 15) while maintaining the integrity of county and school district boundaries to the extent possible. The plan recognizes the value of diversity on the State Board and representation from all areas of the State. The plan needs further revisions to more closely follow school district, municipality, and if needed high school boundaries within Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties. Comments and suggestions are welcome!	2.73	-3.17	5.90	Attempted presentation by Martell Menlove at Glendale, July 20
14	Chad Smith	New State School Board Plan	This plan tries to balance the size of the districts while recognizing the vast population of the Wasatch Front and the numerous school entities contained withing them requires the most districts.	0.06	-0.10	0.16	
15	Rep. Kenneth Sumsion	Sumsion 9 V2	No description.	0.87	0.85	1.72	
16	Rep. Kenneth Sumsion	Sumsion 9 V1	No description.	1.20	1.67	2.87	
17	Rep. Kenneth Sumsion	Sumsion 15 V1	No description.	0.39	0.51	0.90	