Senate Plans

ID Num	User Name	Title	Description	Percent Deviation			Notes
				Large	Small	Total	
1	Ryan Kelly	RJK Senate Final Plan	This plan was created with the goal of dividing the state evenly into 29 districts based largely on population numbers, with some small consideration given to city boundaries. No knowledge of partisanship was used in creating these districts.	3.49	-3.39	6.88	
2	David Edward Garber	Garber SDs	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 three rural counties (Tooele and Weber and Morgan) and significant ones in every urban county. These changes may redistrict some state senators, if not many of their constituents, out of their present respective districts.	3.43	-3.29	6.72	
3	David Edward Garber	Garber SDs 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 three rural counties (Tooele and Weber and Morgan) and significant ones in every urban county. These changes may redistrict some state senators, if not many of their constituents, out of their present respective districts.	3.43	-3.29	6.72	
4	David Edward Garber	Garber SDs C	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 three rural counties (Tooele and Weber and Morgan) and significant ones in every urban county. These changes may redistrict some state senators, if not many of their constituents, out of their present respective districts.	3.43	-3.29	6.72	
5	Adam Bass	State Senate Maps	No description.	3.49	-3.48	6.97	
6	Beau Sorensen	Senate Redistricting	No description.	2.97	-2.55	5.52	Presented by Sen. Okerlund at Logan, July 13
7	Rep. Fred Cox	Draft 1	No description.	3.40	-3.47	6.87	
8	Jon Greiner	Jon Greiner 1	I started with a basic premise of three things; each Senator had earned a right to defend their district in an election without running against another incumbent, that the maps would as closely as possible stay within one county, and that the new districts would be at least 50% of the old district they currently are elected to. Naturally the one county idea was impossible to accomplish in most cases.	0.02	-0.02	0.04	
9	Robert Wren	Senate redistribution	29 Senate districts within 2.5% population. Six large counties and 2 smaller ones contain splits, remaining intact. May need some boundary "beautification." 414 people in Dist 20 need to be moved to 18. No consideration given to current office holders. Interesting project, harder than it appears.	2.59	-2.73	5.32	Presented by Pres. Waddoups at West Jordan, July 12
10	Steve Clark	Steven Clark_State Senate I	This plan was created with two guidelines: 1. To the maximum extent possible, preserve the essential geopolitical characteristics of each district; i.e. keep rural districts rural, suburban districts suburban, and urban districts urban. 2. Respect the incumbency of all seated Senators by making sure none are 'districted out' despite the challenge of meeting the new district population requirements. This plan succeeds on both levels and meets all the 'integrity check' criteria built into the mapping program software.	3.50	-2.41	5.91	Presented by Sen. Okerlund at Ogden, July 13
11	Gary Hawes	one great plan	No description.	0.30	-0.25	0.55	Presented by Rep. Sumsion at Glendale, July 20
12	Gary Hawes	new senate plan	No description.	0.29	-0.19	0.48	
13	Chad S.	Chad Senate	My attempt at a senate map.	3.46	-2.76	6.22	
14	Michael Jolley	Michael Jolley Senate Districts	I just tried to make the districts make sense geographically. I didn't factor in incumbents' locations (which means this map has no chance of being passed).	2.66	-3.24	5.90	
15	JWStaff Utah Citizen Counsel	UCC State Senate B	Plan Two proposes a horizontal division of the state, combining urban and rural interests in all but one district. Salt Lake County is divided east-and-west, with a complete district from its east boundary to approximately 27th West. The western-third of Salt Lake County forms a second district with Tooele County, southern Davis County, and northern Utah County, which all have commercial, employment, educational, and transportation interests in common with Salt Lake County. The northern district joins the urban counties of Weber and northern Davis with the other northern tier counties from east to west. The southern district joins the remainder of Utah County with the southern tier of counties from east to west. Thus, this plan provides relatively compact and contiguous districts with common interests throughout the state, while reflecting potentially different regional interests between Utah's northern and southern counties.	2.92	-3.36	6.28	
16	JWStaff Utah Citizen Counsel	UCC Senate plan A-1	This Senate plan is dividing lines among traditional lines. This keeps I-15 as the main dividing line between east and west.	2.94	-3.06	6.00	