



## **AGENDA**

January 6, 2022

### **ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

Maidu Community Center Reception Hall  
1550 Maidu Drive  
Roseville, California  
[www.roseville.ca.us/IRC](http://www.roseville.ca.us/IRC)

If you need disability-related accommodation  
to participate in this meeting,  
please contact the City at:  
Voice: 916-774-5200 TDD: 916-774-5220.  
Requests must be made as early as possible.

#### **THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE WELCOMES YOUR PARTICIPATION**

If an agenda item is open to public comment, such public comment shall be addressed to the chair of the meeting.

**Public Comment** - Speakers have three minutes under Public Comment to speak on issues that are not listed on the agenda and are within the City's jurisdiction. The Brown Act does not permit any action or discussion on items not listed on the agenda.

**Agenda Items** - Speakers have five minutes to address items that are listed on the agenda.

**Americans with Disabilities Act** - Notify the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance if special assistance is required to participate in a meeting including the need of auxiliary aids or services.

**Audio/Visual Presentations** - If making a presentation regarding an agenda item, audio/visual materials must be submitted to the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance.

Roseville City Clerk 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 916-774-5200 TDD 916-774-5220

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

## **5. MINUTES**

### **5.1. Minutes of Prior Meetings**

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Helen Dreyer recommending the Independent Redistricting Commission approve the minutes of the December 20, 2021.

CONTACT: Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 [hdreyer@roseville.ca.us](mailto:hdreyer@roseville.ca.us)

## **6. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS**

### **6.1. Overview of Draft Maps and Preliminary Redistricting Plan**

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational update and overview of the six (6) draft maps for consideration by the Independent Redistricting Commission and the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map Analysis filed with the City Clerk on December 22, 2021.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)

### **6.2. Draft Map and Community of Interest Public Testimony**

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell and Assistant City Clerk Helen Dreyer recommending the Independent Redistricting Commission receive public testimony on the six (6) draft maps and from communities of interest in accordance with Section 11.10 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)  
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 [hdreyer@roseville.ca.us](mailto:hdreyer@roseville.ca.us)

### **6.3. Upcoming Redistricting Meeting Schedule**

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell and Assistant City Clerk Helen Dreyer to provide an informational update on upcoming redistricting public meeting dates and an overview of final map adoption scheduled for January 24, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)  
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 [hdreyer@roseville.ca.us](mailto:hdreyer@roseville.ca.us)

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**



# ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMUNICATION

**Title:** Minutes of Prior Meetings  
**Contact:** Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

**Meeting Date: 1/6/2022**  
**Item #: 5.1.**

## RECOMMENDATION

Approve the minutes of the December 20, 2021 Independent Redistricting Commission meeting.

## BACKGROUND

There is no background associated with this item.

Respectfully Submitted,

Helen Dreyer, Assistant City Clerk

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

December 20, 2021 Minutes



**MINUTES**  
December 20, 2021

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT  
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

Council Chambers  
311 Vernon Street  
Roseville, California  
[www.roseville.ca.us](http://www.roseville.ca.us)

In compliance with the Brown Act, Commissioner Sweeney will be participating in the meeting via teleconference from the following location: 121 Carndonagh Park, Dublin 13, Ireland.

The meeting may be viewed on Comcast channel 14, Consolidated Communications channel 73, and AT&T U-Verse. Meetings are also video streamed live and are available on the City's website and YouTube channel at [youtube.com/CityofRosevilleCa](http://youtube.com/CityofRosevilleCa).

Members of the public may offer public comment by phone:

Dial in Phone Number: 916-774-5353

If you need disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the City in advance of the meeting at:  
Voice: 916-774-5200, TDD: 916-774-5220. Requests must be made as early as possible.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Paul Frank called the Independent Redistricting Commission meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Assistant City Clerk Helen Dreyer called the roll.

Present: Frank, Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe,

Sweeney, Waggoner, Waldrop  
Absent: Willoughby

Alternates Present: Kuehn, Slaughter  
Absent: Dohner

### **3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Holly Cuthbertson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **3.1. Roseville Redistricting Commission - Consideration of a Resolution to Authorize Remote Telephonic Participation**

Memo from Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell providing information for consideration of a Resolution by the Independent Redistricting Commission to authorize Remote Telephonic Participation in meetings pursuant to the Brown Act as amended by AB 361 for the period of December 20, 2021 to January 19, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell made the presentation to the Commission.

Lisa Larkin - spoke in favor of adoption of resolution allowing telephonic public comment.

Motion by Mary Griffith, seconded by Kevin Waggoner, to adopt the RESOLUTION allowing telephonic public comment from December 20, 2021 to January 19, 2022. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney, Waggoner, Waldrop

Absent: Willoughby

### **4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Placer County Supervisor Bonnie Gore - thanked retiring City Clerk Sonia Orozco for her years of service.

Placer County Clerk/Registrar of Voters Ryan Ronco - thanked retiring City Clerk Sonia Orozco for participation and coordination of the elections process throughout the years.

Richard Roccucci - thanked the commission members for their service.

## 5. MINUTES

### 5.1. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Helen Dreyer and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Independent Redistricting Commission approve the minutes of the November 22, 2021 meeting.

CONTACT: Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 [hdreyer@roseville.ca.us](mailto:hdreyer@roseville.ca.us)  
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 [sorozco@roseville.ca.us](mailto:sorozco@roseville.ca.us)

No public comment received.

Motion by Renee Borowiak, seconded by Kevin Waggoner, to approve the minutes of the November 22, 2021 Independent Redistricting Commission meeting. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney, Waggoner, Waldrop

Absent: Willoughby

## 6. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

### 6.1. Communities of Interest Public Testimony

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Helen Dreyer, Senior Deputy Attorney Joe Mandell, and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Independent Redistricting Commission receive public testimony on communities of interest and other considerations in connection with the redrawing of district boundaries.

CONTACT: Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 [hdreyer@roseville.ca.us](mailto:hdreyer@roseville.ca.us)  
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 [sorozco@roseville.ca.us](mailto:sorozco@roseville.ca.us)  
Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)

Einar Maisch - spoke on adopting maps that follow development of the city.

Lisa Larkin - spoke in favor of maps #15 and #25 which keep the majority of neighborhood associations together with the exception of a part of Sun City.

Item for information only. No action required.

### 6.2. Independent Redistricting Commission Criteria and Map Adoption Procedures

Memo from Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell providing an informational report on Redistricting Criteria and Map Adoption Procedures.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell made the presentation to the Commission outlining the redistricting criteria, map adoption procedures, and draft report development.

Item for information only. No action required.

### 6.3. Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission Supplemental Maps

Memo from Senior Deputy City Attorney and City Clerk Sonia Orozco providing the Independent Redistricting Commission supplemental maps outlining 2020 population by census block, population by neighborhood associations, and single family residential adult living communities.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)  
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 [sorozco@roseville.ca.us](mailto:sorozco@roseville.ca.us)

Supplemental maps were provided to members.

Kathleen Crawford - requested consideration of maintaining boundaries of Districts two (2) and four (4) to the extent possible to allow residents the opportunity to vote in 2022.

Item for information only. No action required by the Commission.

### 6.4. Public Map Submissions Analysis

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Helen Dreyer, Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell, and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Independent Redistricting Commission receive a presentation from FLO Analytics highlighting the commonalities across map submissions, pointing out swing areas, highlighting maps that do the best job of creating population balance, preserving communities (with a focus on neighborhoods), and showing compactness. Following the presentation, the IRC is requested to pick between three (3) to five (5) maps to bring forward to the January 2022 public hearings.

CONTACT: Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 [hdreyer@roseville.ca.us](mailto:hdreyer@roseville.ca.us)  
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 [sorozco@roseville.ca.us](mailto:sorozco@roseville.ca.us)  
Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.a.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.a.us)

FLO Analytics Senior GIS Analyst Jed Roberts made the presentation to the Commission.

Einar Maisch - spoke in support of map #8 and spoke to slight changes to make map more inclusive and also spoke to maps #6 and #7.

Lisa Larkin - spoke on suggested maps stating one of the maps for potential selection was drawn by a political consultant who works to get supervisors and councilmembers elected and spoke that map #6 was better than map #7 with

changes to Washington Blvd. inclusion.

Motion by Ryan O'Keefe, seconded by Renee Borowiak, to approve moving forward with maps #1 with the top corner of District Four (4) moved to District Three (3) and Roseville High School moved to the Sierra Vista Historic District if the standard deviation is not adversely affected, and maps #6, #8, #14, #15, and #25. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney, Waggoner, Waldrop

Absent: Willoughby

Motion by Renee Borowiak, seconded by Karen McPhail, to direct staff to prepare the draft report.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney, Waggoner, Waldrop

Absent: Willoughby

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Paul Frank adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.



# ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMUNICATION

**Title:** Overview of Draft Maps and Preliminary Redistricting Plan

**Contact:** Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)

**Meeting Date:** 1/6/2022

**Item #:** 6.1.



# ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMUNICATION

**Title:** Draft Map and Community of Interest Public Testimony  
Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us  
**Contact:** Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

**Meeting Date: 1/6/2022**  
**Item #: 6.2.**

## RECOMMENDATION

Recommending the Commission receive public testimony on the six (6) draft maps and from communities of interest in accordance with Section 11.10 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter.

## BACKGROUND

This item allows the public to share their "community of interest" testimony, and map preference.

Comments received by the public pertaining to Maps A-F since the last IRC meeting are attached as part of this item.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joe Mandell, Senior Deputy City Attorney

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

Public Testimony

December 31, 2021

TO: Independent Redistricting Commission

Dear Commissioners;

These are my comments on the 6 maps you decided to forward at your December 20, 2021 meeting. I first want to again commend you on your patience with this long and tedious process and listening to the community on their comments regarding communities of interest.

No map is perfect and as I have mentioned at my testimony on December 20<sup>st</sup>, no matter your decisions not everyone will be happy.

I would like to briefly review your attorney Joe Mandell's memo from your December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting and listed as Item 6.2, criteria for map adoption.

There are four main parts in order of priority:

### **Geographic considerations**

**Community of interest** (these include schools, shopping pattern, neighborhood associations, parks, policing and other City services) these change with time and some people act together because of organizations or churches they belong to.

### **Easily identifiable**

### **Compactness**

I reference these since my comments on the maps will include these priority items.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that we should look at the big picture and not get too tied down in minutiae when we make this important decision. I believe there are five distinct and easily identifiable areas in Roseville which have either historical significant or can be related to how the city was expanded using the specific planning process (specific plans).

They are the southeast, northeast, midtown-downtown-old town, central and west.

**Map A** District 2 east of Hwy 80 has little in common with west of Hwy 80; also west of Sunrise has more in common interest with the rest of District 1. Some of the other districts are also not easily indefinable and are not compact

**Map B** Is the most consistent when the priorities are considered as a whole. As mentioned on the maps by the consultant, compactness is more visual than numbers and this is the most compact. It makes sense. It's the best when taking all the criteria into consideration.

**Map C** District 1 should not come west of Hwy 80 and district 2 ranges too far north. Not visually compact, not easily identifiable.

**Map D** Again district 2 east of hwy 80 is not contiguous as defined in your 6.2 memo. District 4 crosses to many specific plans and is not readily recognized. Not compact, spreads everything out too much.

**Map E** Again district 2 across Hwy 80 and district 4 encroaches into the area more easily recognized with district 2. Not compact.

**Map F** Same comments as Map E but worse. Not compact, not easily recognized.

Again, I want to emphasize, look at the big picture and what makes sense. Again, the map selected should be the best fit including all of the priorities and community comments.

Richard Roccucci

CC: City attorney, City clerk

## Dreyer, Helen

---

**From:** Susan Rohan <susanrohan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 31, 2021 3:51 PM  
**To:** Dreyer, Helen; Mandell, Joseph  
**Subject:** Rohan Comments for Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission Regarding maps A-F

**EXTERNAL:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission Chair Paul Frank, Commissioners, and Staff

I've lived, worked and raised a family in Roseville since the mid 80's. I have been active in civic affairs, participating and observing with the eye of an urban planner. While my comments are my own, I am beginning my 3<sup>rd</sup> year as president of a neighborhood association (NA). I served on the Board of Sun City. I also had the privilege to serve as a City Commissioner on several bodies, and to serve two terms on the Roseville City Council, ending in 2018.

I'm sure it is only a small comfort for you Commissioners to be hear what a hard job you have in front of you, because you do, in fact, need to choose a final map on a firm deadline. But I do think it is going to be very hard, unless you allow yourselves the freedom to explore additional or alternative areas of common interest on the basis of attributes other than NA boundaries.

The boundaries of the NAs don't make a perfect footprint for districting considerations because they were drawn for other purposes in the 1990s (late, I think) when members of the City's police department, with fresh federal funding for implementing a higher level of "neighborhood policing", reached out to the community to pitch the formation of RCONA NA's. In fact, NA formation was a condition of the federal grant. Citizens who responded to the invitation came from some of the central neighborhoods like Folsom, and from Maidu and Cresthaven along with a few others. Due to limited public engagement, the work of drawing boundaries throughout the City fell to a few good citizens working with members of the police department to meet the conditions of that grant. And, then, other NAs were added later as Specific Plans were adopted, with the help of the Planning Department. These specific plan areas were designed to be large "planned neighborhoods" as prescribed under the City's General Plan and Specific Plan rules. They shared common resources, such as arterial roads and commercial centers; they were built in the same timeframe, and they share amenities through common financing plans. Only overtime, some the larger NAs were broken into smaller units at the request of new residents to accommodate smaller areas of common interest—such as a common homebuilder.

Given this history, I encourage you to be less constrained by the NA boundaries alone, and allow yourselves to observe larger communities of interest such as shared public facilities and roadways, school attendance boundaries, libraries, neighborhood and regional parks and shopping centers. By doing so, you will create district boundaries that are more readily perceivable by those they will serve. And you will create less contorted boundaries like those in Maps E and F which are east to west in orientation, across multiple generations of development, and multiple specific plan areas.

Below are my comments on the Maps.

Map E pushes Sun City out of District 4 and west into District 5, though Sun City residents largely live out their daily lives east of their homeowners association area. Their shopping, churches, and medical care are largely east of them. Their age affinity to The Heritage or Club projects located in District 5 is weak rationale for Sun City to be included in District 5. There is no other connection between these two communities, save their Zip Code. One is gated, one is not. And, Sun City HOA amenities are not available to seniors in District 5. Districts 3 and 4 in Map E look like “remainders”. And this map would significantly disenfranchise voters in the next (2022) election. The north and south ends of District 2 have very little in common. District 1, being so wholly east of the freeway, consists of subdivisions and neighborhoods that have happily co-existed over the past 40 years but isolates us from the hearts and minds of nearly all 4 other members of the Council.

As for Map F, much of what I have noted about Map E applies. In fact, it appears to be exclusively an attempt to reach consensus on only District 2. The Commission needs to consider the entire community. Map D frames District 2 with a lack of commonality between its northern and southern extremes. My concerns voiced about Maps E and F about the isolation of District 1, and the lack of commonality between eastern and western boundaries of District 4 also apply to Map D.

Map A's illogical District 4/5 boundary could be easily improved by being set on Fiddymont Road. However, Map A disrupts the voters' ability to vote in the Blue Oaks neighborhood in the 2022 elections. Map A also isolates District 1.

Maps B and C do not isolate the neighborhoods to the east of the freeway. Map C may offer more opportunity than B to forge a compromise between the central neighborhoods and the perimeter districts if Map C was revised to place the balance of Highlands Reserve NA in District 3 and southern end of Harding NA was moved into District 2.

It appears Map B offers the least disenfranchisement to voters who expect to vote in 2022. Bringing as much of Junction West and Woodcreek Oaks into District 4 as the population balance would allow and moving the Historic Sierra Vista neighborhood into District 2 might make Map B a viable compromise. Work on Map B should have a priority because it provides the best voting equity across the City. Roseville enjoys a reputation of high voter turnout. Its voters are a “community of interest”.

Maps B and C have good qualities. They balance the interests of the core NAs with the perimeter districts, contain the roadmap for the better universe of voters to vote in the 2022 cycle, and provide for more rational combinations of specific plan areas in the various districts.

Thank you for your service and work on this challenging project, and for your interest in public comment.

Susan Rohan  
[susanrohan@gmail.com](mailto:susanrohan@gmail.com)  
916-412-4796

**Dreyer, Helen**

---

**From:** Parry Lustgarten <parry.lustgarten@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 3, 2022 1:42 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Roseville Redistricting

**EXTERNAL:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please know that as a multi-decade resident and voter of Roseville, I urge the Independent Commission to choose either Maps E, F & D in the Roseville Redistricting process. I believe it is imperative that these three maps, meet the best interest of the community because E & F do not divide neighborhood associations, and D has the fewest neighborhood association divisions. These three maps meet the CA Voter Rights Act requirements that must be observed in this process - contiguity and integrity of neighborhoods and communities.) The integrity of the Roseville community is best served with these three maps, and I sincerely urge the Commission to choose one of them.

Thank you for acknowledging and responding to the public accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

Parry Lustgarten  
Millport Drive, Roseville, CA



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)



# ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMUNICATION

**Title:** Upcoming Redistricting Meeting Schedule  
Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 [jmandell@roseville.ca.us](mailto:jmandell@roseville.ca.us)  
**Contact:** Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 [hdreyer@roseville.ca.us](mailto:hdreyer@roseville.ca.us)

**Meeting Date: 1/6/2022**  
**Item #: 6.3.**