



AGENDA

February 28, 2022

ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us/IRC

The meeting may be viewed on Comcast channel 14, Consolidated Communications channel 73, and AT&T U-Verse. This meeting will also be video streamed live and available on the City's website and YouTube channel.

Members of the public may offer public comment by phone:

Dial in Phone Number: 916-774-5353

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 January 6, 2022, January 11, 2022, January 13, 2022, January 15, 2022, January 18, 2022, January 20, 2022, January 24, 2022, February 3, 2022, February 9, 2022, February 15, 2022, February 17, 2022, and February 22, 2022 meetings.

CONTACT: Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

6. **REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS**

6.1. Consider Resolution to Adopt Final Redistricting Report and Final Map based on Draft Map B-1

Memo from Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell recommending the Independent Redistricting Commission consider a Resolution to adopt Draft Map B-1 as the Final Map pursuant to Subsection C of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter and determine whether to direct staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk. Formal action is required by the Commission to adopt the "Resolution of the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City of Roseville Adopting a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map."

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

6.2. Roundtable Discussion on Redistricting Process and Suggestions for Improvement

Memo from Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell requesting a discussion if the Independent Redistricting Commission adopts Draft Map B-1 as the Final Map and has directed staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk pursuant to Agenda Item #6.1, this agenda item is intended as a forum for Commissioners and the public to openly discuss various aspects of the City of Roseville's 2021-22 redistricting process and make suggestions or recommendations for improvement for when the next Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission begins the redistricting process again in 2031.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@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: 2/28/2022
Item #: 5.1.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the minutes of the January 6, 2022, January 11, 2022, January 13, 2022, January 15, 2022, January 18, 2022, January 20, 2022, January 24, 2022, February 3, 2022, February 9, 2022, February 15, 2022, February 17, 2022, and February 22, 2022 Independent Redistricting Commission meetings.

BACKGROUND

At its December 20, 2021 meeting, the Independent Redistricting Commission selected a group of six (6) draft maps for further public consideration at six (6) public hearings in January 2022.

In January 2022, the Commission held six (6) public hearings:

- Public Hearing #1 – January 6, 2022 at 6pm
Maidu Community Center – 1550 Maidu Dr.
- Public Hearing #2 – January 11, 2022 at 6pm
City Council Chambers – 311 Vernon St.
- Public Hearing #3 – January 13, 2022 at 6pm
Mike Shellito Indoor Pool – 10210 Fairway Dr.
- Public Hearing #4 – January 15, 2022 at 2pm
City Council Chambers – 311 Vernon St.
- Public Hearing #5 – January 18, 2022 at 6pm
Martha Riley Library – 1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
- Public Hearing #6 – January 20, 2022 at 6pm
St. John's Episcopal Church – 2351 Pleasant Grove Blvd.

At its January 24, 2022 meeting, the Commission voted by motion to move forward with Draft Map

B-1 as the final draft map. The motion passed by a vote of 7 - 4.

In February 2022, the Commission held five (5) public hearings on Draft Map B-1:

- Public Hearing #1 – February 3, 2022 at 6pm
City Council Chambers – 311 Vernon St.
- Public Hearing #2 – February 9, 2022 at 6pm
Maidu Community Center – 1550 Maidu Dr.
- Public Hearing #3 – February 15, 2022 at 6pm
Mike Shellito Indoor Pool – 10210 Fairway Dr.
- Public Hearing #4 – February 17, 2022 at 6pm
Martha Riley Library – 1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
- Public Hearing #5 – February 22, 2022 at 6pm
St. John's Episcopal Church – 2351 Pleasant Grove Blvd.

Respectfully Submitted,

Helen Dreyer, Assistant City Clerk

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

January 6, 2022 Minutes

January 11, 2022 Minutes

January 13, 2022 Minutes

January 15, 2022 Minutes

January 18, 2022 Minutes

January 20, 2022 Minutes

January 24, 2022 Minutes

February 3, 2022 Minutes

February 9, 2022 Minutes

February 15, 2022 Minutes

February 17, 2022 Minutes

February 22, 2022 Minutes



MINUTES
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

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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Boroviak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe,
Sweeney, Waggoner, Waldrop, Willoughby

Alternates present: Kuehn, Slaughter
Alternates Absent: Dohner

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Sam Frank led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

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

No public comment received.

Motion by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, seconded by Commissioner Mary Griffith, to approve the minutes of the December 20, 2021 Independent Redistricting Commission meeting. The Motion Passed.

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

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

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

Dave Breninger, Sun City Roseville Community Association Board Member - spoke in support of Map B, and in support of removing Maps D, E, and F from any further consideration.

Dave Breninger, as an individual, spoke in support of Map B.

Jay Reed - spoke in support of Map C, and Map B is good second choice.

Nick Alexander - spoke in support of communities of interest boundaries following specific plan boundaries, and in support of Map B.

Ryan Ronco- spoke in support of maintaining the existing lines of school districts, special districts, state assembly and senate, county supervisors, and voting precincts.

Aldo Pineschi - echoed Nick Alexander and Ryan Ronco's comments, and spoke in support of Map B, next preference would be Map C.

Wendy Gerig - spoke in support of following specific plans, and spoke in support of Map C, next preference would be Map B.

Lisa Larkin - spoke in support of keeping communities of interest together, and in support of Maps E & F, and next preference Map D.

Jim Kidd - spoke in support of not splitting neighborhood associations and keeping core neighborhoods in one district, and spoke in support of Map F, then Map B with adjustments, and remove Map C.

Jim Ferguson - asked for consideration of maps that have two councilmembers in high growth areas, and whether that is a good or bad thing.

For information only. No action required.

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
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

Chair Paul Frank requested members in attendance to provide their comments on communities of interest.

Chair Paul Frank asked if it was possible to obtain a list of active and inactive neighborhood associations.

Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations President Kevin LaChance advised he would provide that list tonight or tomorrow.

Jim Kidd - stated whether a homeowners association is active or not should not be a consideration.

Lisa Larkin - stated whether a homeowners association is active or not should not be a consideration, and two councilmembers representing one homeowners association can be both a good thing and bad thing.

For information only. No action required.

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
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Jefferson Willoughby, seconded by Commissioner Mary Griffith, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.



MINUTES
January 11, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us/IRC

The meeting may be viewed on Comcast channel 14,
Consolidated Communications channel 73, and AT&T U-Verse.
This meeting will also be video streamed live and available on the City's website and
YouTube channel.

Members of the public may offer public comment by phone:
Dial in Phone Number: 916-774-5353

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Waggoner

Alternates Present: Kuehn, Slaughter

Alternates Absent: Dohner

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chair Renee Borowiak led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Stan Bollinger – Spoke in support of adding more lanes on Highway 65 south from Blue Oaks Boulevard to I-80.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Overview of Draft Maps and Preliminary Redistricting Plan

Memo from 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

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

Jay Reed – spoke in support of Maps C & D. Requested the Commission start making changes to maps now and not wait.

Jonathan Martin – spoke in support of Map B to allow for future planning.

Richard Roccucci – spoke in support of not moving district lines to the extent possible, and advised commission and public not to pick a map based on who you want to represent you.

Lisa Larkin – spoke in support of Maps D, E, and F because they keep the neighborhood associations together. Favors Map F because the neighborhood associations are kept together and of the low deviation.

Kathleen Crawford – spoke in support of Maps E, F, or D in order of priority.

Einar Maisch – spoke on amendments he submitted for Maps B & D and advised the Commission to consider amending maps as they go.

For information only. No action required.

5.2. 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 Charter.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

Jay Reed – asked if planned growth is something to consider.

Lisa Larkin - advised that population growth, as well as the specific plans, aren't considerations in the drawing of maps. She is supportive of map D because it keeps the neighborhood associations whole.

Larry Hufty - spoke in support of Map F, E & D because they keep neighborhood associations intact.

Kathleen Crawford - spoke on the infill developments that are happening in District 5 and that the maps need to allow for growth.

For information only. No action required.

5.3. 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 schedule for January 24, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5235 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

Joe with Redistricting Partners - spoke on the small changes being requested by the commission now being unimportant if the commission makes big changes later.

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Karen McPhail, seconded by Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

The meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.



MINUTES
January 13, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

Mike Shellito Indoor Pool
10210 Fairway Drive
Roseville, California
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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney,
Waldrop, Willoughby

Absent: Boroviak, Waggoner

Alternates Present: Kuehn, Slaughter

Alternates Absent: Dohner

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Alternate Commissioner Werner Kuehn led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ryan Ronco, Placer County Recorder/Registrar of Voters - confirmed that Roseville is not split by Senate or Assembly districts, and that he will provide the shape files to the commission.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Overview of Draft Maps and Preliminary Redistricting Plan

Memo from 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

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

Susan Rohan - inquired how written public comment received by the commission is being handled.

Einar Maisch - spoke on his belief that the commission cannot switch district numbers.

Lisa Larkin - spoke on her belief that a map adopted on January 24 would have met the criteria to have been published for 30 days prior to adoption, and in support of Map# 23 of the original maps submitted, and Map D with three changes, and in support of Maps E, D, and A.

Susan Rohan - spoke on the importance of considering public comment.

Jonathan Martin - spoke in support of Map B.

Einar Maisch - spoke in support of Map C, second Map B, and not in support of Maps D, E & F.

Marcus Lo Duca - spoke in support of Map B, and not in support of Maps A, C, D, E & F.

For information only. No action required.

5.2. 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 Charter.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell made the presentation to the

commission.

Lisa Larkin - spoke in support of making changes to the maps.

For information only. No action required.

5.3. 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 schedule for January 24, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5235 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Jefferson Willoughby, seconded by Commissioner Andrew Waldrop, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.



MINUTES
January 15, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

2:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us/IRC

The meeting may be viewed on Comcast channel 14,
Consolidated Communications channel 73, and AT&T U-Verse.
This meeting will also be video streamed live and available on the City's website and
YouTube channel.

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Paul Frank called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney,
Waggoner, Waldrop, Willoughby

Absent: Ludwig

Alternates: Kuehn, Slaughter

Alternates Absent: Dohner

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Alternate Commissioner John Slaughter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Consideration of a Resolution by the Independent Redistricting Commission to Reauthorize Remote Telephonic Participation in Meetings Pursuant to the Brown Act as Amended by AB 361 for the period of January 20, 2022 – February 19, 2022

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

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

Motion by Vice Chair Reneee Borowiak, seconded by Commissioner Mary Griffith, to adopt RESOLUTION to reauthorize remote telephonic participation in meetings pursuant to the Brown Act as amended by AB 361 for the period of January 20, 2022 - February 19, 2022.

Vote: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney, Waggoner, Waldrop, Willoughby
Absent: Ludwig

5.2. Overview of Draft Maps and Preliminary Redistricting Plan

Memo from 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

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell outlined three options to the commission for adopting a final map:

Option 1) At the January 24 meeting adopt one of the current maps with no changes and no line-drawing amendments.

Option 2) At the January 24 meeting make live line-drawing amendments to the

maps, adopt one maps as a draft map and publish on City website for seven days, and adopt as a final map on January 31.

Option 3) Finalize map on January 24 or January 31, publish on City website for 30 days, and adopt as a final map late February with no more public hearings unless community requests.

Jay Reed - questioned what would occur during the seven days when map is published on the City website in Option 2.

Ellen Debach-Riley - spoke in support of Maps D, E & F as they keep most neighborhood associations and historical neighborhoods intact, and allows the most opportunity for voters to vote.

April Marskell - spoke in support of Map B, and in support of an additional 30-day comment period.

Derek Pell - spoke in support of Maps D, E & F as they keep similar communities together, stated Map B could be good compromise with changes, and in support of any maps with proposed changes be made available on the City website.

Kathleen Kitchell - spoke in support of infill areas considered together, in support of Maps D, E & F, in support of considering "The Grounds" as part of the adjacent neighborhoods,

Kevin La Chance - spoke in support of Maps E & F as they keep neighborhoods together, moving Sierra Vista to District 2, keeping Kaseberg and Kingswood neighborhoods together, in support of 2-year Council terms, and stated Map B a good compromise with changes.

Jay Reed - spoke on boundaries not easily identifiable or understandable on Maps D, E & F, and too many voters unable to vote.

Marcus Lo Duca - spoke in support of Map B with changes that keeps areas of the city whole, and in opposition of voters not getting to vote.

Aldo Pineschi - spoke in support of Map B, secondly in support of Map C.

Richard Roccucci - spoke in support of Maps B, and maybe Map C, in support of small changes to the maps, looking at the big picture, and approving maps that meet the most criteria.

Kayla Scott - spoke in support of Map B as it maintains easily identifiable boundaries and is least distracting and consistent with existing boundaries, and stated Communities of Interest include non-profits.

Jeremy Scott - spoke in support of Map B.

Jeff Harper - spoke in support of Maps B.

Gary Szybowski - spoke in support of Maps E and/or F as they keep neighborhood associations together.

Cindy Mitchell - spoke in support of Map B as it keeps neighborhood associations together.

Kathleen Starts - spoke in support of Maps D, E & F, and commented that neighborhood associations are strong community agents.

Carol Weaver - spoke in support of Maps D, E & F with changes, and concerned about seven days of public input vs. 30 days.

Lisa Larkin - spoke on specific plans, and in support of two-year Council terms.

Kathleen Crawford - advised commission to adopt a map that best serves the whole city, and make changes to the map if necessary,

Billy Bennett - spoke in support of Map B.

For information only. No action required.

5.3. 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 Charter.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

April Marskell - commented that any changes made would not impact Blue Oaks Neighborhood Association.

For information only. No action required.

5.4. 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 schedule for January 24, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5235 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell made the presentation to the

commission.

Ellen Debach-Riley - inquired if the January 24 meeting is open to the public.

Chair Paul Frank responded yes.

Richard Roccucci - spoke in support of approving one of the six draft maps with only small changes.

Jay Reed - spoke in support of approving one of the six draft maps.

Ellen Debach-Riley - spoke in support of approving a draft map as presented, or making requested changes to all of the maps.

Kathleen Kitchell - spoke in support of incorporating all public feedback to make the best map possible.

Marcus Lo Duca - spoke in support of approving one of the six draft maps.

Kevin La Champ - recommended the Commission make changes to the six draft maps, publish the maps for 30 days, then vote for one of the six maps.

Lisa Larkin - spoke in support of making changes to the six maps.

Kathleen Crawford - Spoke in support of obtaining public comment and incorporating it at the live line drawing on January 24.

Susan Gutowsky - spoke in support of Map E, and believes a "tweak" is a 10% change to people or geography.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe, seconded by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.



MINUTES
January 18, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

Martha Riley Library
1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
Roseville, California
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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Alternates Present: Kuehn, Slaughter
Alternates Absent: Dohner

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Mary Griffith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Overview of Draft Maps and Preliminary Redistricting Plan

Memo from 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

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

Lisa Larkin - previously spoke in support of Maps D, E, & F, but does fully support Map A with the adjustments made by Commissioner Julia Sweeney.

Stan Bollinger - spoke in support of Map C.

Sue Cook - inquired where she can find Map A that Commissioner Julia Sweeney entered into public comment.

City Clerk Technician Katrina Six responded the map was available to the public at the back of the meeting room with all of the other meeting materials.

For information only. No action required.

5.2. 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 Charter.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

Stan Bollinger - spoke in support of Map C, and requested a map on the City's website that shows the major roads.

Gretchen Littlejohn - spoke in support of Map B, remove Maps A, D, & F, and requested boundaries move as little as possible.

Steve Cho - spoke in support of Map B, and how the process has gone so far.

Judy Hansel - spoke in support of Map B.

Jay Reed - spoke in support of Map B, concerned about the legal challenge that can come out of creating new maps after moving forward with the current six maps, and spoke in opposition to Maps D, E, & F.

Carol Weaver - spoke in support of keeping the Kingswood/Kaseberg neighborhood whole.

Gwen Myers - spoke in support of Map B.

Amy Cho - spoke in support of Map B, and was unaware that maps other than the six draft maps would be considered.

Andrew Tagg - believes school districts are communities of interest, and spoke in support of Map B.

Alisa Fong - spoke in support of Map B, and does not support Maps A, D, E, & F because those residents won't be able to vote for many years.

Kathleen Crawford - Sun City would like to stay in one district, and spoke in support of Maps E & F.

Lisa Larkin - spoke in favor of making changes to the current maps to make the best map.

Shante Martin - spoke in support of Map B due to its simplicity.

Sheri Scott - spoke in support of Map B, but would like to move the boundary to include the senior living facility being built across from Eskaton.

Sue Cook - has no preference on one map, spoke in favor of keeping Sun City in District 3, Historic Sierra Vista stay with the core neighborhoods, Quail Glen, Fiddymont Farms, and Blue Oaks stay whole.

Marcus Lo Duca - spoke in support of Map B, and keeping Sun City, Quail Glen, Blue Oaks together.

For information only. No action required.

5.3. 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 schedule for January 24, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5235 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

Steve Chou - inquired if the January 24, 2022 meeting is open to the public, and what accommodations can be made if public attendance is large and six-feet of space cannot occur.

Chair Paul Frank responded the meeting would be open to the public.

City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger responded there is not a six-foot space mandate at this time.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Kevin Waggoner, seconded by Ryan O'Keefe, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: All ayes

Meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.



MINUTES
January 20, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

St. John's Episcopal Church

2351 Pleasant Grove Blvd.

Roseville, California

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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Alternates Present: Dohnor, Kuehn, Slaughter

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Alternate Commissioner Kristine Dohnor led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. MINUTES

No minutes to approve.

6. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Overview of Draft Maps and Preliminary Redistricting Plan

Memo from 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

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

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

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 Charter.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

Pete Constant - spoke in support of Maps C and E.

Jay Reed - spoke in support of Maps C, then Map B.

Susan Dewayne - spoke in support of Map B.

Melissa Gee - spoke in support of Map B.

Jeff Short - spoke in support of Map B.

Richard Roccucci - spoke on the process of selecting a map.

Loren Cook - spoke in support of keeping neighborhoods together.

Rana Ghadban, Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce CEO and resident of Roseville - spoke in support of Map B.

For information only. No action required.

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 schedule for January 24, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5235 jmandell@roseville.ca.us
Helen Dreyer 916-774-5356 hdreyer@roseville.ca.us

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

Pete Constant - spoke in opposition to changing the process, and that any changes to the draft maps would require a 30-day review period, and in support of not considering the impact to candidates when selecting a map.

Jay Reed - spoke in opposition to changing the process, and in support of determining what a tweak is.

Scott Hubert - spoke in opposition to changing the process, in support of narrowing down the number of maps, and in support of Map B.

Lisa Larkin - demographer stated that any change would be a new map, spoke in support of narrowing the number of maps and making changes.

Father Haggenjos - thanked the commission, and encouraged them to listen to everyone.

Pete Constant - spoke on districts separated by the railroad.

Susan Rohan - recommended asking staff to provide the commission neutral information regarding neighborhoods separated by the railroad.

Einar Maisch - recommended any changes made to maps on January 24 be printed and made available to the public at the meeting.

For information only. No action required.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Jefferson Willoughby, seconded by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.



MINUTES
January 24, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us/IRC

The meeting may be viewed on Comcast channel 14,
Consolidated Communications channel 73, and AT&T U-Verse.
This meeting will also be video streamed live and available on the City's website and
YouTube channel.

Members of the public may offer public comment by phone:

Dial in Phone Number: 916-774-5353

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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Alternates Present: Dohner, Kuehn, Slaughter

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Jefferson Willoughby led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Paul Frank made opening comments.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. COMMISSION ITEMS

5.1. Overview of Independent Redistricting Commission and Redistricting Criteria

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational presentation on the purpose of the IRC, the formation and training of the IRC, and the redistricting criteria to be considered by the IRC on the drawing of the City Council district boundaries.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

5.2. Commission Discussion on Procedure for Final Map Adoption

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational presentation on state law and Roseville City Charter provisions applicable to the selection and adoption of a final map. Following the informational presentation, the Commission will discuss various procedural items related to the selection of a proposed final map (i.e. by ballot, motion, ranking, point values, etc.) as detailed in the staff report.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

Pete Constant - Charter Review Commission's intent was to not separate communities by railyard.

Lisa Larkin - contiguous means you don't have to leave the district to get back into the district, don't rule out maps without making possible changes.

Jay Reed - requested clarification on Chair Paul Frank's comment about amending.

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell provided clarification.

Steve Cho - requested clarification on taking public comment.

Chair Paul Frank provided clarification.

Motion by Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe, seconded by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, to approve an original, unedited map by a majority roll call vote.

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

Noes: Waldrop

Commission consensus to approve the remaining commission decisions by a majority roll call vote.

Jay Reed - recommended commissioners provide their reasons for eliminating maps in the interest of transparency.

Lisa Larkin - feels that publicly discussing the maps is sufficient for transparency.

Commission consensus to approve making map edits by commission consensus.

Jay Reed - inquired who defines what is a tweak and what is a new map?

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell stated if there is a population change to Maps A-F then it should be considered a new map.

Kathleen Crawford - spoke in support of Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell's opinion.

Pete Constant - spoke in support of only considering the six draft maps, and not making changes.

Lisa Larkin - spoke in support of reviewing the maps that have already been submitted with changes.

5.3. Overview of the Six Draft Maps for Further Public Consideration

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational presentation and overview of the six (6) maps that were selected by the IRC at its December 20, 2021 meeting for further public consideration out of the twenty-three (23) maps submitted by the public. These six (6) draft maps were renamed Draft Map A-F and were discussed at the six (6) public hearings throughout January 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5235 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

Sherrie Scott - spoke in support of Map B.

Robert Dugan - commented that neighborhood associations are an important voice but shouldn't override the City's planning corridors, is not supportive of district elections, and in opposition to deferring voters the opportunity to vote.

Barry (last name inaudible) - spoke in support of Maps D & E.

Mrs. Cho - spoke in support of Map B.

Lisa Larkin - the jagged edges of the districts are the actual neighborhood associations.

For information only. No action required.

Meeting recessed at 8:17 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 8:30 p.m.

Chair Paul Frank apologized for earlier comments and doesn't want anyone to be discouraged from providing public comment.

5.4. Commission Review and Discussion on Public Comments Received

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to lead a discussion by the Commission on the public comments received during the thirty (30) day period following publication of the six (6) draft maps and preliminary redistricting plan. All public comments received are available for review on the City's redistricting website. This agenda item will include a brief overview and discussion of comments received regarding communities of interest, expressions of support on a specific map with further proposed modifications, and expressions of support for a specific map or maps. The Commission will also consider whether any specific recommendations regarding communities of interest or proposed map edits should be included in the interactive mapping editing session in agenda item #5.6.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5235 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

Susan Rohan - requested that staff confirm that the oral testimony and call-in testimony has not been printed for the commissioners.

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell confirmed that the oral testimony and call-in testimony has not been printed for the commissioners but is available on the website in a video or audio recording immediately following the meeting.

Ellen Debach-Riley - read her public testimony into the record that the Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association supports Map E.

Motion by Commissioner Julia Sweeney, seconded by Commissioner Karen McPhail, that the Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission commit to preserving historic Roseville in a single City Council district by establishing a rule that any map that divides that specific Roseville community will either be a) modified to preserve historic Roseville in a single district, or b) removed from consideration. For the purpose of this motion, historic Roseville is defined as the following seven neighborhood associations: Historic Sierra Vista, Los Cerritos, Folsom Road, Roseville Heights, Cherry Glenn, Hillcrest, and Thieles Manor.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Cuthbertson, McPhail, Sweeney

Roll Call Vote: Noes: Borowiak, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, O'Keefe, Waggoner, Waldrop, Willoughby

Motion failed.

For information only. No action required.

5.5. Commission Discussion Whether to Remove Any Draft Maps from Further Discussion

The Commission will have a discussion regarding whether it would like to remove any of the six (6) draft maps from further consideration. This item is intended to narrow the focus down from six (6) draft maps to a smaller number of Commission-preferred maps that would continue forward in the process for interactive map editing in agenda item #5.6.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

Lisa Larkin - shouldn't remove any maps until maps with changes have been reviewed.

April Marskell - wondered the status of Map 7.

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell responded that Map 7 will be introduced in Item 5.6.

Carol Weaver - spoke on not removing any maps from consideration until edits have been reviewed, heard a lot of public comment in support of Map B but speakers didn't have a lot of passion, believes similar neighborhoods and houses should be kept together.

Robert Dugan - believes Maps, D, E, & F should be removed due to the number of deferred voters.

Kathleen Crawford - doesn't care what district Sun City is in as long as it is kept whole, and believes that Map C should be removed from consideration as it was created to accommodate for planned growth.

Jay Reed - believes Maps, D, E, & F should be removed due to the number of deferred voters.

Einar Maisch - thought it odd that so many people spoke in support of Maps D, E & F but didn't care which one. All three maps have the same number of people in District 4 that would no longer be in District 4.

Steve Cho - the individuals moved out of District 4 by a new map would defer voters for six years, not 2 years.

Motion by Commissioner Karen McPhail, seconded by Commissioner Kevin Waggoner, to remove Map F from further consideration.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Cuthbertson, Frank, McPhail, O'Keefe, Waggoner, Waldrop, Willoughby

Noes: Borowiak, Griffith, Ludwig, Sweeney

5.6. Interactive Map Editing Session

During this agenda item, the Commission will engage in an interactive and live map editing session with its demographer, FLO Analytics. This interactive and live map editing session would only include the maps selected by the Commission for further consideration pursuant to agenda item #5.5. The intent of this item is for the Commission to discuss and analyze any proposed comments, edits or changes to the remaining maps. The City's demographer will be making Commission-requested edits in real time and displaying those changes on screen to provide visual feedback, as well as ensuring that the proposed edits to the draft maps comply with the law and render a map feasible. CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

FLO Analytics Senior GIS Analyst Jed Roberts presented edits to Maps A-E.

Meeting recessed at 10:48 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 10:52 p.m.

Einar Maisch - spoke on changes he made to Map C.

Chair Paul Frank - spoke on changes he made to Map C.

Lisa Larkin - spoke on changes she made to various versions of Map D and Map E.

Einar Maisch - spoke on changes he made to Map E.

Kathleen Crawford -spoke in support of Map E.

Derek Pell - spoke in support of Map E.

Lisa Larkin - should not consider voter deferral as criteria for picking a map.

Gary Gutowsky - spoke in support of Map E with adjustments.

Carol Weaver - spoke in support of Map E with or without adjustments, and Map A1.

Ellen Debach-Riley - spoke in support of Map E with adjustments.

Susan Rohan - spoke in support of compromise when choosing a map.

For information only. No action required.

5.7. Commission Selection of a Proposed Final Map

Following the interactive map editing session, the Commission will have an open discussion on whether to eliminate any of the draft maps edited during agenda item #5.6 from further consideration. This item is intended to narrow down the remaining maps, including any edited maps, to those maps preferred by the Commission. After the draft maps are narrowed down further (if at all), the Commission will select a proposed final map using the process outlined during the discussion in agenda item #5.2.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

Motion by Commissioner Julia Sweeney, seconded by Commissioner Karen McPhail, to select Map E with Larkin adjustments, as the proposed final map.

Motion amended by Commissioner Julia Sweeney, seconded by Commissioner Bryan Ludwig, to select Map E with January 21, 2022 Larkin adjustments, for further consideration.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Cuthbertson, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, Sweeney, Waggoner

Noes: Borowiak, Frank, O'Keefe, Waldrop, Willoughby

Motion Passed.

Motion by Commissioner Jefferson Willoughby, seconded by Vice Chair Renee

Borowiak, to move Map B with Maisch and McPhail adjustments forward for further consideration.

Motion amended by Commissioner Jefferson Willoughby, seconded by Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe, to move Map B with Maisch and McPhail adjustments, and Map C with Frank adjustments, forward for further consideration.

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

Motion by Commissioner Julia Sweeney, seconded by Commissioner Brian Ludwig, to adopt Map E1 with January 21, 2022 Larkin adjustments.

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

Motion by Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe, seconded by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, to move forward Map B1 with Maisch and McPhail adjustments as the proposed Final Map.

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

5.8. Set Dates for any Required Future Action by the Commission

Following the selection of a proposed final map, the Commission will have an open discussion regarding the proposed final map and how much it differs, if at all, from one of the six (6) draft maps selected by the Commission for further consideration at its December 20, 2021 meeting. Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide the Commission with options for further map publication and public hearings, if necessary. The Commission will then make a decision on whether further action is necessary prior to adoption of a final map.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

Derek Pell - congratulated commission and spoke in support of commission's decision.

For information only. No action required.

5.9. Commission Direction to Staff to Publish Proposed Final Map and Prepare Final Redistricting Report

Following the Commission's selection of a proposed final map and a determination of any future action(s) required to adopt a final map, the Commission should direct staff to publish the proposed final map and prepare the final redistricting report in accordance with Article XI, Section 11.10 of the City Charter.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

Motion by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, seconded by Commissioner Holly Cuthbertson, to direct the City Clerk to publish Draft Map B1 for at least 30 calendar days prior to the adoption of a final redistricting report and final map, and to direct staff to prepare and publish the preliminary redistricting plan for Draft Map B1.

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

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Jefferson Willoughby, seconded by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.



MINUTES
February 3, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us/IRC

The meeting may be viewed on Comcast channel 14,
Consolidated Communications channel 73, and AT&T U-Verse.
This meeting will also be video streamed live and available on the City's website and
YouTube channel.

Members of the public may offer public comment by phone:
Dial in Phone Number: 916-774-5353

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Cuthbertson, Frank, Ludwig, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney, Waggoner,
Waldrop, Willoughby

Absent: Boroviak, Griffith

Alternates Present: Dohner, Kuehn

Alternates Absent: Slaughter

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Paul Frank welcomed incoming City Clerk Carmen Avalos.

No public comments received.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Overview of Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational update and overview of the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1. The Independent Redistricting Commission will also receive public comments and testimony on Draft Map B-1.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

Jay Reed - spoke in appreciation of the commission's work, he had advocated for Map C, but B1 is a good map.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Karen McPhail, seconded by Commissioner Andrew Waldrop, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.



MINUTES
February 9, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

Maidu Community Center Reception Hall
1550 Maidu Drive
Roseville, California
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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, O'Keefe,
Waggoner, Waldrop, Willoughby
Absent: McPhail, Sweeney

Alternates Present: Kuehn, Dohner
Alternates Absent: Slaughter

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Mary Griffith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Marcus Lo Duca - thanked commissioners for the public hearings, for Map B1,
and for listening.

Robert Dugan - thanked the commission, and stated people are pleased with Map B1.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Overview of Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational update and overview of the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1. The Independent Redistricting Commission will also receive public comments and testimony on Draft Map B-1.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell made the presentation.

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe, seconded by Commissioner Brian Ludwig, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: All ayes

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.



MINUTES
February 15, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

Mike Shellito Indoor Pool
10210 Fairway Drive
Roseville, California
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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Cuthbertson, Willoughby

Alternates Present: Kuehn

Alternates Absent: Dohner, Slaughter

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Julia Sweeney led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Overview of Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational update and overview of the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1. The Independent Redistricting Commission will also receive public comments and testimony on Draft Map B-1.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Mary Griffith, seconded by Commissioner Andrew Waldrop, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.



MINUTES
February 17, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

Martha Riley Library
1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
Roseville, California
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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, Ludwig, McPhail, Waggoner,
Waldrop

Commissioner Ryan O'Keefe arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Absent: Sweeney, Willoughby

Alternates Present: Kuehn

Alternates Absent: Dohner, Slaughter

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Holly Cuthbertson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Consideration of a Resolution by the Independent Redistricting Commission to Reauthorize Remote Telephonic Participation in Meetings Pursuant to the Brown Act as Amended by AB 361 for the period of February 20, 2022 – March 22, 2022

Memo from Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell providing information for consideration of a Resolution by the Independent Redistricting Commission to Reauthorize Remote Telephonic Participation in meetings pursuant to the Brown Act as amended by AB 361 for the period of February 20, 2022 – March 22, 2022.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

Motion by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, seconded by Commissioner Bryan Ludwig, to adopt a RESOLUTION to Reauthorize Remote Telephonic Participation in Meetings Pursuant to the Brown Act as amended by AB361 for the period of February 20, 2022 - March 22, 2022.

The motion passed

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

5.2. Overview of Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational update and overview of the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1. The Independent Redistricting Commission will also receive public comments and testimony on Draft Map B-1.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

Ellen Debach-Riley - thanked commission for diligence.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Karen McPhail, seconded by Commission Ryan O'Keefe, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.



MINUTES
February 22, 2022

**ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6:00 p.m.

St. John's Episcopal Church
2351 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
Roseville, California
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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Borowiak, Cuthbertson, Frank, Griffith, McPhail, O'Keefe, Sweeney,
Waldrop

Absent: Ludwig, Waggoner, Willoughby

Alternates Present: Kuehn

Alternates Absent: Dohner, Slaughter

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Richard Roccucci and Steve Chou led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Overview of Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1

Senior Deputy City Attorney Joe Mandell to provide an informational update and overview of the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and Draft Map B-1. The Independent Redistricting Commission will also receive public comments and testimony on Draft Map B-1.

CONTACT: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

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

No public comment received.

For information only. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Vice Chair Renee Borowiak, seconded by Commissioner Andrew Waldrop, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: all ayes

Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.



ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMUNICATION

Title: Consider Resolution to Adopt Final Redistricting Report and Final Map based on Draft Map B-1

Contact: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 2/28/2022
Item #: 6.1.

RECOMMENDATION

The Independent Redistricting Commission will consider Draft Map B-1 for adoption as the Final Map pursuant to Subsection C of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter and determine whether to direct staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk.

BACKGROUND

The Independent Redistricting Commission will consider Draft Map B-1 for adoption as the Final Map pursuant to Subsection C of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter and determine whether to direct staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk.

Section 11.10 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter sets forth the procedure for the Independent Redistricting Commission to follow when approving a final map. The Commission shall file a preliminary redistricting plan and draft map with the City Clerk, along with a written statement of findings and reasons for adoption, which shall include the criteria employed in the process and a full analysis and explanation of decisions made by the Commission. The City Clerk shall publish the preliminary redistricting plan and draft map at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the adoption of a final redistricting report and final map.

At its January 24, 2022 meeting, the Independent Redistricting Commission selected Draft Map B-1 as the final draft map. Following the Commission's selection of Draft Map B-1 as the proposed final map, the City Attorney's Office provided the opinion to the Commission that Draft Map B-1 should be considered a new "draft" map for purposes of subsection A of Section 11.10, Article XI of the Roseville City Charter due to the fact that the edits that created Draft Map B-1 resulted in the shift of a portion of the population from one district to another.

In an effort to provide the public with further opportunity to comment on Draft Map B-1, the

Commission held five (5) more public hearings in accordance with subsection B of Section 11.10, Article XI of the Roseville City Charter. Dates and locations of the public hearings to receive public comment on Draft Map B-1 were as follows:

- Public Hearing #1 – February 3, 2022 at 6pm
City Council Chambers – 311 Vernon St.
- Public Hearing #2 – February 9, 2022 at 6pm
Maidu Community Center – 1550 Maidu Dr.
- Public Hearing #3 – February 15, 2022 at 6pm
Mike Shellito Indoor Pool – 10210 Fairway Dr.
- Public Hearing #4 – February 17, 2022 at 6pm
Martha Riley Library – 1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
- Public Hearing #5 – February 22, 2022 at 6pm
St. John's Episcopal Church – 2351 Pleasant Grove Blvd.

Subsection C of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter states that, “[a]fter having heard comments from the public on the preliminary redistricting plan and draft map, the Commission shall adopt a final redistricting report and final map.”

During this agenda item, the Independent Redistricting Commission will consider whether to pass the attached “Resolution of the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City of Roseville Adopting a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map” that would adopt Draft Map B-1 as the Final Map pursuant to Subsection C of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter and direct staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk.

If approved, the attached “Resolution of the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City of Roseville Adopting a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map” would also confirm that the Commission has given consideration to the provisions and applicable decisions of the courts related to the Fair Maps Act of 2019 as amended in 2020, codified at California Elections Code sections 21500 to 21509, the provisions of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter, and any other applicable state and federal law, and after giving consideration to those provisions and applicable decisions of the courts, the Independent Redistricting Commission adjusts, changes, and establishes the district boundaries for the Roseville City Council as set forth in Draft Map B-1, and that they shall constitute the boundaries of the City Council districts of the City of Roseville for subsequent elections until readjustment is required by law.

If the “Resolution of the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City of Roseville Adopting a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map” is approved by a majority of the Commission, the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map have the force and effect of law and are effective thirty (30) calendar days after they are filed with the City Clerk and shall remain effective until the adoption of new district boundaries following the next federal decennial census. The City Council may not rescind, supersede, or revise the district boundaries adopted by the Commission.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joe Mandell, Senior Deputy City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution for Adoption

Final Redistricting Report

A RESOLUTION OF THE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ADOPTING A FINAL REDISTRICTING REPORT AND FINAL MAP

WHEREAS, the Independent Redistricting Commission (“Commission”) was created pursuant to Article XI of the Roseville City Charter to establish a redistricting process in the City of Roseville that is open and transparent and allows public comment on the drawing of City council district boundaries, ensure that the district boundaries are drawn according to the redistricting criteria set forth in Section 11.09 of the City Charter and applicable state and federal laws, and ensure that the redistricting process is conducted with integrity, fairness, and without personal or political considerations; and

WHEREAS, Section 11.10 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter sets forth the procedure for the Independent Redistricting Commission to follow when approving a final map; and

WHEREAS, at its January 24, 2022 meeting, the Independent Redistricting Commission selected Draft Map B-1 as the final draft map; and

WHEREAS, on January 27, 2022 the Commission filed a preliminary redistricting plan and draft map with the City Clerk based on Draft Map B-1, along with a written statement of findings and reasons for adoption, which includes the criteria employed in the process and a full analysis and explanation of decisions made by the Commission pursuant to Subsection A of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter; and

WHEREAS, the City Clerk has published the preliminary redistricting plan and draft map based on Draft Map B-1 for at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to consideration of the adoption of a final redistricting report and final map by the Commission pursuant to Subsection A of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter; and

WHEREAS, in February 2022, the Commission held five (5) public hearings, including one (1) public hearing in each existing council district, to receive public comments on Draft Map B-1 in accordance with subsection B of Section 11.10, Article XI of the Roseville City Charter; and

WHEREAS, after having heard comments from the public on the preliminary redistricting plan and Draft Map B-1, the Commission desires to adopt a final redistricting report and final map pursuant to Subsection C of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City of Roseville that:

Section 1. Recitals. The Recitals set forth above are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. Compliance with Applicable Law. The Commission has given consideration to the provisions and applicable decisions of the courts related to the Fair Maps Act of 2019 as amended in 2020, codified at California Elections Code sections 21500 to 21509, the provisions of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter, and any other applicable state and federal law, and after giving consideration to those provisions and applicable decisions of the courts, the Independent Redistricting Commission hereby adjusts, changes, and establishes the district boundaries for the Roseville City Council as set forth in Draft Map B-1 and reflected in Exhibit A hereto, and they shall constitute and are hereby established as the boundaries of the City Council districts of the City of Roseville for subsequent elections until readjustment is required by law.

Section 3. Adoption of Final Redistricting Report and Final Map. The Commission hereby adopts Draft Map B-1, attached as Exhibit A hereto, as the Final Map pursuant to Subsection C of Article XI, Section 11.10 of the Roseville City Charter and directs staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk. The Commission-adopted Final Redistricting Report and Final Map have the force and effect of law and are effective thirty (30) calendar days after they are filed with the City Clerk and shall remain effective until the adoption of new district boundaries following the next federal decennial census. The City Council may not rescind, supersede, or revise the district boundaries adopted by the Commission.

Section 4. Effect on Incumbents. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Resolution, and in accordance with Section 11.11 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter, the term of office of any councilmember who has been elected and whose term of office has not expired shall not be affected by any change in the boundaries of the district from which the councilmember was elected. Accordingly, upon any redistricting pursuant to the provisions of this Resolution, each incumbent councilmember will continue, during the remainder of the councilmember's term, to represent the electoral district to which the councilmember was elected prior to such redistricting.

Section 5. Dissolution of Commission. In accordance with Section 11.14 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter, the Commission shall cease operations and dissolve on the ninety-first (91st) day following approval of the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map, unless a referendum against the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map has qualified or a lawsuit has been filed to enjoin or invalidate the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map, in which case the Commission shall continue operations until a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map is implemented by the City. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if a lawsuit to enjoin or invalidate a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map is filed later than the ninety-first (91st) day following approval of a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map, the Commission shall automatically revive and continue operations during the pendency of such lawsuit and until a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map is implemented by the City.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 2022, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COMMISSIONERS:

NOES COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN COMMISSIONERS:

CHAIR
Independent Redistricting Commission

ATTEST:

City Clerk

EXHIBIT A

TO

RESOLUTION OF THE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION OF THE CITY
OF ROSEVILLE ADOPTING A FINAL REDISTRICTING REPORT AND FINAL MAP

(Draft Map B-1 adopted as the Final Map on February 28, 2022)

Total Population Deviation

Ideal Population = 29,594
Overall Range = 9.4%

City Council Districts - Draft Map B-1


City of Roseville | Independent Redistricting Commission
January 25, 2022

Draft Map B-1 is an adjusted version of Draft Map B. The adjustments were made by the Independent Redistricting Committee on January 25, 2022 following a series of public hearings in January 2022. Draft Map B was originally published for public consideration on December 20, 2021.

Total Population & Deviation Per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation from Ideal
1	29,453	-141	-0.5%
2	31,058	1,464	4.9%
3	28,274	-1,320	-4.5%
4	28,854	-740	-2.5%
5	30,330	736	2.5%

California Database Adjusted (non-censused persons re-districted) 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary File - 100% representation



Total Population by Race/Ethnicity Per District

District	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	64.2%	1.2%	0.6%	8.3%	0.3%	0.6%	6.2%	15.1%
2	59.9%	2.0%	0.8%	5.3%	0.3%	0.8%	6.3%	24.5%
3	60.2%	2.2%	0.8%	14.0%	0.3%	0.3%	6.8%	14.9%
4	64.3%	2.4%	0.2%	12.3%	0.2%	0.2%	6.1%	12.0%
5	53.0%	2.7%	0.3%	21.4%	0.3%	0.4%	7.3%	14.1%

California Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary File - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin

Citizens of Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity Per District

District	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	60.2%	2.0%	0.2%	3.4%	0.1%	0.2%	10.3%
2	70.2%	1.9%	0.2%	3.4%	0.1%	0.2%	20.8%
3	70.2%	2.7%	0.1%	9.8%	0.2%	0.2%	11.9%
4	74.5%	1.3%	0.2%	10.8%	0.1%	0.2%	8.6%
5	62.6%	2.9%	0.1%	13.3%	0.4%	0.4%	12.4%

California Database Adjusted 2012-2017 American Community Survey Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin. Special tabulation. Reporting of estimates from seed to summation of percentages not equal to 100% +/- 0.1%.





INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

Final Redistricting Report

February 28, 2022

Background and History

Every ten (10) years, after the U.S. Census, the City of Roseville must re-establish the boundaries for City Council districts. The resulting council district boundaries must be balanced in population in accordance with state and federal rules governing the redistricting process.

In 2021, the Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission, made up entirely of community members, was formed to establish district boundaries in a process that is open and transparent and allows public comment on the drawing of City Council district boundaries. The redistricting process also ensures that the district boundaries are drawn according to the redistricting criteria set forth in the City Charter and applicable state and federal laws, and that the process is conducted with integrity, fairness, and without personal or political considerations.

The Commission consists of eleven (11) members and five (5) alternates. In a public setting, the City Clerk randomly selected the initial eight (8) members of the Commission from the qualified applicants, two (2) each from four (4) geographic quadrants of the City: a northwest quadrant, a northeast quadrant, a southeast quadrant, and a southwest quadrant. The commissioners selected by the City Clerk then selected three (3) at-large commissioners and five (5) at-large alternates from the remaining applicants on the basis of the applicant's relevant analytical skills, ability to comprehend and apply the applicable state and federal legal requirements, familiarity with the City's neighborhoods and communities, familiarity with the City's demographics and geography, ability to be impartial, and apparent ability to work cooperatively with other commissioners.

As an independent body, the Commission is empowered to adopt the district boundaries, without City Council approval. The district map approved by the Commission must follow all local, state and federal laws, be substantially equal in population, be geographically contiguous, and follow all of the substantive and procedural requirements listed in Article XI of the Roseville City Charter. As further detailed below, the Commission is required to hold at least five (5) public hearings to consider the draft map(s), one (1) in each council district, prior to adopting a final map. The following section sets forth the redistricting criteria to be considered by the Commission in approving a final map.

Redistricting Criteria for Final Map

Section 11.09 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter sets forth the following redistricting criteria for the Independent Redistricting Commission to consider when approving a final map:

A. The Commission shall draw its final map so that:

1. Council districts are substantially equal in population as required by the United States Constitution. Population equality shall be based on the total population of residents of the City as determined by the latest federal decennial census.
2. Council district boundaries comply with the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, and any other requirement of state or federal law applicable to charter cities.

B. The Commission shall adopt district boundaries using the following criteria as set forth in the following order of priority:

1. To the extent practicable, council districts shall be geographically contiguous. Areas that meet only at the points of adjoining corners are not contiguous. Areas that are separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not contiguous. Areas that are separated by a railyard or a highway are not contiguous.
2. To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of any local neighborhood, local neighborhood association boundaries, or local community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division. A “community of interest” is a population that shares common social or economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.
3. Council district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents. To the extent practicable, council districts shall be bounded by natural and artificial barriers, by streets, or by the boundaries of the City.
4. Where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria in this subdivision, council districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness in a manner that nearby areas of population are not bypassed in favor of more distant populations.

5. Other Commission-adopted criteria that do not conflict with the other requirements and criteria listed in this section or with state or federal law.

C. The Commission shall not adopt council district boundaries for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.

D. The Commission shall not consider place of residence of any individual, including any incumbent or political candidate, in the creation of a map. (Added by Measure R in the General Municipal Election on November 3, 2020.)

Procedure for Adoption of Final Redistricting Report and Final Map

Section 11.10 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter sets forth the following procedure for the Independent Redistricting Commission to follow when approving a final map:

A. The Commission shall file a preliminary redistricting plan and draft map with the City Clerk, along with a written statement of findings and reasons for adoption, which shall include the criteria employed in the process and a full analysis and explanation of decisions made by the Commission. The City Clerk shall publish the preliminary redistricting plan and draft map at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the adoption of a final redistricting report and final map.

B. During the thirty (30) calendar day period after publication, the Commission shall hold at least five (5) public hearings, including one (1) public hearing in each existing council district.

C. After having heard comments from the public on the preliminary redistricting plan and draft map, the Commission shall adopt a final redistricting report and final map. A Commission-adopted final redistricting report and final map has the force and effect of law and is effective thirty (30) calendar days after it is filed with the City Clerk and shall remain effective until the adoption of new district boundaries following the next federal decennial census. The City Council may not rescind, supersede, or revise the district boundaries adopted by the Commission.

D. After the final map is adopted, the City Clerk shall number each council district such that, for as many residents as possible, the number of the council district they reside in remains the same.

E. The final redistricting report and final map shall be subject to referendum in the same manner as ordinances.

F. If the Commission does not adopt council district boundaries by the deadlines set forth in this article, the City Attorney shall immediately file a petition in Placer County Superior Court for an order adopting council district boundaries. The map prescribed by the court shall be used for all subsequent council elections until a final redistricting report and final map are

adopted by the Commission to replace it. (Added by Measure R in the General Municipal Election on November 3, 2020.)

Six (6) Preliminary Draft Maps for Public Consideration

At its December 20, 2021 meeting, the Independent Redistricting Commission selected a group of six (6) draft maps for further public consideration at six (6) public hearings in January 2022. The six (6) draft maps that were approved at the December 20, 2021 meeting are attached below to this report and have been labeled as Draft Map A, Draft Map B, etc. Each attached draft map contains written findings, criteria employed in the decision process, and a full analysis and explanation of the reasons supporting further Commission and public consideration.

For ease of review, the six (6) draft maps that were selected on December 20, 2021 for further consideration can be summarized as follows:

- Draft Map A – Formerly “Public Map # 1”
- Draft Map B – Formerly “Public Map # 6”
- Draft Map C – Formerly “Public Map # 8”
- Draft Map D – Formerly “Public Map # 14”
- Draft Map E – Formerly “Public Map # 15”
- Draft Map F – Formerly “Public Map # 25”

The six (6) draft maps selected by the Commission for further consideration were posted by the City Clerk on December 22, 2021 and were available for at least thirty (30) days for public review. During that thirty (30) day period following publication by the City Clerk, the Commission held six (6) public hearings:

- Public Hearing #1 – January 6, 2022 at 6pm
Maidu Community Center – 1550 Maidu Dr.
- Public Hearing #2 – January 11, 2022 at 6pm
City Council Chambers – 311 Vernon St.
- Public Hearing #3 – January 13, 2022 at 6pm
Mike Shellito Indoor Pool – 10210 Fairway Dr.
- Public Hearing #4 – January 15, 2022 at 2pm
City Council Chambers – 311 Vernon St.
- Public Hearing #5 – January 18, 2022 at 6pm
Martha Riley Library – 1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
- Public Hearing #6 – January 20, 2022 at 6pm
St. John’s Episcopal Church – 2351 Pleasant Grove Blvd.

Selection of Final Draft Maps

Following the six (6) public hearings, the Commission held a meeting on January 24, 2022 to consider the selection and adoption of a final map. At its January 24, 2022 meeting, the Commission, by motion, removed Draft Map F from further consideration, leaving five (5) remaining draft maps. Subsequent to the removal of Draft Map F from further consideration, the Commission analyzed various proposed edits to the five (5) remaining Draft Maps A – E. After analyzing the various proposed edits to Draft Maps A – E, the Commission voted by motion to only consider three (3) maps moving forward - the edited versions of the following maps – Draft Map B, Draft Map C, and Draft Map E. For ease of reference and to distinguish the remaining edited maps from the original draft maps, the edited maps from the January 24, 2022 meeting were labeled by the Commission as:

- Draft Map B-1
- Draft Map C-1
- Draft Map E-1

Selection of Draft Map B-1

On January 24, 2022, after receiving further public input regarding Draft Maps B-1, C-1, and E-1, the Commission voted by motion to move forward with Draft Map B-1 as the proposed final map. The motion passed by a vote of 7 - 4.

Following the selection of Draft Map B-1 as the proposed final map, the City Attorney's Office provided the opinion to the Commission that Draft Map B-1 should be considered a new "draft" map for purposes of subsection A of Section 11.10, Article XI of the Roseville City Charter due to the fact that the edits that created Draft Map B-1 resulted in the shift of a portion of the population from one district to another.

Additional Public Hearings to Consider Comments on Draft Map B-1

In an effort to provide the public with further opportunity to comment on Draft Map B-1, the Commission held five (5) more public hearings during the thirty (30) day period following publication of Draft Map B-1 by the City Clerk on January 27, 2022, in accordance with subsection B of Section 11.10, Article XI of the Roseville City Charter.

In February 2022, the Commission held the five (5) public hearings on Draft Map B-1 at the following locations:

- Public Hearing #1 – February 3, 2022 at 6pm
City Council Chambers – 311 Vernon St.
- Public Hearing #2 – February 9, 2022 at 6pm
Maidu Community Center – 1550 Maidu Dr.
- Public Hearing #3 – February 15, 2022 at 6pm
Mike Shellito Indoor Pool – 10210 Fairway Dr.

- Public Hearing #4 – February 17, 2022 at 6pm
Martha Riley Library – 1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd.
- Public Hearing #5 – February 22, 2022 at 6pm
St. John’s Episcopal Church – 2351 Pleasant Grove Blvd.

Adoption of Final Redistricting Report and Final Map

Following the additional five (5) public hearings to receive public comment on Draft Map B-1, the Commission held a public meeting on February 28, 2022 to consider adoption of Draft Map B-1 as the Final Map and this report as the Final Redistricting Report. At that meeting on February 28, 2022, the Independent Redistricting Commission passed a motion by the roll call vote of ____ aye votes and ____ no votes to adopt the “Resolution of the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City of Roseville Adopting a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map” and approved Draft Map B-1 as the Final Map and this report as the Final Redistricting Report. The Final Map and Resolution are attached to this Final Redistricting Report. All other maps considered by the Commission at public hearings are also attached to this Final Redistricting Report for future reference and use with subsequent redistricting efforts.

Effect of Redistricting on Incumbents

In accordance with Section 11.11 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter, the term of office of any councilmember who has been elected and whose term of office has not expired shall not be affected by any change in the boundaries of the district from which the councilmember was elected. Accordingly, upon any redistricting pursuant to the provisions of this Resolution, each incumbent councilmember will continue, during the remainder of the councilmember’s term, to represent the electoral district to which the councilmember was elected prior to such redistricting.

Dissolution of Commission

Section 11.14 of Article XI of the Roseville City Charter states that the Independent Redistricting Commission shall cease operations and dissolve on the ninety-first (91st) day following approval of the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map (91 days after February 28, 2022 is May 30, 2022), unless a referendum against the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map has qualified or a lawsuit has been filed to enjoin or invalidate the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map, in which case the Commission shall continue operations until a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map is implemented by the City. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if a lawsuit to enjoin or invalidate a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map is filed later than the ninety-first (91st) day following approval of a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map, the Commission shall automatically revive and continue operations during the pendency of such lawsuit and until a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map is implemented by the City.

Please visit www.roseville.ca.us/redistricting for further details on the 2021-22 redistricting process in the City of Roseville.

FINAL MAP

**Resolution of the Independent Redistricting Commission of the City
of Roseville Adopting a Final Redistricting Report and Final Map**

**** (To be inserted when approved) ****


DRAFT MAP B-1

Adopted by the Commission as the Final Map on February 28, 2022

Total Population Deviation

Ideal Population = 29,594

Overall Range = 9.4%



Draft Map B-1 is an adjusted version of Draft Map B. The adjustments were made by the Independent Redistricting Commission on January 25, 2022 following a series of public hearings in January 2022. Draft Map B was originally published for public consideration on December 20, 2021.

Total Population & Deviation Per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation from Ideal
1	29,453	-141	-0.5%
2	31,050	1,464	4.9%
3	28,274	-1,320	-4.5%
4	28,854	-740	-2.5%
5	30,330	736	2.5%

California Database Adjusted (Incorporated persons reallocation) 2020 Census PL 14-171 Redistricting Data Summary File - Total Population.

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity Per District


District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.7%	1.9%	0.4%	8.7%	0.2%	0.4%	6.2%	15.3%
2	59.3%	2.0%	0.4%	5.5%	0.3%	0.4%	6.7%	24.3%
3	60.2%	2.8%	0.3%	14.0%	0.4%	0.3%	6.6%	14.9%
4	66.3%	2.4%	0.3%	12.0%	0.2%	0.3%	6.1%	12.0%
5	53.0%	2.9%	0.3%	21.4%	0.3%	0.4%	7.3%	14.1%

California Database Adjusted (2010) 2010 Census PL 14-171 Redistricting Data Summary File - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

Citizens of Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity Per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	60.8%	2.0%	0.1%	5.2%	0.2%	1.7%	10.3%
2	70.2%	1.9%	0.2%	3.6%	0.1%	3.0%	20.8%
3	70.3%	2.9%	0.1%	9.6%	0.2%	4.3%	11.9%
4	74.3%	1.3%	0.2%	10.3%	0.1%	2.3%	8.4%
5	42.4%	2.9%	0.1%	18.2%	0.4%	2.8%	12.4%

California Database Adjusted (2010) 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (± 0.1%).



City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map B-1 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/25/2022



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	9.4%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	29,453	-141	-0.5%
2	31,058	1,464	4.9%
3	28,274	-1,320	-4.5%
4	28,854	-740	-2.5%
5	30,330	736	2.5%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.7%	1.9%	0.4%	8.7%	0.2%	0.6%	6.2%	15.3%
2	59.9%	2.0%	0.6%	5.5%	0.3%	0.6%	6.7%	24.5%
3	60.2%	2.8%	0.3%	14.0%	0.6%	0.5%	6.8%	14.9%
4	66.3%	2.4%	0.2%	12.3%	0.2%	0.5%	6.1%	12.0%
5	53.0%	2.9%	0.3%	21.6%	0.3%	0.4%	7.3%	14.1%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	80.8%	2.0%	0.1%	5.2%	0.2%	1.7%	10.3%
2	70.2%	1.9%	0.2%	3.6%	0.1%	3.0%	20.8%
3	70.3%	2.9%	0.1%	9.8%	0.3%	4.3%	11.9%
4	76.5%	1.3%	0.2%	10.8%	0.1%	2.3%	8.6%
5	62.6%	2.9%	0.1%	18.3%	0.4%	2.8%	12.6%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map B-1 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/25/2022



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	3	60%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	39	87%	Diamond Oaks, Fiddymont Farm, Foothills Junction, Kaseberg-kingswood, Stoneridge, Woodcreek Oaks

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.31	1.81	0.38	0.76	0.83
2	0.26	1.95	0.49	0.74	0.76
3	0.28	1.89	0.32	0.68	0.74
4	0.68	1.22	0.62	0.94	0.78
5	0.27	1.93	0.35	0.60	0.80

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map B-1 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/25/2022




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2022-01-25 00:47:39
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File: gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb\|Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_B1

Draft Map B-1

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



Total deviation
9.4%

87% of
neighborhoods
preserved

District #5 is
2.5% above
the ideal



DRAFT MAP C-1

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map C - 1 1/20/2022 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/21/2022



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	9.4%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	29,564	-30	-0.1%
2	28,209	-1,385	-4.7%
3	29,277	-317	-1.1%
4	31,003	1,409	4.8%
5	29,916	322	1.1%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	67.4%	1.8%	0.4%	6.2%	0.2%	0.6%	6.3%	17.0%
2	59.4%	2.0%	0.6%	6.3%	0.3%	0.5%	6.6%	24.3%
3	60.8%	2.7%	0.3%	15.0%	0.5%	0.5%	6.7%	13.7%
4	63.7%	2.4%	0.2%	14.3%	0.2%	0.4%	6.5%	12.3%
5	54.3%	3.1%	0.3%	19.7%	0.4%	0.5%	7.0%	14.7%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	78.7%	2.3%	0.1%	3.9%	0.2%	1.9%	12.9%
2	71.8%	1.6%	0.0%	4.0%	0.1%	2.8%	19.7%
3	71.2%	2.7%	0.1%	10.7%	0.4%	4.3%	10.7%
4	74.1%	1.6%	0.2%	12.3%	0.1%	2.5%	9.0%
5	65.1%	2.8%	0.3%	16.0%	0.4%	2.6%	12.4%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map C - 1 1/20/2022 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/21/2022



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	2	40%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Eureka Union School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	40	89%	Diamond Oaks, Fiddymment Farm, Harding, Hist. Sierra Vista, Pleasant Grove

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.30	1.81	0.30	0.83	0.38
2	0.28	1.89	0.45	0.72	0.97
3	0.33	1.75	0.31	0.71	0.85
4	0.28	1.89	0.28	0.62	0.56
5	0.52	1.39	0.46	0.82	0.69

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map C - 1 1/20/2022 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/21/2022




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2022-01-21 17:20:33
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File:gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb|||Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_C_Frank_20220120

Draft Map C – 1

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



Total deviation
9.4%

89% of
neighborhoods
preserved

District #4 and #5
are 4.8% and 1.1%
above the ideal,
respectively

Formerly Public Map #8

Author Comment: This map focuses on creating compact, contiguous districts. This map has a very low total deviation (4.4%). This allows for planned growth to be shared between the western two districts (numbered 4 and 5 on this map). To the extent possible, natural and physical boundaries are used to create district boundaries and communities of interest are respected.



DRAFT MAP E-1

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map E - 1 1/21/2022 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/21/2022



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	7.1%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	30,505	911	3.1%
2	30,048	454	1.5%
3	30,067	473	1.6%
4	28,399	-1,195	-4.0%
5	28,950	-644	-2.2%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.3%	1.8%	0.4%	10.0%	0.2%	0.6%	6.1%	14.6%
2	60.3%	2.3%	0.5%	6.6%	0.4%	0.6%	6.7%	22.6%
3	61.2%	2.6%	0.2%	14.6%	0.4%	0.5%	7.1%	13.3%
4	61.1%	2.5%	0.4%	9.9%	0.4%	0.5%	6.6%	18.7%
5	56.5%	2.8%	0.2%	21.1%	0.3%	0.3%	6.5%	12.2%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	80.0%	1.8%	0.1%	6.2%	0.3%	1.6%	10.0%
2	69.8%	3.0%	0.1%	4.7%	0.1%	4.1%	17.8%
3	72.4%	1.7%	0.2%	12.7%	0.2%	2.9%	10.0%
4	71.9%	1.7%	0.2%	6.9%	0.1%	2.8%	16.3%
5	67.3%	2.7%	0.1%	17.0%	0.4%	2.3%	9.7%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map E -1 1/21/2022 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/21/2022



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	3	60%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	42	93%	Highland Reserve, Pleasant Grove, Sun City

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.40	1.58	0.51	0.81	0.75
2	0.35	1.69	0.40	0.71	0.74
3	0.39	1.61	0.41	0.77	0.62
4	0.24	2.05	0.40	0.63	0.91
5	0.31	1.80	0.46	0.67	0.88

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map E - 1 1/21/2022 – Districts Summary Statistics

01/21/2022




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2022-01-21 17:53:12
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File:gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb\|Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_E_Larkin_20220121

Draft Map E – 1 1/21

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



Total deviation
7.1%

93% of neighborhoods preserved
(Sun City split affects no population)

District #5 is 2.2% below the ideal, leaving room for expected growth

Formerly Public Map #15
Author Comment: Contiguous, communities of interest together, EVERY neighborhood association intact with the exception of Sun City which has one tiny piece across Blue Oaks (Note: in the program, this piece is showing up in both Blue Oaks AND the Sun City neighborhood associations). All Police districts together with the exception of 26 (one tiny block upper right corner - zero population- Sun City). All but 5 specific plans together and one of those is Sun City because one block that crosses over Blue Oaks. I believe a 8.2% deviation, with less population in D5 to allow for more growth. Compact, and natural lines were possible.



DRAFT MAP A

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map A – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	9.5%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	30,505	911	3.1%
2	30,612	1,018	3.4%
3	30,666	1,072	3.6%
4	28,339	-1,255	-4.2%
5	27,847	-1,747	-5.9%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.3%	1.8%	0.4%	10.0%	0.2%	0.6%	6.1%	14.6%
2	59.9%	2.1%	0.6%	5.6%	0.3%	0.6%	6.6%	24.4%
3	60.4%	2.9%	0.2%	14.1%	0.5%	0.5%	6.9%	14.4%
4	67.5%	2.1%	0.3%	8.7%	0.3%	0.5%	6.2%	14.3%
5	51.1%	3.2%	0.2%	24.3%	0.3%	0.4%	7.2%	13.3%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	80.0%	1.8%	0.1%	6.2%	0.3%	1.6%	10.0%
2	69.9%	2.7%	0.1%	3.6%	0.1%	2.6%	21.0%
3	70.3%	2.5%	0.0%	12.2%	0.2%	4.5%	10.1%
4	77.7%	0.9%	0.3%	6.7%	0.1%	2.4%	11.5%
5	60.0%	3.6%	0.1%	21.8%	0.5%	2.8%	11.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map A – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	3	60%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	39	87%	Blue Oaks, Harding, Hist. Sierra Vista, Quail Glen, Stoneridge, Sun City

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.43	1.52	0.50	0.83	0.79
2	0.30	1.81	0.47	0.71	0.97
3	0.35	1.68	0.39	0.76	0.69
4	0.62	1.28	0.51	0.89	0.91
5	0.31	1.81	0.42	0.63	0.87

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map A – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2021-12-21 08:54:02
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File: gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb\|Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_A

Draft Map A

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



Total deviation
9.5%

89% of
neighborhoods
preserved

District #5 is
5.9% below the
ideal, leaving
room for
expected growth

Formerly Public Map #1 (note: one block in northeast Sun City with zero population was moved from District 4 to District 3 to meet the contiguity criterion)

Author comment: This map is generally divided evenly by population with a deviation of 9.5 (District 3 plus +3.6, District 5 minus -5.9). Given District 5 expected growth over the next 10 years, it makes sense that it has the lowest current population.

Communities of interest priority is to neighborhood associations. All populated neighborhood associations are kept intact except Blue Oaks and Quail Glen, which are each shared by two districts due to population considerations.

All school districts are kept in single districts except Dry Creek, which is shared by two districts due to population and geographic considerations.

All districts are contiguous and compact.



DRAFT MAP B

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map B – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	6.3%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	29,453	-141	-0.5%
2	29,752	158	0.5%
3	29,962	368	1.2%
4	28,472	-1,122	-3.8%
5	30,330	736	2.5%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.7%	1.9%	0.4%	8.7%	0.2%	0.6%	6.2%	15.3%
2	59.3%	2.0%	0.6%	5.6%	0.3%	0.6%	6.8%	24.8%
3	60.6%	2.7%	0.3%	13.4%	0.6%	0.5%	6.8%	15.1%
4	66.4%	2.4%	0.2%	12.4%	0.2%	0.5%	6.0%	11.9%
5	53.0%	2.9%	0.3%	21.6%	0.3%	0.4%	7.3%	14.1%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	80.8%	2.0%	0.1%	5.2%	0.2%	1.7%	10.3%
2	68.9%	1.8%	0.2%	3.6%	0.2%	2.9%	21.7%
3	71.6%	2.9%	0.1%	9.3%	0.3%	4.3%	11.7%
4	76.7%	1.3%	0.2%	10.9%	0.1%	2.3%	8.5%
5	62.6%	2.9%	0.1%	18.3%	0.4%	2.8%	12.6%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map B – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	3	60%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	41	91%	Fiddlyment Farm, Kaseberg-kingswood, Stoneridge, Woodcreek Oaks

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.31	1.81	0.38	0.76	0.83
2	0.27	1.92	0.46	0.75	0.76
3	0.34	1.71	0.34	0.70	0.74
4	0.62	1.27	0.62	0.94	0.77
5	0.27	1.93	0.35	0.60	0.80

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map B – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2021-12-21 08:55:22
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File: gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb\|Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_B

Draft Map B

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



District #5 is 2.5% above the ideal

Total deviation
6.3%

91% of neighborhoods preserved

Formerly Public Map #6
Author Comment: This map keeps many district boundaries in tact, while cleaning up other lines. It is generally even by population, with the deviation at 6.3%. In this map, only four neighborhood associations are shared by two districts, unlike the current districts which has eleven neighborhood associations shared by different districts.



DRAFT MAP C

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map C – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594
Overall Range	4.4%
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> < 5.0% 5.0 - 10.0% > 10.0% </div>	

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	29,576	-18	-0.1%
2	29,395	-199	-0.7%
3	30,422	828	2.8%
4	29,443	-151	-0.5%
5	29,133	-461	-1.6%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.4%	1.7%	0.4%	5.3%	0.2%	0.6%	6.1%	19.1%
2	61.8%	2.1%	0.5%	6.9%	0.4%	0.5%	6.6%	21.3%
3	59.0%	2.7%	0.3%	15.9%	0.5%	0.6%	6.9%	14.2%
4	64.2%	2.4%	0.2%	13.8%	0.2%	0.4%	6.4%	12.3%
5	54.2%	3.1%	0.3%	19.9%	0.4%	0.5%	7.0%	14.6%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	77.7%	2.2%	0.1%	3.7%	0.2%	2.1%	14.2%
2	72.6%	1.7%	0.0%	5.2%	0.1%	2.8%	17.7%
3	70.8%	2.6%	0.1%	10.9%	0.4%	4.1%	10.9%
4	74.8%	1.7%	0.2%	11.4%	0.2%	2.4%	8.9%
5	65.1%	2.8%	0.3%	16.0%	0.4%	2.6%	12.4%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map C – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	2	40%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Eureka Union School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	35	78%	Blue Oaks, Campus Oaks, Diamond Oaks, Fiddymont Farm, Folsom Road, Highland Reserve, Hist. Sierra Vista, Johnson Ranch, Pleasant Grove, Roseville Heights

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.32	1.77	0.30	0.84	0.38
2	0.29	1.85	0.45	0.73	0.89
3	0.25	1.98	0.28	0.65	0.84
4	0.23	2.08	0.26	0.59	0.56
5	0.50	1.41	0.44	0.81	0.69

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map C – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2021-12-21 08:56:16
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File:gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb|||Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_C

Draft Map C

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



Formerly Public Map #8

Author Comment: This map focuses on creating compact, contiguous districts. This map has a very low total deviation (4.4%). This allows for planned growth to be shared between the western two districts (numbered 4 and 5 on this map).

To the extent possible, natural and physical boundaries are used to create district boundaries and communities of interest are respected.



DRAFT MAP D

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map D – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	6.3%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	30,505	911	3.1%
2	29,513	-81	-0.3%
3	28,644	-950	-3.2%
4	29,679	85	0.3%
5	29,628	34	0.1%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.3%	1.8%	0.4%	10.0%	0.2%	0.6%	6.1%	14.6%
2	60.6%	2.0%	0.6%	5.7%	0.3%	0.6%	6.5%	23.7%
3	59.4%	3.0%	0.2%	15.9%	0.5%	0.5%	6.9%	13.7%
4	61.0%	2.6%	0.3%	11.3%	0.4%	0.6%	6.8%	17.0%
5	58.1%	2.7%	0.2%	19.2%	0.3%	0.3%	6.7%	12.5%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	80.0%	1.8%	0.1%	6.2%	0.3%	1.6%	10.0%
2	69.2%	2.4%	0.1%	4.2%	0.1%	3.6%	20.2%
3	69.3%	2.6%	0.0%	14.0%	0.2%	4.1%	9.6%
4	73.3%	1.9%	0.2%	8.0%	0.1%	2.3%	14.2%
5	70.3%	2.2%	0.2%	14.4%	0.3%	2.4%	9.8%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map D – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	2	40%	Center Joint Unified School District, Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	42	93%	Harding, Quail Glen, Sun City

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.40	1.58	0.51	0.81	0.75
2	0.24	2.04	0.40	0.70	0.96
3	0.37	1.65	0.38	0.80	0.57
4	0.30	1.82	0.26	0.70	0.34
5	0.26	1.95	0.33	0.70	0.64

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map D – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2021-12-21 08:56:54
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File: gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb\|Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_D

Draft Map D

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



DRAFT MAP E

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map E – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	8.3%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	30,505	911	3.1%
2	28,402	-1,192	-4.0%
3	29,262	-332	-1.1%
4	30,850	1,256	4.2%
5	28,950	-644	-2.2%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.3%	1.8%	0.4%	10.0%	0.2%	0.6%	6.1%	14.6%
2	60.0%	2.3%	0.6%	6.2%	0.4%	0.6%	6.8%	23.2%
3	60.7%	2.7%	0.2%	15.0%	0.4%	0.5%	7.0%	13.5%
4	61.8%	2.4%	0.4%	9.8%	0.4%	0.5%	6.7%	18.0%
5	56.5%	2.8%	0.2%	21.1%	0.3%	0.3%	6.5%	12.2%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	80.0%	1.8%	0.1%	6.2%	0.3%	1.6%	10.0%
2	69.6%	3.0%	0.1%	4.4%	0.1%	3.9%	18.4%
3	71.6%	1.9%	0.2%	13.0%	0.2%	3.4%	9.7%
4	72.7%	1.6%	0.2%	6.9%	0.1%	2.6%	15.9%
5	67.3%	2.7%	0.1%	17.0%	0.4%	2.3%	9.7%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map E – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	3	60%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	44	98%	Sun City

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.40	1.58	0.51	0.81	0.75
2	0.22	2.11	0.39	0.65	0.87
3	0.25	2.00	0.39	0.71	0.62
4	0.35	1.69	0.47	0.67	0.89
5	0.31	1.80	0.46	0.67	0.88

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map E – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2021-12-21 08:57:48
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File:gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb\|Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_E

Draft Map E

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



Formerly Public Map #15

Author Comment: Contiguous, communities of interest together, EVERY neighborhood association intact with the exception of Sun City which has one tiny piece across Blue Oaks (Note: in the program, this piece is showing up in both Blue Oaks AND the Sun City neighborhood associations). All Police districts together with the exception of 26 (one tiny block upper right corner - zero population- Sun City). All but 5 specific plans together and one of those is Sun City because one block that crosses over Blue Oaks. I believe a 8.2% deviation, with less population in D5 to allow for more growth. Compact, and natural lines were possible.



DRAFT MAP F

Removed from further consideration on January 24, 2022

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map F – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Ideal Population Criterion

Ideal Population	29,594	
Overall Range	6.0%	
< 5.0%	5.0 - 10.0%	> 10.0%

California Statewide Database Adjusted
(incarcerated persons reallocation) 2020
Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data
Summary Files - Total Population.

Total Population & Deviation per District

District	Total Population	Over / Under Ideal	Deviation From Ideal
1	30,505	911	3.1%
2	28,741	-853	-2.9%
3	29,262	-332	-1.1%
4	30,511	917	3.1%
5	28,950	-644	-2.2%

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	66.3%	1.8%	0.4%	10.0%	0.2%	0.6%	6.1%	14.6%
2	59.2%	2.3%	0.6%	6.0%	0.3%	0.6%	6.6%	24.4%
3	60.7%	2.7%	0.2%	15.0%	0.4%	0.5%	7.0%	13.5%
4	62.6%	2.5%	0.3%	9.9%	0.4%	0.6%	6.9%	16.8%
5	56.5%	2.8%	0.2%	21.1%	0.3%	0.3%	6.5%	12.2%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - Total Population by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin.

CVAP by Race/Ethnicity per District

District	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Hispanic/Latino
1	80.0%	1.8%	0.1%	6.2%	0.3%	1.6%	10.0%
2	68.1%	2.9%	0.1%	3.7%	0.2%	4.2%	20.6%
3	71.6%	1.9%	0.2%	13.0%	0.2%	3.4%	9.7%
4	74.2%	1.7%	0.2%	7.6%	0.1%	2.4%	13.8%
5	67.3%	2.7%	0.1%	17.0%	0.4%	2.3%	9.7%

California Statewide Database Adjusted 2015-2019 American Community Survey Citizen Voting-age Population (CVAP) by Race and Ethnicity Special Tabulation. Rounding of estimates may lead to summation of percentages not equal to 100% (+/- 1%).

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map F – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021



Contiguity Criterion

Are all the districts contiguous? **Yes**

Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e., minimize division of cities, communities of interest, etc.)

COI Category	Total # of COIs	# of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	% of COIs Preserved in Minimum Districts	COIs Not Preserved in Minimum # of Districts
Elementary School Districts	5	3	60%	Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District, Roseville Elementary School District
Neighborhood Associations	45	44	98%	Sun City

Compactness Measures per District


District	Polsby-Popper	Schwartzberg	Reock	Convex Hull	Length-Width
1	0.40	1.58	0.51	0.81	0.75
2	0.19	2.28	0.37	0.66	0.87
3	0.25	2.00	0.39	0.71	0.62
4	0.33	1.75	0.32	0.80	0.44
5	0.31	1.80	0.46	0.67	0.88

A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist, and no specific scores for any measures indicate satisfactory or unsatisfactory compactness. Measures are typically based on comparing geometric features of the district (e.g. perimeters, areas) to the features of a related base geometric object (e.g. minimum bounding circle, convex hull). In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test—a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass nearby population for people farther away. Note that Polsby-Popper, Reock, Convex Hull, and Length-Width scores fall within the range of 0-1, with 0 being the least compact and 1 being the most compact. In comparison, a Schwartzberg score of 1 is the most compact and higher scores are increasingly less compact.

City of Roseville Redistricting Summary Statistics

Draft Map F – Districts Summary Statistics

12/21/2021




Metadata

Run Time Stamp: 2021-12-21 08:58:29
Workflow Directory: C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Projects\Alteryx\
District Scenario: File: gdb:C:\Workspace\F2074_01_01_Roseville\Data\Redist.gdb\|Districts_Scenario_Draft_Map_F

Draft Map F

- District #1
- District #2
- District #3
- District #4
- District #5



Total deviation
6.0%

98% of
neighborhoods
preserved

District #5 is
2.2% below the
ideal, leaving
room for
expected growth

Formerly Public Map #25

Author Comment: Another variation of map 11 - but with all neighborhoods intact except for a tiny detached part of Sun City just South of Blue Oaks, and divided by a weird panhandle from the rest of Sun City. All police districts intact. 6.2% deviation





ROSEVILLE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMUNICATION

Title: Roundtable Discussion on Redistricting Process and Suggestions for Improvement
Contact: Joe Mandell 916-774-5325 jmandell@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 2/28/2022
Item #: 6.2.

RECOMMENDATION

If the Independent Redistricting Commission adopts Draft Map B-1 as the Final Map and has directed staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk pursuant to Agenda Item #6.1, this agenda item is intended as a forum for Commissioners and the public to openly discuss various aspects of the City of Roseville's 2021-22 redistricting process and make suggestions or recommendations for improvement for when the next Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission begins the redistricting process again in 2031.

BACKGROUND

If the Independent Redistricting Commission adopts Draft Map B-1 as the Final Map and has directed staff to file the Final Redistricting Report and Final Map with the City Clerk pursuant to Agenda Item #6.1, this agenda item is intended as a forum for Commissioners and the public to openly discuss various aspects of the City of Roseville's 2021-22 redistricting process and make suggestions or recommendations for improvement for when the next Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission begins the redistricting process again in 2031.

Areas for discussion may include, but are not limited to:

- Commissioner qualifications
- Commissioner selection process
- Commissioner training
- Demographer services
- Suggested Charter language edits/clarifications
 - o Redistricting Criteria
 - o Map Adoption Procedures
 - o Edits/Tweaks to draft maps
 - ? Defining minor/major edits
- Public Hearings
 - o Number of hearings

- o Location/time of hearings
- o Hearings after edits to draft maps
- Receiving Community of Interest testimony

Respectfully Submitted,

Joe Mandell, Senior Deputy City Attorney