



INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

Final Redistricting Report

Filed with City Clerk – March 1, 2022

Effective Date – March 31, 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 10 aye votes and 0 no votes (1 Commissioner absent) 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

Total Population Deviation
 Ideal Population = 29,594
 Overall Range = 9.4%

Legend

- Existing City Council Districts
- Neighborhoods
- Streets
- Streams
- Census Block
- District Number
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5



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 (incarcerated persons relocations) 2020 Census PL 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - 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	64.7%	1.9%	0.4%	8.7%	0.2%	0.6%	4.2%	15.3%
2	59.9%	2.0%	0.6%	5.5%	0.3%	0.6%	6.7%	24.3%
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%	0.3%	6.1%	12.0%
5	53.0%	2.9%	0.3%	21.4%	0.3%	0.4%	7.3%	14.1%

California Database Adjusted (incarcerated persons relocations) 2020 Census PL 94-171 Redistricting Data Summary Files - 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	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%	6.8%
5	62.4%	2.9%	0.1%	18.3%	0.4%	2.8%	12.4%

California Database Adjusted (2015-2019) American Community Survey Census 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%).

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

Passed on February 28, 2022

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 28th day of February, 2022, by the following vote on roll call:

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

NOES: None


ABSENT: Sweeney

ABSTAIN: None



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)

City Council Districts - Draft Map B-1

City of Roseville | Independent Redistricting Commission
January 25, 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 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	29,459	-141	-0.5%
2	31,058	1,464	4.9%
3	28,274	-1,320	-4.5%
4	28,654	-740	-2.5%
5	30,330	736	2.5%

Census 2010 population adjusted for race and gender redistricting 2020 Census. District population based on 2020 Census. District population based on 2020 Census.



Total Population by Race/Ethnicity Per District

District	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
1	64.9%	1.9%	0.4%	6.7%	26.1%
2	49.9%	2.0%	0.5%	5.5%	42.1%
3	40.2%	2.8%	0.3%	4.0%	52.7%
4	44.1%	2.4%	0.3%	12.3%	40.9%
5	53.0%	2.7%	0.3%	11.4%	32.6%

Census 2010 population adjusted for race and gender redistricting 2020 Census. District population based on 2020 Census. District population based on 2020 Census.

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

District	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
1	60.1%	2.0%	0.1%	5.2%	32.6%
2	40.2%	1.9%	0.2%	3.4%	54.3%
3	30.1%	2.7%	0.1%	4.0%	63.1%
4	34.1%	1.3%	0.2%	10.8%	53.6%
5	42.1%	2.9%	0.1%	14.5%	40.4%

Census 2010 population adjusted for race and gender redistricting 2020 Census. District population based on 2020 Census. District population based on 2020 Census.



DRAFT MAP B-1

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

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, Fiddyment 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%
<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	29,564	-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, Fiddymont 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



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



Total deviation
6.3%

91% of
neighborhoods
preserved

District #5 is
2.5% above
the ideal

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

