

December 31, 2021

TO: Independent Redistricting Commission

Dear Commissioners;

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

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

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

There are four main parts in order of priority:

Geographic considerations

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

Easily identifiable

Compactness

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Richard Roccucci

CC: City attorney, City clerk

Dreyer, Helen

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Below are my comments on the Maps.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Susan Rohan
susanrohan@gmail.com
916-412-4796

Dreyer, Helen

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

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

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

Thank you for acknowledging and responding to the public accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

Parry Lustgarten
Millport Drive, Roseville, CA



Virus-free. www.avast.com