

Help shape the future of City Council district maps and boundaries

Every ten years, U.S. Census data is used to redraw the City of Roseville's City Council district boundaries. This ensures that districts are properly balanced to account for changes in population. The Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission wants to hear from you on how these boundaries should be drawn.

Please complete this form to tell the Independent Redistricting Commission about your thoughts on the six (6) draft maps they have selected for further consideration. We also want to hear about your community of interest because keeping communities of interest together is a high-ranking criteria in the redistricting process. Thank you for your input and participation!

Which draft map do you think best serves the interests of the residents of the City of Roseville?

Draft Map A

Draft Map B

Draft Map C

Draft Map D

Draft Map E

Draft Map F

Please describe what you like or do not like about the draft map(s) you selected above:

What is a Community of Interest?

A Community of Interest is a group of people in the same geographically-definable area who share common social and economic interests. Some examples of Communities of Interest are:

- Senior citizens
- College students living near campus
- People who live downtown or in a neighborhood
- Residents who share a common language
- People that use the same transportation systems

Document Your Community of Interest

1. What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.

2. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries?

3. What is the reason your community of interest should be considered in the redistricting process?
Please describe how the redistricting process could have an impact on your community.

4. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

What Can You Do to Further Participate in the Redistricting Process?

1. Provide your comments by completing this worksheet and returning it by email to the Roseville City Clerk Department at cityclerk@roseville.ca.us or by dropping off a hard copy to the City Clerk at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 or attending a public hearing and providing your comments to the Independent Redistricting Commission.
2. Attend one of the City of Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission public meetings. Times and locations of all meetings can be found on the City's redistricting website at: [roseville.ca.us/redistricting](https://www.roseville.ca.us/redistricting)



Send an email:
cityclerk@roseville.ca.us



Meet in person: Call
916-774-5200 to make
an appointment



Mail: Roseville City Clerk
311 Vernon Street,
Roseville CA 95678

Questions or comments?

We want to hear from you. Email the City of Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission at cityclerk@roseville.ca.us or visit our webpage at: [roseville.ca.us/redistricting](https://www.roseville.ca.us/redistricting)

From: [City Clerk Public Record Request](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: FW: MAP B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:50:37 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Blair Hutchison

Deputy City Clerk

City Clerk's Office

o: (916) 774-5266

f: (916) 786-9175

Civic Center | 311 Vernon Street | Roseville, CA | 95678



From: Shannon Tucker-White <stucker4re@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 4:52 PM
To: City Clerk Public Record Request <CityClerk@roseville.ca.us>
Subject: MAP B

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.

Hello –

My name is Shannon Tucker-White and I have had the pleasure of living in Roseville for 40 years and have sold residential real estate for nearly 25 years in our wonderful city. I also live in one of “historic” neighborhoods of Folsom Road.

I can personally and professionally affirm that the planned growth benefits my family and the thousands of clients I have served. We love our community and all it has to offer in its spacious parks, top rated schools and endless indoor and outdoor activities. I hear it over and over from my clients.

After looking over the maps, my firm belief is **Map B is best. In fact, from my conversations with neighbors and friends, it’s known as the “People’s Map.” It satisfies most of the residents who have commented.**

-**Map B** is the least disruptive. It improves our current map configuration, which has worked well. Please don’t cause undue chaos every 10 years by dismantling when you don’t have to.

-**Map B** meets all criteria which you are to be looking at; compactness, easily identifiable, honoring communities of interest, while meeting population needs.

-**Map B** offers a low percentage of total population deviation and provides for more than 90% of neighborhood associations.

-**Map B** upholds communities of interest, although I do find this term confusing. Communities of interest could be my son's preschool, which is across town. It could be where we go to church, where we volunteer, where I work, where my office is. My community of interest is ALL of Roseville.

-Other maps would exclude almost one fifth of our voters from voting for 6 years, isn't this our right to vote every election?

-Other maps split Sun City into two districts. I have clientele in Sun City who tell me many members do not want that within their community and they have even publicly said so, repeatedly.

-There is discussion of keeping "core" or historic neighborhoods together. I speak from experience in the real estate sales of many historic homes and they are not just in one area. There are many historical "pockets" throughout Roseville.

In conclusion, please adopt Map B as-is, understanding there is no perfect map but it's pretty darn close. Adjusting maps is a precarious position for the commissioner. **Map B** is the only one that is acceptable to me.

Shannon Tucker-White

DRE License # 01236733

(916)919-5966

**TUCKER FAMILY
LYON REAL ESTATE**

2220 Douglas Blvd., Suite #100
Roseville, CA 95661
fax (916) 865-3028

DISCLAIMER - I have not and will not verify any of the information contained in documents prepared by others. Buyers and Sellers need to satisfy themselves as to the issues discussed or contained in any documents, disclosures, and reports.

From: [Derek Pell](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Independent Redistricting Commission Comment
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 9:37:34 AM

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 the Redistricting Commission:

Throughout the redistricting process, there have been comments made by both commissioners and your consultants that the process will culminate in a live line-drawing session on January 24th, with no quantification of the scope or limits of adjustments at that time. It is clear that the public feedback is fairly evenly split into two camps (either you like maps D/E/F or you like map B) and it is my perception you have been leading the public to believe that this commission will make enough adjustments to a map to take into account the entirety of public testimony and essentially come up with a compromise.

Since the December 20th meeting where the 6 draft maps were moved forward, there has been vastly more public involvement than before. I don't see why the commission should essentially tell the public to just live with the 6 draft maps as is when there is obviously significant division in the community. There have been multiple sets of adjustments proposed by different members of the commission, taking into account these public comments, and they should be considered fairly at the January 24th meeting.

The IRC charter makes no mention on how much maps can be modified between draft and final state, and only talks about "draft map" (singular) anyway. Furthermore, the IRC website states that "The Commission will be required to hold five public hearings, one in each council district, as they are developing the district boundaries", implying that the process for developing the boundaries is ongoing, and not set in stone. This community will be best served over the next decade by seriously taking public testimony into account and actually modifying a map to find boundaries that work for the entire city. If this means extending the process slightly to meet statutory requirements, so be it.

The train hasn't yet left the station on this map drawing process.

Thank you,

Derek Pell
175 Park Dr

January 20, 2022

To: Independent Redistricting Commission

Tonight I present a method to rank the 6 draft maps you will review after 6 public hearings. I remind the commission that there is a process in place and has been reviewed by the city attorney's office the last 6 meetings. The charter provisions are very clear on how this process works.

You selected 6 maps at the Dec 20, 2021 meeting and asked the public for additional comments. You did not say that you would start redesigning a map before the final of the 6 meetings. Unfortunately some have started to design and comment on new maps which is clearly a violation of your process.

Your attorney has been very clear thru all 6 meetings that you need to wait until and after the final of the 6 meetings to make any changes on the 6 maps. Those changes and evaluation need to take place on January 24th. You cannot start changing any map until you have evaluated and ranked the 6 maps before you. Any discussion about new maps or combining maps or moving lines before this occurs is a clear violation of your responsibility as an independent redistricting commission. As your attorney mentioned at your meeting on Jan 18th, you need to accept one or several maps to move forward. Good luck if you can select one map.

After that occurs, you can make minor changes to a map and wait for 7 days. Any significant changes would require a 30 day review period.

To help you in your evaluation process, I have provided a simple chart with the priorities as outlined in the city charter. You may wish to discuss the numbers I have assigned to the various priorities but I did so in accordance with what you have heard the last couple of months

I have rated the maps and I look forward to seeing how you rate the 6 maps according to the priorities that are in our charter. Use the chart in an objective way to rank the relative merits of the 6 maps. Don't conclude that none of the maps meet with your approval. Because if you do, you are telling the public who designed 23 legitimate maps and attended 6 public meetings their input doesn't matter and that you know better than anyone else.

Richard Roccucci

CC: City Clerk, City Attorney

Priorities	Total Points	Map A	Map B	Map C	Map D	Map E	Map F
1 Geographical	10						
2A Comm of interest Neighborhoods 4/8	4						
2B Comm of Interest Other 4/8	4						
3 Easily Identifiable	6						
4 Compactness	6						
5 Least disenfranchise	6						
Grand Total	36						

I assigned the total points by using the priorities in order of importance. You may pick different amounts, but the higher priority should receive a higher total number of points possible. While neighborhoods are important for organizing communities, they are not the only thing around which district lines should be drawn. As I stated in my letter on December 31, 2021, the commission needs to look at the big picture. Several of the maps were supported on the sole basis that the neighborhood associations were kept intact within one district. There is a rating system that should be used and the maps evaluated on all of the criteria, not just one.

City Charter

Sec. 11.09. Redistricting criteria.

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.