

**From:** [Robert Lyss](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback on Redistricting  
**Date:** Friday, January 21, 2022 10:19:54 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.

*Hello City Clerk friends - can you forward this feedback to the redistricting commission?  
Thanks!*

Hello Commission – My name is Robert Lyss and I’m a 17 year Roseville resident. This has been a fantastic community to live in, and I’m pleased and honored to have contributed as a former chair of the City Transportation Commission and Grants Advisory Commission.

I’d like to take a moment to give feedback on the redistricting map choices. Looking at the demographic information and taking into stock my knowledge of the neighborhoods, business, and industrial components to our city, I’d like to put forth an endorsement to adopt either Map B or Map C for our redistricting efforts. These seem to be the most equitable in preserving current neighborhoods as well as planning for future growth in West Roseville. I don’t look at this as a 10 year only exercise, it should be looked at as a long-term plan for the future of Roseville; the result of which would mean only minor updates to the district maps in the decades to come.

Thank you to the City and the Redistricting Commission for their significant efforts on this, and to the community at large for their public input.

Best,

-Robert Lyss

## Six, Katrina

---

**From:** Liz Moore <lmoorerdh@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 22, 2022 2:07 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Redistricting maps

**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:** [cityclerkroseville@roseville.ca.us](mailto:cityclerkroseville@roseville.ca.us)  
**From:** Elizabeth Moore, Roseville Resident

I am a long-time resident of Kaseberg-Kingswood and I fully support maps E, D, or F. All of these maps not only keep my neighborhood association intact, they keep my neighborhood association in the district with which our community identifies as a community of interest.

We were completely ignored in the last map drawings and were split into District 5 and District 1, which makes no sense whatsoever! We identify best with the neighborhoods in maps E, D, and F. Although map A keeps us intact, we do not identify with District 2. In addition, maps E and F keep all neighborhood associations together, not just mine. Map D appears to have very few neighborhood divisions as well and also splits west Roseville's potential growth, keeping District 1 east of Highway 80. It's time we give an opportunity to those neighborhoods to elect a representative who actually lives east of Highway 80 and is familiar with their needs.

In my review of the previous meetings, it appears you will be making some changes to existing maps. I hope any changes you make keep my neighborhood intact and with the communities as shown on any of the three maps, E, D or F. If that doesn't happen, then I would also be in favor of Map A if Kaseberg-Kingswood is moved out of district 2 and will not divide historic Roseville. There is also a map in public testimony document 5 that accomplishes this and would allow me to support this map as well.

Thank you for your consideration,

Elizabeth A. Moore  
86 Hancock Dr.  
Roseville, CA 95678  
[lmoorerdh@mac.com](mailto:lmoorerdh@mac.com)  
925-586-1206

Liz Moore, RDH, MEd  
editorcdha@gmail.com

**From:** [Kathryn Perry](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Re-districting  
**Date:** Saturday, January 22, 2022 7:31:45 PM

---

**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.

I am a long-time resident of Kaseberg-Kingswood and I fully support maps E, D, or F. All of these maps not only keep my neighborhood association intact, they keep my neighborhood association in the district with which our community identifies as a community of interest.

We were completely ignored in the last map drawings and were split into District 5 and District 1, which makes no sense whatsoever! We identify best with the neighborhoods in maps E, D, and F. Although map A keeps us intact, we do not identify with District 2. In addition, maps E and F keep all neighborhood associations together, not just mine. Map D appears to have very few neighborhood divisions as well and also splits west Roseville's potential growth, keeping District 1 east of Highway 80. It's time we give an opportunity to those neighborhoods to elect a representative who actually lives east of Highway 80 and is familiar with their needs.

In my review of the previous meetings, it appears you will be making some changes to existing maps. I hope any changes you make keep my neighborhood intact and with the communities as shown on any of the three maps, E, D or F. If that doesn't happen, then I would also be in favor of Map A if Kaseberg-Kingswood is moved out of district 2 and will not divide historic Roseville. There is also a map in public testimony document 5 that accomplishes this and would allow me to support this map as well.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Kathryn Perry

94 Hancock Drive  
Roseville, CA. 95678

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Janice Vance](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** District maps  
**Date:** Sunday, January 23, 2022 1:19:39 PM

---

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.

I am a long time resident of the Kaseberg-Kingswood area and fully support maps E,D, or F.

All of these maps not only keep my neighborhood association intact, they keep my neighborhood association in the district which our community identifies. We do not identify with Map A which has District 2.

First choice is E, D, or F  
Second choice is A if need be.

Janice Vance  
85 Hancock Dr.  
Roseville, CA 95678

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Gary Gutowsky](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Roseville Redistricting  
**Date:** Monday, January 24, 2022 1:05:02 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.

Greetings Commissioners,

I want to follow up on my comments at the January 15, 2022 Independent Redistricting Commission meeting and urge the Commission to adopt either Map E or F for the following reasons:

1. Both maps far exceed any other in keeping neighborhoods together. Both maps are at 98%, which is probably a good as it can get.
2. Both maps do the best job of keeping districts geographically contiguous. These maps keep Stoneridge in the same district as the majority of southeast Roseville, where other maps (Maps B & C) split Stoneridge from other east Roseville neighborhoods and put it in a district separated by the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and I-80.
3. Both maps keep communities of interest intact the the greatest extent possible. They keep the Historic Sierra Vista neighborhood in the same district as other historic and long established Roseville neighborhoods that share similar concerns. They also keep Stoneridge in a district with other southeast neighborhoods that share common interests, such as Olympus Point and Johnson Ranch. Other maps (Maps B & C) have Stoneridge in the same district as Highland Reserve, Stanford Crossing, and Galleria despite being separated by the previously mentioned railroad tracks and interstate. The Stoneridge neighborhood, and others nearby, share little of the same issues or concerns as those neighborhoods to the north.
4. By adopting either Maps E or F, the Independent Redistricting Commission has the opportunity to correct the flaws in the current district map. Adopting any map only because it maintains the status quo will do a disservice to the residents of Roseville and will continue to give the perception that the map was drawn to favor certain individuals or special interest groups.

Again, I urge your support for either Map E or Map F.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

*Gary M. Gutowsky*

Gary M. Gutowsky, Col, USAF (ret)  
Stoneridge resident/homeowner since 2012  
916-742-4995

**From:** Laura Zwald <[lbzwald@sbcglobal.net](mailto:lbzwald@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 23, 2022 7:57 PM  
**To:** City Clerk Public Record Request <[CityClerk@roseville.ca.us](mailto:CityClerk@roseville.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** Please choose 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.

To whom it may concern,

My name is Laura Zwald. I have lived in Roseville for 21 years. I can't imagine calling anywhere else home. I love living in our close-knit, family orientated community. It has been a wonderful place to raise my children, now 14 and 17 years old.

Although the population of Roseville has increased over the years, I don't see how most of the proposed re-districting maps make sense. I understand that we have to re-evaluate our districts in light of the census every ten years...but most of these maps change the existing districts quite a bit. Modifications are to be expected each 10 year period...but not the drastic changes presented by most of the proposed maps.

Map B makes the most sense to me as it is close to our existing districting lines, which have worked for us well since they were drawn.

Thank you for your consideration,

Laura Zwald

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

# PETE CONSTANT

108 Saddle Rock Ct., Roseville, CA 95747 ■ 408.649.9500 ■ Pete@PeteConstant.com ■ [Linkedin.com/In/PeteConstant](https://www.linkedin.com/in/PeteConstant)

## Roseville Independent Redistricting Commission

311 Vernon St.  
Roseville, California 95678

Re: Draft Map Selection

Honorable Commission Members,

January 24, 2022

I am a City of Roseville resident, residing in District 5. I am a professor of Public Policy and Director of the Institute for Public Policy at William Jessup University. As an active community member, I serve our community in a number of roles including serving as a Roseville Joint Union High School Board Trustee, a member of the city's Board of Appeals, a former board member and Vice President of the Fiddyment Farm Neighborhood Association, a former member of the city's Community Priorities Advisory Committee (CPAC), and served as Vice Chairman of the Charter Review Commission. In addition to my involvement in the Roseville community, I served my previous community in San Jose for 29 years as a police officer, city commissioner, and two-term elected city councilmember.

As Vice Chairman of the Charter Review Commission, I participated in the subcommittee that crafted the language of the charter measure which created Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) and defined the criteria for drawing final maps. Additionally, I served as the chair of the meeting on March 16, 2020 in which the Charter Review Commission approved the final language that was sent to the city council ([meeting agenda link](#)). This language was approved by the city council without change and presented to the voters as Measure R, establishing Article 11 of the Roseville City Charter. More than 40,000 voters overwhelmingly approved the measure with 63.5% of the vote.

When I attended and spoke at the meeting of the IRC on Thursday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, there appeared to be a misunderstanding or perhaps confusion around the priority application of the criteria in section 11.09 for final map selection and the intent behind the language related to "areas separated by a railyard" in section 11.09 (B)(1).

First in relation to the priority application of criteria for final map selection, section 11.09(B) clearly states:

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. *[emphasis added]*

There is no ambiguity that contiguous districts are a requirement and the top priority. The language is very precise and uses the word *practicable* – which is not the same as practical. Practicable means feasible or capable of

being done. Black's Law Dictionary defines practicable as, "Any idea or project which can be brought to fruition or reality without any unreasonable demands" (<https://thelawdictionary.org/practicable/>). This term is commonly used in legislation to indicate how or if something should be done. This specific word and its meaning were discussed and selected by the Carter Review Commission specifically for this section (see below).

It appeared unclear at the meeting, and in subsequent discussions I have had with commissioners, staff, and community members, the intent behind the language defining "areas separated by a railyard," as "*not contiguous*" in section 11.09 (B)(1).

At the Charter Review Commission meeting on March 16, 2020, the commissioners discussed the clear intent of this section. A review of the meeting ([link to the video](#)) may be helpful to IRC commissioners. This understanding will ensure that a final map will pass judicial review.

Here are some selected portions of the discussion that clearly illustrate the Charter Review Commission's intent when crafting and approving the language:

Time Stamp – 57:47 Vice Chair Constant noted that railyard language was specifically added to the proposed language and is a "physical barrier, we don't want a district on both sides of that"

Time Stamp – 59:35 Commissioner Frank clarified that one district could not have the entire railyard in it if practicable

Time Stamp - 1:00:40 Commissioner Garrett clarifies that the districts can encompass the railyard only if needed to reach population balance

Time Stamp - 1:01:15 Commission discussion that this was specifically added to address the unique issues in Roseville and specifically chose the qualifier "practicable"

Time Stamp - 1:01:30 Vice Chair Constant comments about why the railyard language was placed in the criteria, this "tells the commission, look, unless you have to, don't separate people by a railyard. They should be neighbors. You should be able to walk..."

It is important to note that the highest priority per the city charter criteria is to create geographically contiguous districts *if it is feasible or capable to do so*. This is not discretionary; it is a charter requirement that you *must* give this specific criterion the highest priority.

In your final set of six maps there are two maps that meet this clear charter requirement: Map C and, to a lesser extent, Map E. These two maps demonstrate both that it is feasible to, and the IRC is capable of, meeting this specific requirement.

Map C not only meets this Priority Criteria; it meets all subordinate criteria in the charter specified order. Further it provides the best option for maintaining the lowest population deviation over the next ten years, as it splits the western, high growth area of the city into two districts. Nearly all other maps under consideration keep the high growth area in a single district, which will lead to much larger deviations in future years – the exact issue we see now with the current districts that have over 62% total deviation. This is essential to maintaining the constitutional standard of one person one vote now, and over the long term to the best extent possible.

In closing, thank you for your willingness to serve on this very important commission. Your work will leave a lasting imprint on the city of Roseville and is essential to fair representation for all current and future Roseville residents.

Sincerely,



Pete Constant

Full Links to Charter Review Commission Meeting on 3/16/2020

Video: <https://roseville.novusagenda.com/AgendaPublic/VODPreview.aspx?meetingVideoID=52905d61-43a7-46a8-81ef-52c7f289d8fd>

Agenda:

<https://roseville.novusagenda.com/AgendaPublic/MeetingView.aspx?MeetingID=1198&MinutesMeetingID=976&doctype=Agenda>

From: Jeff Short <[short.jeff@outlook.com](mailto:short.jeff@outlook.com)>  
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2022 9:49 AM  
To: City Clerk Public Record Request <[CityClerk@roseville.ca.us](mailto:CityClerk@roseville.ca.us)>  
Subject: Comments to the Independent Redistricting Committee

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 and thank you for the opportunity to comment. I gave these remarks orally at the public hearing on January 20th, but have been encouraged by friends and neighbors to submit them in written form as well.

My name is Jeff Short, and I live in the northwest portion of the Westpark Neighborhood Association, the part sometimes described as "half a crop circle," but our facebook group is Brookstone Loop at Westpark.

I've been following this closely, and thanks to the city for making the meetings available online, including the audio only version on youtube when video isn't possible.

My neighbors and I agree, map "B" is the clear best option. We are a unique part of Roseville that has important concerns specific to our areas that this map best addresses.

First, we have very different transportation needs out here than most of the rest of the city. While I-80 is the lifeblood for much of Roseville, it is rarely the best option for those of us in the far west to get to Sacramento or the Bay Area. However, the roads we need are not yet ready for all of us. We need the expansion of Baseline Road and the development of Placer Parkway to get to downtown, the airport, or the Bay Area. The extension of Westbrook Boulevard is also critical as this will get us down to Baseline much quicker. These roads and our need for their expansion is a key community of interest and a necessary focus item for our representative on the City Council.

Another unique feature of west Roseville is that we are the portion of the city with the most families with young children. As such, we use many of the family and kids- oriented large park and recreation options more than other areas of the city. When my son plays in Little League, we go to the Woodcreek Little League fields. When my daughter wants to go to the library, we go to Martha Riley. With rare exception, when we play sports or go to a city activity, we head to Mahaney. We believe it is critical that those amenities are not divided from their main users on the far west part of town. Only map B does this.

Finally, and again, uniquely in Roseville, we have a desperate need for more commercial development. While the rest of the city benefits from some of the best shopping in the nation, we still travel 10 minutes by car just to get to a grocery store. (Longer for those of us who drive the speed limit on Pleasant Grove!) Map B is the map that best groups those neighborhoods, like mine, that needs representatives who are motivated to reach out to the business community and encourage them to build their next store out here. We love Kitchen 747 and Mojo's. We need more of that!

It is my sincere hope that when I speak to this committee again in 2032, I'm asking for a very different district. My neighbors and I want these needs to be met. But right now, and over the course of the next

decade, we need councilmembers who identify with our needs, who understand how urgent they are, and who can articulate that to the rest of the city.

Thank you, and please consider adopting map B so those of us on the far west don't lose our voice in city government.

Sincerely,  
Jeff Short

One of the members of your commission reached out to me to ask for me to provide her with that information.

During my work on the county's redistricting process, whenever a member of the public reached out to me to ask for information, it was our practice to provide that information to the entire body so that all commissioners had the same access to information. Therefore, I told the commissioner (Commissioner McPhail) and the entire commission at a subsequent meeting that I would provide this information to the commission and I asked if that should go to you. My understanding was the answer was yes, it should go to you.

So, that gets us to this moment now lol.

Please let us know if it would be more appropriate for us to send this directly to the demographer.

Sincerely,

Ryan

**Ryan Ronco**

Placer County Clerk-Recorder-Registrar of Voters

(530) 886-5690 | (530) 886-5689 fax | [rronco@placer.ca.gov](mailto:rronco@placer.ca.gov)



**From:** [Werner Kuehn](#)  
**To:** [Six, Katrina](#)  
**Subject:** Public testimony for Redistricting Map  
**Date:** Monday, January 24, 2022 10:17:50 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.

I am a 33 year resident of the Folsom Road Neighborhood and have had the opportunity to visit all of our neighborhood associations with 10 years in RCONA executive leadership. \ With previous newspaper delivery work, I also visited each unique neighborhood on a 'street by street' basis.

**I feel that districts in Map B + C match up well with the specific plan maps. I am a strong advocate of keeping all the 'infill' , inner city, core neighborhoods in the same district (#2).**

In my opinion, I feel that Maps B + C match up at a "75% level of success" to Roseville Police Beat maps and Roseville Fire district maps. However, I would call Maps B + C a "50% level of success" matching to School district maps, though.

Although BOTH B + C are good maps, to create the best map, I would recommend modifying Map B as follows,

West side of I 80 -Core Neighborhoods

- All of Historic Sierra Vista NA could be in District 2, rather than District 3

Specific plan areas

- All of Kaseberg Kingswood NA could be in District 3, rather than split between 2 + 3

- All of Woodcreek Oaks NA could be in District 5, rather than split between 1, 4 + 5

- All of Industrial Area East could be in District 4, instead of 3

I realize that various census block populations could affect how any of these changes could be made, so I would repeat **my #1 request is to keep Historic Sierra Vista NA in District 2**

Thanks

Werner Kuehn

193 Park Drive

[kuehn.w@gmail.com](mailto:kuehn.w@gmail.com)

916-367-2524