

January 24, 2022

To: Independent Redistricting Commission

My comments address the agenda items for the January 24, 2022 meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission.

Item 5.2

As you remember, I presented a table at your January 19<sup>th</sup> meeting that can help rank the 6 maps under consideration. I include in this letter my evaluation for your consideration.

Item 5.4

The comments you should consider under this item are the public comments on why someone felt one map was more representative of the city than the others. I can imagine some discussion will ensue where a map has been modified but no information given on why that particular map was satisfactory in the first place and worthy of future consideration. This discussion should be had after item 5.5 when the number of maps is narrowed.

Item 5.6

This item will consider if any adjustments should be made to a map. In my opinion, this discussion can go down the slippery slope rather quickly by bringing out comments on why a person likes a map from a personal standpoint (lives in a particular neighborhood, politically motivated, etc.) rather than applying the priorities in the charter.

At the end of all the discussion, the commission will recommend a final map with a plan and report. I would hope that the priorities that are listed in the charter are utilized to make the final determination and listed in the report.

Remember, while we have 5 districts, this is a Roseville redistricting plan not an individual district redistricting plan.

In closing, I have attached my analysis and table for your consideration. A reminder, the public spent a great deal of time and energy to draw maps and make comments. Don't betray the public trust by personal interests. I have said in the past and I will repeat it again, there is no perfect map and map B satisfies the charter and public interest the best with no changes.

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	6	9	7	5	5	5
2A Comm of interest Neighborhoods 4/8	4	3	3	2	4	4	4
2B Comm of Interest Other 4/8	4	3	4	3	3	3	3
3 Easily Identifiable	6	4	5	4	2	2	1
4 Compactness	6	3	6	4	2	3	3
5 Least disenfranchise	6	3	5	6	1	1	1
Grand Total	36	22	32	26	17	18	17

I assigned the total points by using the priorities in order as outlined in the charter. 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. My community of interest is much larger than one neighborhood association; in fact it spans several.

## 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.

**From:** Marty Boyer <[martyboyer@sbcglobal.net](mailto:martyboyer@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 24, 2022 1:19 PM  
**To:** Six, Katrina <[KMSix@roseville.ca.us](mailto:KMSix@roseville.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** Re[2]: Check this out – \*COR\_Redistricting\_TestimonyForm.pdf

**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.

Just replied to a colleague. That input form left MUCH to be desired in its ability to allow you to submit it. There was no submit or send button ... just the link to city clerk's office. The bottom line is I prefer Map E or F as best meeting the stated goals of the process.



*Marty Boyer*

Communication Advantage  
916-749-4786  
510-303-8794 (cell)  
[www.martyboyer.com](http://www.martyboyer.com)

From: "Six, Katrina" <[KMSix@roseville.ca.us](mailto:KMSix@roseville.ca.us)>

To: "City Clerk" <[CityClerkroseville@roseville.ca.us](mailto:CityClerkroseville@roseville.ca.us)>; "[martyboyer@sbcglobal.net](mailto:martyboyer@sbcglobal.net)" <[martyboyer@sbcglobal.net](mailto:martyboyer@sbcglobal.net)>

Sent: 1/24/2022 10:23:00 AM

Subject: RE: Check this out – \*COR\_Redistricting\_TestimonyForm.pdf

Good Morning Marty,

The link below opens to a blank form. Do you have one that is completed?

Thank you!

**Katrina Six**

*City Clerk Technician*  
City Clerk Department

o: (916) 774-5267

f: (916) 786-9175

---

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



**From:** Marty Boyer <[martyboyer@sbcglobal.net](mailto:martyboyer@sbcglobal.net)>

**Sent:** Friday, January 21, 2022 9:14 AM

**To:** City Clerk Public Record Request <[CityClerk@roseville.ca.us](mailto:CityClerk@roseville.ca.us)>

**Subject:** Check this out – \*COR\_Redistricting\_TestimonyForm.pdf

**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.

\*COR\_Redistricting\_TestimonyForm.pdf

[https://p1cdn4static.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server\\_7964838/File/City%20Clerk/COR\\_Redistricting\\_TestimonyForm.pdf](https://p1cdn4static.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_7964838/File/City%20Clerk/COR_Redistricting_TestimonyForm.pdf)

**From:** [April Marskell](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Re-Districting  
**Date:** Monday, January 24, 2022 11:05:22 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 Whom it May Concern:

My name is April Marskell and I am the president of the Blue Oaks Neighborhood Association . I did attend your public meeting at city hall. I was in favor of map B with minor tweaks . However at that meeting a mystery map 7 was mentioned and I know I heard at least three commissioners say it was truly a better map. I am emailing you today to ask that if it is truly a better map please present it to the public and I am sorry if you have to repeat this grueling process again . That night at the meeting I heard a few people comment that this process is all about choosing the best map for our city and if in fact the mystery map 7 is a better map than we should be allowed to see it and comment on it . People will be upset no matter what map is chosen for me it's important to see the least amount of people affected by your choice . If that's map B great , if it's mystery map 7 fantastic. I would just like to see you make the best possible decision for a crappy situation. Thank you for taking time to read my comment.

April Marskell

**From:** Natalie Pagel <[nataliejpagel@gmail.com](mailto:nataliejpagel@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 24, 2022 1:33 PM  
**To:** City Clerk Public Record Request <[CityClerk@roseville.ca.us](mailto:CityClerk@roseville.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** Comments on 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.

To the Redistricting Committee and Council,

I was able to attend part of the redistricting hearing on Saturday, January 15th. I agree with the expressed concerns over the concept of "districting" in itself. Does "districting" effectively serve the intended purpose behind "districting"?

I heard at least one speaker voice concern over the fact that districting can render voter ineligibility. If this is accurate--if any system effectively causes any contingency of legal citizens to become ineligible to vote, how is that structure still in effect?

As for opining on which map suits my interests, I am not sure if it is better to disburse likeminded folk into the 6 districts or to cluster them. If the latter bodes better for the concerns I have, I would like to propose any map which keeps Sierra Vista, Los Cerritos, Folsom Road, Roseville Heights, and Diamond Oaks together. Merely by our proximity in Central Roseville, the people I interact with:

- 1) Share the positive and negative effects of the cluster of affordable housing which has concentrated itself in one predominant area of Roseville.
- 2) Share as well in the effects of human health and social services all situated mainly in Central Roseville, which among other things perhaps has led to the burgeoning presence of unsheltered people camping out in public areas, the higher crime rates in these areas, and the increase of litter all in the historic downtown and closely surrounding areas. I am also concerned about how this could affect property value in an economic downturn. We happen to be the "backyard" which bears the physical cost of the noble concern for poverty, mental health, homelessness. I have parking and pedestrian concerns as my daughters weekly walk to coffee and music lessons on Lincoln and Main, from our Sierra Vista neighborhood home.
- 3) We share in the pride and support of boutique and small business, as they are the heartbeat of Central Roseville.

So if we must be divided into districts, and if those districts are purposed to somehow benefit the collective voice of shared interest based on location, and if the best strategy is to group areas together by location, then I pick Map C.

**Natalie Pagel**

**Top Producer**

**Master's Club Member - 2019**

Realtor DRE# 01971948  
Real Estate eBroker, Inc.  
916.759.7530  
[www.PaGeIGroup.com](http://www.PaGeIGroup.com)  
Instagram: @natalieJpagel  
Facebook: thepagelgroup

From: Susan Wilson <[grandmasusan6@gmail.com](mailto:grandmasusan6@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2022 1:53 PM  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerkroseville@roseville.ca.us](mailto:CityClerkroseville@roseville.ca.us)>  
Subject: 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.

I strongly support maps E,D,orF as these encompass the community in which I live and shop.

Susan E. Wilson  
89 Hancock Dr.  
Roseville, Ca 95678

**From:** [Ellen Debach-Riley](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association Roseville Redistricting Map endorsement  
**Date:** Monday, January 24, 2022 3:31:28 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.

Dear Commissioners,

Our Neighborhood Association greatly appreciates your consideration of our position as a historic neighborhood and our interest is keeping historic core neighborhoods in Roseville in the same city district. At our January 19th general meeting, we agreed that Map E would best serve our neighborhood's interests. In contrast to previous endorsements for any of maps D, E or F, we determined map E, in its current form, is the only one that would keep our neighborhood intact and grouped with like historic neighborhoods and would include Diamond Oaks neighborhood. Having just learned how the census blocks split off half of the street Alta Vista into the Diamond Oaks neighborhood, and that the commission must keep census blocks together, we feel map E is the only current map that will keep our neighborhood intact. I understand some adjustments are being considered for some of the existing maps, so as those changes are being proposed, please keep these factors in mind for our historic neighborhood.

Thank You,  
Ellen Debach-Riley  
President, Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association  
Member of RCONA