

President Tiffa...: Good evening. I now call the Rocklin Unified School District Board of Education special meeting for Tuesday, May 28th, 2024 to order. Georgia, will please call the roll.

Georgia Navarre: Julie Hupp?

Julie Hupp: Here.

Georgia Navarre: Rachelle Price?

Rachelle Price: Here.

Georgia Navarre: Dereck Counter.

Dereck Counter: Here.

Georgia Navarre: Michelle Sutherland.

Michelle Suther...: Here.

Georgia Navarre: Tiffany Saathoff?

President Tiffa...: Here.

Please join me in standing for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Trustees: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

President Tiffa...: Thank you. Okay, before we get on with our meeting, I actually have a really special announcement. We have not one, but two birthdays this evening. So I don't know if it's a special announcement, or apologies in order that you're here on your birthday, but I would first like to wish a happy birthday to Georgia Navarre, executive assistant to superintendent. I will say, you did not tell us when we were scheduling this meeting that it would fall on your birthday. So, again, congratulations and apologies in order. And then, in addition, Ryan Johnson, our chief technology officer, it is also his birthday this evening.

Trustee: Happy birthday, Ryan.

President Tiffa...: Listen, if you're going to have to be here, the least we can do is publicly embarrass you and say happy birthday to both of you. So thank you for being here. Hopefully we don't keep you too long on your birthdays, and we appreciate you as well.

Okay, with that, we will kick right into our meeting with item 3.1. I would like to call Dr. Justin Levitt from National Demographics Corporation to present on the transition to bi-trustee area elections. Welcome.

Dr. Justin Levi...: Well, thank you, President Saathoff, and the members of the board. And I'd also like to wish happy birthday to Ms. Navarre and Mr. Johnson as well. So, it's a pleasure to be back here again for our, hopefully, final meeting to make a choice of the final map. This month has been a real health challenge, and I'm glad to be here actually in person to talk tonight. I'm not going to take too much time on the procedures, how we got here, although we will revisit this slide when it comes to the county committee hearing. Needless to say, we've fulfilled all of our timeline requirements, and most of the maps we have tonight to show you, the new ones, meet the rules and criteria. Three out of the four do. The first one does not, and we can talk about that as we look at the individual draft maps.

We also do have our interactive web viewer pulled up, so if we want to zoom into the details, we can do that as well. I'm just going to walk us through a little bit of the requests that were made, starting with Map 103, which was one of the two focus maps chosen at the third public hearing, the first one when we looked at the draft maps. As we pointed out, there was a lot of really good points about this map, but there were some concerns we had about contiguity and about the borders. And so, we came back at our fourth public hearing with Map 111, which sought to kind of straighten some of the borders, move the area along Park Drive in particular to Area 3 to keep that homeowner association and the contiguity of the residents along the park there in one area.

However, this did not meet the mark, and so tonight we've come back with some modifications to Map 111, based on the direction last time. Looking at our first map, 116, we wanted to incorporate everything we heard at the last hearing. And so, there were four separate requests at the last hearing. The first one, and I'm just going to number them off here so we kind of talk about them. The first request was around Whitney Oaks to align areas 3 and 5 in the green and purple to Whitney Oaks Drive. The second request was to move the area around Twin Oaks Elementary School to Area 4. We had an Area 3 in some of the previous maps. The third request was to move that area. It's kind of the eastern extension of Cobblestone Drive across Stanford Ranch into Area 3 and move some of the population as much as possible of the Pebble Beach Road area into Area 5 as well.

And so, those were requests one through four. We looked at a map that included all of them. This is what 116 is. Unfortunately, this has about a 12% population deviation. We need to stay under 10, and this is driven by area 2. And it's no wonder because in the first map, 103, we crossed along Park Drive to get some of that northern area that wasn't contiguous. Map 111, we had gotten more contiguous area and lowered the deviation intentionally trying to get closer to that equal population. When we move both of those areas into Area 3 in green,

that really leaves Area 2 under that ideal number, the minimum number, actually, in our case, and this is really driven by Area 2, and Area 1 doesn't really help because Area 1 itself is already 3% underpopulated, so simply moving between 2 and 1 didn't produce that equal population.

And so, what we have are three ways of balancing this. Map 117, minimal changes. It actually makes changes one and two. So Twin Oaks Elementary and the area along Whitney Drive. I know my colleague, Kristen, who was here last time, that northern area is a very small population, as she mentioned. We were able to make that change in every map. Similarly, the area that includes Twin Oaks Elementary School, every map was able to move that area completely into Area 4. Where the population deviation really comes in is that third change. That Cobblestone area, unfortunately, it has about 3000 residents, so just a lot of people live in a very densely populated neighborhood. So, in this map in 117, we leave that area in Area 2. We make some of the other adjustments. So with this map has a 7.5% deviation, but it still is under 10%. This would be a legally viable alternative.

And 118, we looked at going as far as we could moving that Cobblestone area into Area 3. As you see, we can't get the entire area. There's about three census blocks that between them have about 500 residents that remain in Area 2, but it moves the vast majority of the population into Area 3, also making the change to the Pebble Beach area in order to lower District 3's population and be able to move more of that Cobblestone area into Area 3. This does have a 9.3% deviation. Moving any additional block would take it over 10%, so we've kept it as close to 10% as we could get it. This does overpopulate areas 4 and 5, and it leaves District 2 at about 6% under, so within our range, but it's right pushing that 10% threshold.

In addition, we came up with a map of 119 that split the difference. In this, we divide the Cobblestone eastern area equally, as close to equal as we could get, literally along Cobblestone Drive. North of Cobblestone Drive is in Area 3, south remains in Area 2. This produces a 7.2% deviation, and that deviation's not driven by either Area 2 or Area 3. Remember, those are the largest and smallest areas in this map. Areas 1 and 5 are the largest and smallest areas. So, areas 2 and 3 kind of split that difference equally. Each area comes out at about 3% under its the ideal population.

So, I know these changes are minuscule. I want to emphasize all of them do make the Twin Oaks change. All of them do make the Whitney Oaks change in the north. And where we really come down to those differences is particularly in that Cobblestone area that's driving the other three maps. We did look at the election sequences and as we can see here, they're all the same. Every single one of these maps, going back to 103, has the exact same election sequence, and actually for our purposes, this really then comes down to that community question of, where's the best place to create that line for the communities we're

talking about? If those maps are not detailed enough, I'm happy to pull up the interactive web viewer so we can see the changes and differences in more detail.

Trustee: Would you mind doing that for us? I want to look a little closer at 117. 117, I think you said keeps Whitney Oaks whole. Is that right?

Dr. Justin Levi...: So, 116. 116.

Trustee: I just want to see, if we're going on Pebble Beach, do we still have to the right, which is Whitney Oaks in Area 5?

Trustee: Probably [inaudible 00:15:45].

Trustee: ... the issue of the street.

Trustee: Can you zoom up on the Pebble Beach area? Do you know where that is? Between 1 and 5, or 5 and 3, I'm sorry.

Dr. Justin Levi...: So, I'll start with 116 where we did move as far as down as we could to cross Pebble Beach Road here, down to Mansion Oaks Park, down to Mountain Gate Drive and the population along Mountain Gate Drive and Iron Wheel Drive, or Iron Wheel Court. Now, in 117 in our minimal changes, we kept it the way it was in 111 and 103, which both drew the line along Pebble Beach Road.

President Tiffa...: Which we didn't love last time, but we knew we couldn't get around that because of the census blocks, correct? So this one essentially is showing that one side of the street would be one district, the other side of the street would be the other, or the other option that you're giving us in 118 and 119 is to follow Pleasant Grove Creek. Is that correct? Is that line following the creek line?

Dr. Justin Levi...: That's correct. It follows the creek. And I'm showing you 118. The line is identical in 118 and 119 here, so it actually puts all of the homes themselves along those streets into Area 5. I'd say one of the big reasons why we didn't do this earlier was because of that population deviation. This actually overpopulates Area 5, and so we just want to make sure that that's clear, 'cause some of our other direction was to try to under-populate Area 5, but we're moving people into it.

Trustee: I get a little concerned when we start talking about the borders up there. Again, I don't know that we're preparing to try to make additional changes. I feel like after the last meeting we became clear that-

President Tiffa...: I think she's trying to understand.

Trustee: ... anything that's not totally-

Trustee: I just want to make sure I was clear on it. Yeah.

Trustee: I wanted to throw out, if we're talking about these maps that are population-balanced map, and looking at that Cobblestone neighborhood, I like that all the maps were able to pull in the rest of that Twin Oaks community because as I was looking at them, there's no major street there that divides that really is a community of interest, and I believe that was a positive change. It looks a lot better. For the Cobblestone community, on Map 119, I don't really care for how it divides that neighborhood in half because I think that is a very distinct neighborhood, an established neighborhood, and if we're looking at districts, voting districts, I think the district that it lies in, whether it ends up being two or three, is more arbitrary where it's, in my opinion as a voter and a neighbor, it's more important to kind of have your neighborhood together than whether it's number two or number three.

So the 119, I just took issue with X, and I feel like we're running into the same problem that we had with the Twin Oaks community. We're just moving that issue. Map 117 looks the cleanest, in my mind, with the Cobblestone neighborhood. 118 seems similar, but it does kind of have this little Butte Drive that ends up in two rather than three, where 117, it really keeps the whole neighborhood together. But those were my thoughts on the changes that we asked for.

Trustee: I appreciate the points. I agree with 119. Not interested in 116, of course. The thing I like a little bit more about 117 is that the division is on Pebble Creek Road, which I think we've tried to be really consistent with, versus a creek. It makes more sense, I think, for people looking at a map that it's on a road. That was my only thought between those two. I think the Cobblestone I agree with you about. Is it Bluffs or is it Butte? I couldn't tell.

Trustee: Oh, that little street?

Trustee: Yeah, that little [inaudible 00:20:34] on 118.

Trustee: Yeah, maybe it's Bluffs.

Trustee: I think it's Bluffs. Okay.

Trustee: And another thing about 117 is the deviation's better compared to 18, even though they're fairly similar as far as keeping the neighborhoods together. The 118 is pretty close.

Trustee: So, from a 118 standpoint, though, the majority of the Cobblestone in 3, that's truly Cobblestone families, right? On that side?

Trustee: Mm-hm.

Trustee: Yes.

Trustee: So I guess the difference between, I'll call it 117 and 118 is, you're either taking half the Cobblestone families and putting them in 2, or you're taking most of the Cobblestone families and putting them in 3, but there's always going to be a little piece?

Trustee: Your point is that we can't get all those families whole anyways?

Trustee: So this is where you start changing... I mean, I don't want to change maps, but [inaudible 00:21:43]...

If you're going with that, the 117... What's the street up there? What's this one up here? You were saying...

Trustee: Sterling area. That's the neighborhood.

Trustee: Sterling, yeah. So keep-

Trustee: It does keep that in.

Trustee: Keep that in, but then... And now I'm just moving stuff on the fly. Can you add more? Can you get all of Cobblestone in but keep the street square?

Trustee: I don't think we can get all of Cobblestone in, but at least this is a clean kind of break on either side of Stanford Ranch to where you do end up with two trustees for that, that kind of fall under that boundary. But it does still feel like more of a community of interest to keep both of those pockets together respectively.

Dr. Justin Levi...: I will just point out that every map that has a division that doesn't involve the southern ends, like south of Sunset has some division of the Cobblestone Elementary attendance area. That's just because of where it is.

Trustee: And then from a, I guess, a data standpoint, well, 116, I guess, is out, not population-balanced, but 117, 118, 119, all the percentages and total population and age, they're all pretty... I guess from a diversity standpoint, they're all bucketed the same way, so no matter what one we pick, they're all going to fit into a...

Dr. Justin Levi...: Yeah, I mean, the only thing I would say is that given where we're expecting population growth, 117 does the best job of the three in terms of its deviations in areas 4 and 5, especially Area 5, if where we expect more growth than Area 2, which is expected not to grow quite as much.

Trustee: I would like to make a motion that we adopt Map 117.

This transcript was exported on May 29, 2024 - view latest version [here](#).

Trustee: Do we also need to put the sequencing into the same vote or... ? Okay.

Trustee: Does it have to be the same motion, or can it be a separate motion? 'Cause I can do it all together if...

Trustee: Yeah.

Trustee: Yeah.

Trustee: Okay. Then-

Trustee: [inaudible 00:24:20].

Trustee: Yeah, you should take public comment, and then, Ms. Cannon, did you have some guidance that might be helpful?

Trustee: Two things, did you actually open the public hearing because we need to do that?

Trustee: Yes.

Trustee: Okay, perfect. And then I do want to give you a word on sequencing before you guys take any action tonight, just because of the way the sequencing is worded, you have options, and you need to actually select the sequencing, so we could pull up that chart when you're ready to do that, and then part of your motion will have to be to adopt certain sequencing, if that makes sense. Okay.

Trustee: [inaudible 00:24:54].

President Tiffa...: Speak to the sequencing, and then we can officially open.

Trustee: Sure. Justin, will you help me go to that sequencing slide?

Trustee: Yeah, just the previous slide.

Trustee: Oh, right here? Yeah. So, if I just focus on maps 117, 118 and 119, you'll see that you have options for the sequencing. So you would need to say, let's say you're selecting Map 17, part of your motion would have to be, for the 2024 election, it would be Area 1, and then you'd pick either 3 or 4, and then you would do that for the last part of 2026 as well where you've got an option. So I just want to make sure you guys see that and take care of that. Okay. Thank you.

Trustee: Thanks.

President Tiffa...: Thank you. Okay, if there's no further questions, then I'd love to officially open the public hearing. Are there any other questions?

Trustee: Back to the sequencing, there were two separate... So you had to do '24 and '26 in the motion, and there's two in '24 and three in '26, right? So isn't it automatic once you choose '24, isn't '26 a given?

Trustee: Yeah, you're right, it will. It'll dictate what happens in '26.

Trustee: Okay.

Trustee: Yeah. Thank you.

Trustee: However, just because we're creating a public record and transcript, it'd be great to list them out so there's no ambiguity in our official record.

Trustee: Okay. Yeah.

President Tiffa...: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you for clarifying.

We'll now move to item 3.2 to officially hold a public hearing regarding the demographic process to draw trustee area boundaries. And now officially open the public hearing regarding the demographic process to draw trustee area boundaries to gather community input regarding composition of trustee area boundaries pursuant to elections code section 10010A1.

See no comment cards.

I will now officially close the public hearing.

At this point, we'll move to item 4.1. This is where we will discuss as a board our map selection, our election sequencing. I know I heard we have a possible motion coming. I will say, for me, the two areas of interest that were really important to me was the Twin Oaks being together as much as possible in Area 4, and that was able to be accomplished in all three of the maps. And then also that Sterling section up at the top was kept in Area 3, which was accomplished. And then hearing the presentation, talking about the deviation, and then in specific, the population count of areas 5 and 4, which is where I think we will see the most growth over the next six years before we do this process again. I myself am leaning towards Map 117, but I would be happy to entertain a motion if there's no other conversation from the board.

Julie Hupp: All right, then I will motion that we adopt Map 117 with the sequence of areas 1 and 3 in '24, and areas 2, 4 and 5 in 2026.

President Tiffa...: Okay. We have a first. And just clarifying for motion, the motion is to approve map number 117 with election sequencing of areas 1 and 3 for 2024, 2, 4, and 5 for 2026. Is that motion correct?



This transcript was exported on May 29, 2024 - view latest version [here](#).

Julie Hupp: Correct.

President Tiffa...: Great. Motioned by Trustee Hupp. Is there a second?

Michelle Suther...: Second.

President Tiffa...: Second by Trustee Sutherland. Georgia, will you please call the roll?

Georgia Navarre: Julie Hupp?

Julie Hupp: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Rachelle Price?

Rachelle Price: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Dereck Counter?

Dereck Counter: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Michelle Sutherland?

Michelle Suther...: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Tiffany Saathoff?

President Tiffa...: Yes.

Motion passes.

Okay, now to the fun part, item 4.2. I have to read the legal jargon so we have it on the record accurately.

The board, on March 6th, 2024 expressed its intent to shift to by-trustee area elections through resolution number 23/24/31. Following public hearings on March 20th, 2024 and April 3rd, 2024 to gather community input on trustee area boundaries on April 10th, 2023, the district published draft maps on its website. The district published additional draft maps on April 24th, May 8th and May 20th. The board held public hearings on these draft maps on April 17th, May 1st, May 15th, and May 28th respectively. After an additional public hearing today, the board will now decide whether to take action to adopt resolution number 23/24/41 to adopt the map and sequencing schedule for item 4.2.

So, essentially this is for us to adopt a resolution to send to the County Committee. Is that correct? Great.

This transcript was exported on May 29, 2024 - view latest version [here](#).

Trustee: Yes.

President Tiffa...: Now that we have identified and voted in 4.1 on our Map 117 and our sequencing options, is there a motion to finalize the resolution to send to the county committee to reflect such?

Julie Hupp: So moved.

President Tiffa...: First by Julie Hupp, or Trustee Hupp. Is there a second?

Michelle Suther...: Second.

President Tiffa...: Second by Trustee Sutherland.

Georgia Navarre: Georgia. Will you please call the roll? Julie Hupp?

Julie Hupp: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Rachelle Price?

Rachelle Price: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Dereck Counter?

Dereck Counter: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Michelle Sutherland?

Michelle Suther...: Yes.

Georgia Navarre: Tiffany Saathoff?

President Tiffa...: Yes.

Motion passes.

For the record, to preserve a clear record for the County Committee hearing, we would like to be clear that the motion was to move to adopt resolution 23/24/41 to adopt map option 117 with the election sequencing identified therein.

If there are no further questions, the meeting is adjourned.