



**FOR YOUR INFORMATION**

Compliments of  
El Dorado County Supervisor  
Ron Briggs  
District IV

330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
530-621-6513  
530-622-3645

# 1

**LATE DISTRIBUTION**

Date 6:05 pm, Aug 05, 2011

July 19, 2011, item 44

Supervisor Briggs: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank everyone who came here today, it's not easy to get off on a Tuesday, 9:00, 10:00, 11:00 a.m. I do feel we have vetted this information out substantially, in districts, at the County, at Special Districts, one on one, Supervisors and their constituents. I think we all have gone quite a long way on getting to a map. I also believe the map that is presented, the compiled map, and the map today titled preview final draft have a fair accurate presentation of the County. I think it keeps the County as we know it rightly represented and has done a tremendous job in balancing population and accomplishing the goals we had set up way back when, I believe in March. **I am going to make a motion to accept the preview final draft as our base, as our map.** Before I yield the floor for a 2<sup>nd</sup>, we can move these lines all day long, we can lift this one up, do that one up, were just going to have a mess. I think the staff has gone an extra, extra long hard way and they put a map that really isn't perfect and it's the imperfection that the map has that makes it perfect because if you move a line, it's a gerrymander and you guys can say whatever you want but when we waste two more weeks and move this line over here and that line over there, that will be a gerrymander and it will be continuous to a point where I don't see where it ends. This perfect imperfection of a map is the reason why I support it. I don't like some of the things it does to District IV. I don't like some of the things it does to the rural part of the County, you talk about suburban, let us talk about rural and the rural representation is important because it's the rural representation that gives balance to this County. Otherwise, it becomes another Folsom or Placer if you like suburban houses and suburban representation, keep asking for it, so with that Mr. Chairman I'm going to move that the preview final draft as our adopted map and set it for the next hearing whenever that is for the first reading.

Supervisor Nutting: OK, we have a motion, do we have a second? (Repeated 3 times)

Supervisor Santiago: Motion fails for lack of second.

Supervisor Nutting: Motion fails for lack of second.

Supervisor Knight: I would move to continue the item to; I believe we have an additional board meeting for August 22, 2011 and out of respect for Supervisor Santiago not being available on the 16<sup>th</sup>. What do we have scheduled on the 22<sup>nd</sup>?

SAD: I don't believe we have anything for the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Supervisor Knight: I'll move to continue the item until the 22<sup>nd</sup>. I guess for another review and another cut of the map that was presented on June 29<sup>th</sup>. And my reason for continuance is I think we need to take another cut at the map. I know it's been frustrating for certain people, but I have to take a look at the fact that one third of the population lives in El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park. We need to always take a look at communities of interest and anybody that was here at the very first discussion of how we were going to do that, that was one of the issues we talked about, wanted to continue that continuity in communities of interest and another reason

we need to take another cut at it is when you take a look at the probably easily 50% of the population lives in the urban or suburban areas we need to have that balance as we look at what has transpired over the last twenty years and probably where we are going in the next ten years. I think that's what we really need to take a look at. My motion is to continue this item to August 22, 2011.

Supervisor Nutting: We have a motion to continue to August 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Supervisor Santiago: I will second for the purpose of discussion.

Supervisor Nutting: We have a motion and a second and the discussion is going to be very important because we do not want to have vague direction, because I will tell you, you will have three hundred or four hundred folks in here that will all come from all over parts of this County with regards to this issue. By narrowing the issue I believe we get closer, we give staff direction and get closer to closure. By having a vague motion it basically opens up every aspect in every community so we need to be very cautious about that right now, so we have a motion and a second now, let's talk about discussion, Supervisor's Sweeney's light was on first followed by Supervisor Santiago.

Supervisor Sweeney: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I would have seconded Supervisor Briggs' motion but it's been my sixteen years of history that whenever a member asks for a continuance of a matter if it's at all possible I believe it's appropriate because often times the member needs more information or wants whatever it is, so I respect that. I'll support a continuance but I won't support a continuance to the 22<sup>nd</sup> of August, that's five weeks away. We've been at this now for four and a half months and to take another five weeks, walk in with a new map, some of the rest of us haven't seen it; we're going to have more discussion. I think you ought to have it back in three weeks that would be our regular August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. That's my concern, whatever the date is five weeks is just simply too long. What we are going to do is wind up with what I've seen two other times, this is my third time on redistricting and what happens is people take breaks and there is more crap in the back hallway than there should be and decisions get made out there and deals get cut. I will tell you that's what we tried to avoid and I absolutely disagree with you Racheline, we've put this in the hands of the independent staff and said take what you hear and present it to the Board. When their work came to this board, this board said that looks what I heard and I thought we got someplace without political gerrymandering and now here we are going to politically gerrymander so if we're going to gerrymander I got two bites I want here and there, so what I'm saying is I'd rather see the map in three weeks instead of five weeks. It doesn't take five weeks to draw a map, I run thousands of them and I will tell you a couple of other things, people say this is a ten year map, it is not necessarily a ten year map. The Board of Supervisors in two years could do this all over again. The law says as I understand it in five years you look at the Board of Equalization's numbers and if you are out of respect you need to do it again by law. So in all likely hood in five years the growth that is projected for El Dorado Hills will probably have taken place disproportionate to growth in the rest of the County. So we'll have to correct that problem at that time. So look forward to it in five years. We did one as I recall on a five year cycle about twenty five years

ago and so here we go, but I think we are going to have a difficult time if we wait five weeks. We are going to push up against that timeline and I'm afraid what will happen if we do it in three weeks, take a look at it we may be back in five weeks trying to look at a final map so I'd rather step this up a little bit and I also will tell you the reason we went with the staff hearings instead of the Board hearings was so that each meeting could be informal and not be under the formal Brown Act Rule, and all that kind of stuff and you are right, there weren't that many people interested because they probably thought nobody is here of authority, but I think there was two to three Supervisors at each one of those hearings. I've gotten a lot of input from people in the County. My last observation is when the chips are down you all are going to find out looking back that this won't have mattered all that much to begin with when you think about all the redistricting we've had over the years. I think you're more fortunate than people in most of this State, that most of the people that serve on this BOS look out for the good of the whole County as opposed to just their district so we've been fortunate in that regard.

Supervisor Knight: Supervisor Sweeney, to gain your support the motion maker will amend his motion to continue the item until August 9<sup>th</sup> if the Second concurs.

Supervisor Santiago: I have no problems with that, but as you all know I was the one that said we need a separate meeting outside the board meeting and I know I was overridden in that as far as having a special meeting. We were going to have a special meeting yesterday just on this item. I don't know what's on the agenda for August 9<sup>th</sup> or what's proposed for August 9<sup>th</sup> and I'm still in favor of having a special meeting just focusing on this, frankly, hoping that we can do the first reading on the 9<sup>th</sup>. I'm being a little optimistic that way but that's what my proposal would be to kind of move things forward.

Supervisor Knight: **The 8<sup>th</sup> is fine; I have no life so the 8<sup>th</sup> is fine, so start at 9:00 a.m.**

Supervisor Santiago: **And the Second would concur with that.** I'm at the tell end of the County, up in God's Country. I still have some other things to say and you know it's to agree with some of the things that have already been said except the one thing is I think we need to be very clear in drawing the parameters of the discussion for the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting so that we have clear direction for staff, and the public knows what we are going to be talking about. I'm very serious when I'm talking about; **I'm hoping that we have a vibrant well thought out meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup>, that we can actually do the first reading on the 9<sup>th</sup>.** So there were some things that I was proposing, first of all that we decide that we're working off this map, the preview final draft of the redistricting base map that we are working off this map, not that we are going to bring in an entirely new map and not that we are starting all over, but that we are looking at additional modification to this map. I was very intrigued by the testimony of; I believe it was about the census designated place as related to Pollock Pines. Could you define that for me? That was the first time I had heard that.

**Surveyor Rich Briner:** The census group put together what they thought was a designated area. I don't know how much input they had but they created it and it doesn't necessarily follow what's kind of been said here. Some of the problem is that everybody has their own opinion of

what they consider their community and I can guarantee you get ten people up here and none of them are going to agree. I do have a map that has the census designated places per the census these are based on the census tracks, they kind of wind in and out of what we may consider Pollock Pines or EDH, there's a Cameron Park one, El Dorado Hills one, Georgetown one, Pollock Pines one and a Shingle Springs one.

**Supervisor Sweeney:** You can go back to the 1964 General Plan and you can look at where those communities were named in the General Plan and it would give you a whole connotation, but they have kept the community name and they have grown. Some have grown like the pebble in the water and some have grown according to the contours of the ground and some have grown just because some developer went out there and plunked down some money and a subdivision got approved. As an example, Grizzly Flat, if we had said forty years ago that there would be a subdivision in Grizzly Flat nobody would have believed you but it go there. So to say they grew as a community, sort of maybe, but will those communities look like that twenty years from now. If you would have told me when my dad and I looked at El Dorado Hills for grazing ground that there would be a community like there is today and that was only forty years ago, we were dam fools that we didn't buy it, but if we had bought it for cattle grazing it wouldn't be El Dorado Hills.

**Supervisor Santiago:** What I'm throwing out here in terms of, remember how I started my discussion that when we come back on the 8<sup>th</sup>, I think that we need to be very, very specific in the direction we give staff in terms of what we are looking at. And when this discussion about census designated place came up, I'm wondering, do we take, and I'm throwing it out there for consideration, I have no opinion on that because I'm hearing now that census designated place possibly doesn't represent community. But, is it a good start to help us identify communities of interest that's the question, is that a direction we want to give our staff? Noodle on that as a basis for communication of interest. Looking at the census designated place to help draw some of these boundaries or help re-drawing some of those boundaries. The other thing that Supervisor Knight, and he just left and was brought out before the testimony, how much emphasis, concern, and consideration is the word, how much consideration do we want to give to the fact that there is some planned development in some areas that are going to cause population spikes? We heard that in testimony over three or four times out here. We heard Supervisor Knight talk about it, so like I said these are some of the notes I made as we look at some very specific direction for you when you come back on the 8<sup>th</sup>. The other thing, if you're looking at that transient population, I'll put out my thing again about how the Federal Government recognizes population in South Lake Tahoe. We have a special designation because six months out of the year our population more than triples and as a result of that those people haven't been counted as people that visit here, they utilize county services, they utilize all kinds of things there so how that comes into play is another thing. I'm just throwing that thing out for consideration because I totally agree with Supervisor Nutting that we have to be very, very specific in our direction on Aug. 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Supervisor Briggs:** Norma, on March 15<sup>th</sup> this Board adopted the guidelines which was the point, we adopted the guidelines, we had 17, 18 public hearings and developed maps based on

a certain set of guidelines and we are going to change that, I would suggest that we go all the way back to the beginning and have another 18 meetings with all the people who were working on a criteria that was adopted and everybody understood where we were coming from and today I'm just playing off what I heard, you know, potential future development or any other gerrymandering of the words much less lines. I think it puts the entire process at risk. I think we need to stick with what we have done. And what I'm hearing is El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park don't like El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park lines, but I don't understand what we're going to do. What are you going to do, split it in half and send half of it down to Latrobe where there is nobody and the other half up to Cool, Pilot Hill? Is that what is being asked?

**Supervisor Santiago:** That's why we are going to have those discussions.

**Supervisor Briggs:** But we have had those discussions 18 times now. The moment you begin to move anything in that yellow or in Cameron Park, it is going to drastically change the rest of the County and it's going to significantly shrink everything else because the population is so dense.

**Supervisors Nutting:** Let me interject a little bit, because of the result of the motion here, it will require me to clear my calendar and go into the forty plus communities that I represent. We have gone through that process for a year and a half. The entire configuration of all five districts change, then at play is the thousands of people who have gone through that process the last year and a half, so if we open it up to be broad then every things at play. If you narrow the discussion for example, the edges to make going down Starks Grade and travel patterns, I get all that and Tom understands that. We both have vast working knowledge of those lines. If you wanted to take a look at those edges there, or a total reconfiguration, what's at play is that every community now has to be engaged with whatever is purposed next at the August 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. So if there is a big change from this to something new on August 8<sup>th</sup> then everybody in the County needs to be re-engaged. So what I'm saying here is that we have a responsibility to give staff very good direction so that they can accomplish the goals.

**Supervisor Santiago:** That's exactly what I'm talking about, I am reiterating the points I heard in testimony so that we can draw up some guidelines for staff. I am not issuing an opinion on where the lines are. I am trying to make sure that the meeting we have on the 8<sup>th</sup> is very meaningful and we have to be very, very clear and very, very specific in terms of the direction to staff, based upon what we heard today, based upon what we heard in the 17 public meetings and looking at this. First of all making sure this is the map we are starting with. So, like I said I'm not rendering an opinion, I'm just trying to make sure we are specific to staff.

**Supervisor Nutting:** We are on the same page Norma. Ok Supervisors Briggs, followed by Supervisor Sweeney.

**Supervisor Briggs:** I think I just said what I wanted.

**Supervisor Sweeney:** It's my experience that whenever we meet again on the map until the moment we actually adopt the map everything will be out the door anyhow, so you can sit here

for another hour and a half if you would like and try and set parameters for staff, the public or for anybody else you want and next time we meet on this topic it'll all be changed, I guarantee you. So why don't we just continue the matter like the motion says and let us see what pops up on August 8<sup>th</sup>, because I left here about three weeks ago and thought we were pretty close to being done but I'm willing to set here for another couple of days and go through some more testimony and see what people can do and Supervisor Knight thinks he needs a continuance. If we are going to sit here for another half or hour and a half I suggest we take a break to take care of some of the things we need to take care of.

**Supervisor Briggs:** I will support Supervisor Knight's request as a courtesy of my colleague, but I would just say this if that map comes back and the purple lines are moved in any way I'm going to ask for a continuance.

**Supervisor Sweeney:** That's why I wanted it for the 8<sup>th</sup> instead of three weeks later.

**Supervisor Nutting:** If we punt to the 8<sup>th</sup> we'll just see what pops up, that's vague isn't it staff? Just see what pops up, I mean isn't that vague?

**Surveyor Rich Briner:** Well, to me it means we just bring this map back and let everybody talk about it again.

5 minute break

**Supervisor Nutting:** We took a little break and I'm going to start all the lights at green, are there any red lights wishing to speak? When we deal with direction to staff my concern is that staff is given clear direction and what was returned to me was that staff would clearly come back August 8<sup>th</sup> meeting with the same maps and just take continuance of public comment. What that means is what is at play and what is not at play; and from my perspective when I think about what has unfolded over the last year and a half, I will tell you that the public input I have received is this process has gone out to thousands and thousands of people throughout District III, IV and V. Supervisor Briggs has articulated that if a map comes back that alters District IV, he will be asking for another continuance so that his constituents can see an altered IV. I will tell you if you see an altered III or altered V out of respect for our citizens that would require a continuance for their public input. I believe the same things for the other regions. Now from my perspective in the dozens of community meetings I've had is that the issue, what I've heard, let us just talk about this meeting for example is the populations in Cameron Park, the populations in El Dorado Hills and staff took it upon themselves to interpret these maps as to doing a switch defining Dist II in El Dorado Hills to District I and defining District I to District II in Cameron Park. That wasn't a result from my perspective as of the multitudes unfolding coming to the County requiring that. Now when we traverse these lines and talk about continuity and geographics all of these constraints given the criteria spelled out I will tell you that Pollock has recognized that there is a 3/2 vote we couldn't, unless the Board wants to have Tahoe as its own district. I don't think that's at play, then Tahoe needs to come over the mountain and where do they logically go is down the corridor. We've gone through that

political process and came up with this iteration, do I like it? No, I absolutely do not like it. We went through iterations with Somerset, with Latrobe, with the cattle and agricultural areas of Latrobe, what their infinity was. We went to Cameron Park, we had a few people at the Cameron Park meeting, a few people at the EDHs meeting. I would like to narrow this with respect to all our communities. When I look at the Georgetown meeting if it changes and they are at play, they are going to want to be part of that. If you bring that Tahoe map to include that West Slope over there, they are going to want another meeting. I want to focus on narrowing what we heard today in the discussion and what I think is at play is the supervisorial Districts in the Cameron Park area of II being proposed and the supervisorial District of I, south of Hwy 50. I think so that we don't create a disruption for tens of thousands of people that have already been engaged over the year and a half. I think what's at play is a good discussion and I've heard it, and about five or six of you came up and said one little bubble there would fix a lot of your problems there in Cameron Park. I would believe what's at play and this is from public processes is Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills, in the Cameron Park green north of Hwy 50 and the EDHs yellow, south because the yellow and the green almost look exactly the same to me, south of Hwy 50. Let us deal with the Tom DeVille issue, some of the edge issues, that doesn't radically change the lines but that should be where the discussion is because that's what I'm hearing today because of the configuration of Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills. But, to put everybody else in the County at play and then say punt and staff will have a supervisor bring you some maps or do you have five supervisors bring you some maps is what you are going to get at the 8<sup>th</sup>, as Supervisor Briggs says we are going to punt again and believe me that won't serve the public well.

**Supervisor Santiago:** That's the specificity I was looking for.

**Supervisor Nutting:** I would like to see us have the discussion narrowed there, but we do not touch other than very minor changes to look at the census issues like Norma Santiago said. That the green area north of Hwy 50, the yellow area south of Hwy 50 as the narrowing of the discussion and I'm very much open minded to configurations of the green part and the south part. But, if you were to go to Districts III, IV or to District V and to include, because Pollock Pines, I've gone through that process. They've come to the conclusion that if you want equal representation and stay out of Court that is probably what they need to do. Supervisor Santiago and I made that political jump and we lost on a 3/2 vote. Now I don't think that is at play anymore and if it's not, that's the logical sequence of bringing people in to get the numbers and again I'll reiterate, I don't like that. But, if the what the Board desires is the narrowing to deal with your issue with regards to some of those lines in Pollock Pines, some of those lines on the edge of Cameron Park, some of those lines that's north in the green area and that is south in the yellow area, I believe those are what is at play right now. I don't want to say it again, because if we bubble out anywhere else we have everybody else at play.

**Supervisor Santiago:** You got exactly to my point and the whole thing is we need to give specific directions to staff because what Supervisor Briggs has said over and over again, we want to avoid starting all over again.



**CAO Terri Daly:** I just wanted to point out that the census designation area that we are talking about was one of the parameters that the Surveyor used in coming up with the maps.

**Supervisor Nutting:** Right, so we can address Mr. DeVille's issues just by taking a closer look at that and Mr. DeVille can talk to the Surveyor and figure that one out. But from my perspective if we narrow direction to staff then we get to the decision and I would entertain it's going to be the balance of this board. I would entertain that we narrow it to Cameron Park green north and El Dorado Hills yellow south and direct Supervisor Knight and I work with the communities and with staff to try to figure out the different iterations in El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park to draw the lines between District I and District II. I think that will be a tremendous narrowing and the discussion doesn't open a Pandora's box with Rescue, Kelsey, Georgetown, Volcanoville, Mountain Dixon, it goes on and on. We are focusing on narrowing not broadening. I would propose that.

**Supervisor Santiago:** OK, we have a motion and the motion was essentially to continue to the 8<sup>th</sup>, so the motion maker, are you willing to make some specific changes to that motion to reflect what Supervisor Nutting is saying?

**Supervisor Knight:** Deal with the first motion, and then we will get to staff direction. I think for discussion purposes and looking at the continuities of interest, I think that is what we should be talking about is where the lines are between District I and District II in the westerly end of El Dorado County. I don't want to be so specific north, south, and east. I think that's where we need to massage it, to come up with the 36,201.

**Supervisor Santiago:** I think we go with the original motion in terms of having this discussion on August 8<sup>th</sup> and then provide direction to staff.

**Supervisor Nutting:** Which would be a subsequent motion? It's very clear. Is there any further discussion on the motion? All in favor? Ayes: Knight, Santiago, Nutting, Sweeney, Briggs.  
Noes: none, Absent: none.

**Supervisor Nutting:** We have a 5/0 vote for an August 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Now, do we want to give clarity to staff?

**Supervisor Knight:** I will make the direction to staff, my motion would be to work with Supervisor District I and Supervisor District II to work on community of interest boundary line adjustments between the El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park communities, the boundary lines between the two making sure we have the population balance that equity in these. I'm not going to; you may have some movement out of the Latrobe area.

**Supervisor Nutting:** I would like to support that with a second.

**Supervisor Briggs:** I think I want to support this, basically leaving purple alone.

**Supervisor Nutting:** Yes.

**Supervisor Briggs:** Then I will support it.

**Supervisor Nutting:** I would say the motion would keep the purple in probably 99%; there might be a couple of edge issues.

**Supervisor Nutting:** All in favor? Ayes: Knight, Nutting, Sweeney, Briggs, Santiago, Noes: none, Absent: none.