

## ***REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA***

**Amador County Administration Center, Board Chambers, 810 Court Street, Jackson, California  
Wednesday, October 13, 2021, 6:00 p.m.**

**ANY INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE NOT FULLY VACCINATED FOR COVID-19 AND WISH TO ATTEND THIS MEETING IN PERSON WILL BE REQUIRED TO WEAR A FACE SHIELD OR MASK TO ENTER THE BUILDING AND THROUGHOUT THE DURATION OF THEIR ATTENDANCE AT THE MEETING.**

**DUE TO THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDER N-25-20, THE AMADOR COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WILL BE CONDUCTING ITS MEETING VIA TELECONFERENCE. WHILE THIS MEETING WILL STILL BE CONDUCTED IN-PERSON AT 810 COURT STREET, WE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE THE PUBLIC TO PARTICIPATE FROM HOME BY CALLING IN USING THE FOLLOWING NUMBER:**

**+1-669-900-6833 (alternate phone numbers listed on amadorgov.org)**

**Access Code: 758 573 6084#**

**YOU MAY ALSO VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING USING THIS LINK:**

**<https://zoom.us/j/7585736084>**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call:
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of October 13, 2021 Agenda
4. Approval of September 29, 2021 Minutes
5. Public Matters Not on the Agenda
6. Review of what we've done and how to use the information-Demonstration by Ruslan Bratan.
7. Review of current census information and how it affects our mapping capabilities.
8. Discussion of how we move forward from here and how do we bring this to a conclusion?
  - a. Discuss the Process on How New Maps will be Created.
9. Brief demonstration by Ruslan Bratan on mapping program.
10. Other Items/Questions/Agenda Items for Next Meeting
11. Adjournment – Until Wednesday, October 20, 2021

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board staff, at (209) 223-6470 or (209) 257-0619 (fax). Requests must be made as early as possible and at least one-full business day before the start of the meeting. Assisted hearing devices are available in the Board Chambers for public use during all public meetings. Pursuant to Government Code 54957.5, all materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the Board by Board members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, at and after the time of such distribution, in the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 810 Court Street, Jackson, California 95642, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except for County holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the Board at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the Board or County staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials that are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

**Amador County Redistricting Advisory Committee**  
**MINUTES**

**DATE:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021  
**TIME:** 6:00 p.m.  
**LOCATION:** County Administration Center, 810 Court Street, Jackson, California

The Redistricting Advisory Committee of Amador County met at the County Administration Center, 810 Court Street, Jackson, California, on the above date pursuant to adjournment, and the following proceedings were had, to wit:

**Present on Roll Call:**

Keith Sweet, District I, Chairman, Regular Member  
Dana Jorgensen, District I, Alternate Member  
Patti Fisher-Misuraca, District II Regular Member  
Andy Byrne, District IV, Regular Member  
Bruce Baracco, District IV, Regular Member  
Jan Houghton, District IV, Alternate Member  
Don Dowell, District V, Regular Member  
Tom Patten, District V, Regular Member  
Anne Heissenbuttel, District V, Alternate Member

**Staff:** Chuck Beatty, Director of Planning  
Ruslan Bratan, Planner  
Heather Peek, Deputy Clerk of the Board

**Absent:** Charles T. Iley, County Administrative Officer  
Wayne Garibaldi, District I Regular Member  
Robert Enyeart, District II, Alternate Member  
Katya Anderson, District III, Vice-Chairman, Regular Member  
Stephanie Thompson, District III, Regular Member

**REGULAR SESSION:** At approximately 6:00 p.m., the Committee convened into regular session.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Chairman Keith Sweet led the Committee and the public in the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

**PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** Discussion items only, no action to be taken. Any person may address the Committee at this time upon any subject within the jurisdiction of the Amador County Redistricting Advisory Committee; however, any matter that requires action may be referred to staff and/or Committee for a report and recommendation for possible action at a subsequent Committee meeting. Please note - there is a **three (3) minute limit per person**.

There were no public comments at this time.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Review and possible approval of the October 13, 2021 agenda.

**ACTION:** Direction given pursuant to the following motion.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Andy Byrne, District IV, seconded by Don Dowell, District V, and unanimously carried to approve the October 13, 2021 agenda.

**APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 29, 2021 MINUTES:** Review and possible approval of the September 29, 2021 Minutes.

**ACTION:** Direction given pursuant to the following motion.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Andy Byrne, District IV, seconded by Tom Patten, District V, and unanimously carried to approve the September 29, 2021 Minutes.

**REVIEW SUBMITTED AND MAPPED COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST:** The committee finished reviewing the submitted and mapped communities of interest (COI), and picked up where they left off, starting with the Ione Miwuk Band #1. It was decided to leave at as is. Next on the list was Irishtown, which is encompassed in a larger area. Mr. Byrne, District IV, regular member added there will be a bunch that are encompassed with Pine Grove. Chairman Sweet said that even though something is encompassed inside of something if and when there is a line drawn through it, the committee would want to take that into consideration which is being cut one way or the other. Mr. Byrne, District IV, regular member, said that is correct and that if you have to cut down the middle of a COI you don't want to cut all of the COI's that are in it. The committee moved onto Jackson Pines stating this one may partially be in the Pine Grove overlap and that some people may consider themselves in Jackson because of the name and/or that they're currently in District I. The committee then decided they would keep Jackson Rancheria #2 as it's totally encompassed. Jackson Rancheria #2 would be a better representation than Jackson Rancheria #1. Mr. Byrne, District IV, regular member, said he agreed with he thought he originally put the Jackson Rancheria in and he just plugged in the one, not knowing much about it. Mr. Bratan, Amador County Planner, said there was one recently added COI called Jackson Valley Lake Amador. Mr. Byrne, District IV, regular member, said that he had added that one and it's the Jackson Valley area, which is, basically not heavily populated but it's definitely a ranch/community area. He continued, saying he had them pop up at him at an Amador County Planning Commission meeting when quarries are up and had a person from the public assist him on this. Mr. Jorgensen, District I Alternate Member, asked what the roads on the top right were. Mr. Bratan, said the main road is Stonycreek. Mr. Byrne, District IV, regular member, said some of those got big because of the census blocks are pretty big in there and he didn't know that he would've made it that big otherwise. Chairman Sweet said we have this on the list and that we'll pull #1 from the list. The committee decided to leave KC Ranchettes leave as is and moved on to Lockwood. Chairman Sweet asked if Ruslan could bring all four of the Lockwood COI's up at once. It was determined that Lockwood #2 encompasses #1, #3, and #4. Chairman Sweet asked if there was anyone who could speak to #1, #3, and #4 as to why they are differentiated or can speak to #2. Don Dowell, District V Regular Member, said the largest one is the result of small census blocks and that for instance, Lockwood, generally is not known to extend all the way down into Fiddletown. He continued that the usual border for Lockwood would be Brockman Mills, which is quite a ways up Fiddletown Road from Fiddletown. Chairman Sweet noted they're all a bit too far to the west. Don – yes as far as the more southerly area towards the west that's accurate.

Lockwood goes almost all the way down to Stage Road, which would be a Sutter Creek address. Keith – it's fair to say, will the committee accept that we're going to use Lockwood #2? Andy – that would be my consensus. I think what it is that you'd want to add part of the top one but it's just one big census block. It wouldn't tell us if there's a line out there, we'd have to be looking for it. Don Dowell, District V Regular Member, replied with exactly, and that this will all come to bear during the actual figuring out of the supervisorial districts. He also said that because part of that shouldn't be included in the Lockwood COI, but to remove that would remove a major portion of what should be in there and the committee will actually have to start paying attention when we start drawing the supervisorial lines. Andy Byrne, District IV Regular Member, added that it'll be interesting because that will be the same problem, when you draw the supervisorial lines; they're going to be pushed in these directions the same way we're pushing these COI's. Mr. Byrne also noted it will make some lines go places that you wouldn't necessarily want them. For example, he wanted to push a line straight through one of these, but you can't just do that. Tom Patten, District V Regular Member, said he's all in favor of doing whatever we need to do, especially in Mr. Dowell's opinion, because of his knowledge and association of the Lockwood District to the extent that it doesn't eliminate any of the Dry Creek COI's. He also stated there is overlap there and also with Fiddletown one and that he thought the committee all agreed that overlaps are ok, as long as there's synergy. Mr. Patten stated he liked the idea of Lockwood and Dry Creek together because of fire protection issues. Chairman Sweet said Lockwood #2 will stay and the other Lockwood's will be scrapped. The committee moved on to Lower Ridge and Chairman Sweet asked Mr. Bratan to combine all the plotted COI's for Ridge. This included Upper Ridge, Middle Ridge, Lower Ridge and Ridge. Andy Byrne, District IV Regular Member said he mapped this one and he didn't go further down and find a community, and that it seemed more commercial. Chairman Sweet said part of it is in Sutter Creek and part of it might be in the County. Mr. Byrne noted the part that's in Sutter Creek is uninhabited for the most part. Chairman Sweet asked to look at Lower Ridge by and of itself. Mr. Bratan said that Lower Ridge is entirely within Ridge and Chairman Sweet said to subtract it. Andy Byrne, District IV Regular Member, said when he was mapping that he put these in because it currently had a conflict going through these areas as supervisorial districts. He went on to say he thought it was important to look at those areas where there are current conflicts when he was mapping. Chairman Sweet asked if Lower Ridge #2 was all within Ridge Road. Mr. Byrne said yes and Mr. Bratan said that he already removed it. Chairman Sweet added we want to keep Lower Ridge #1 and asked if it should still be retained with Lower Ridge #2. Andy Byrne, District IV Regular Member, said the reason he can see keeping multiples is that as it stands today there is a conflict through this area and that if there is another line going through this with the new mapping then we'd want to have all the small ones intact if we cut through a bigger one. He continued saying that it's a long stretch of road and there'd be multiple communities along this stretch of road and there are gaps in it and the mapping techniques don't always come up with the gaps so we have to find those to work them out. Don Dowell, District V, Regular Member said it's definitely going to overlay other COI's and that if you look at Upper Ridge #1, that encompasses the major part of Pine Grove. Andy Byrne, District IV Regular Member, added that it also overlaps with Surrey Junction. Mr. Dowell said there's going to be overlap especially with something as vague, if you will, Ridge Road. At this time, Ms. Susan Peters, District IV resident, addressed the committee, wondering if it's possible to show the boundaries of Pine Grove Community Services District (CSD), on the Upper Ridge and that she thought the Upper Ridge boundary should be in its own district/and or neighborhood or encompassed in there. Ms. Peters continued that she is worried about the boundary on the Upper

Ridge and that maybe it's going into part of the Pine Grove CSD and said it should either be completely in the CSD or out of it entirely and that dividing it in the middle of the CSD would not be the right thing to do. Chairman Sweet asked Mr. Bratan to put the CSD up there for just Pine Grove and Mr. Bratan said those are the CSD's. Ms. Peters added the maroon one is Sunset Heights, so that's completely in that so that makes sense, but dividing the Upper Ridge on other hand, would not. Andy Byrne, District IV Regular Member, said he thinks this is one of those cases where we end up with overlap and you can have communities overlap each other, that it's one thing we're looking at when you have a bunch of multiples that overlap that starts to show you a larger community that you're not going to want to run a line through. He continued that the surface districts are pre-mapped and are already a layer within our mapping and in consideration and asked if that helped. Ms. Peters said yes, although she was concerned about the ultimate impact and how it will look at the end and the way District IV is mapped out now, is chaotic at best. Ms. Peters reiterated her concern that Pine Grove CSD will be split up or not in one district; and it should remain in one district. Mr. Byrne said the CSD is also a COI so it's on the list of one of the things that should not be split. Don Dowell, District V Regular Member, said that Pine Grove is a census designated place (CDP) which is also being considered. Ms. Peters asked if there were different versions of the Upper Ridge Road neighborhood or if there was only one being proposed and Chairman Sweet said that right now we have four proposals, but it will be narrowed down. Don Dowell, District V, Regular Member, said there's only one for Upper Ridge Road or at least there's one called Upper Ridge Road. Andy Byrne, District IV Regular Member also added there's probably some overlap with Surrey Junction and others that might overlap on it also because of the census blocks. Don Dowell, District V, Regular Member, stated it appears that Surrey Junction is completely within the Upper Ridge Road. Chairman Sweet updated the committee there were still have four that have the word "Ridge" in them and that there is one that is contained within the other three. Andy Byrne, District IV, Regular Member, said he suspects there are more neighborhoods that got through there and with the census block issue that's why we went big with it because there might two small communities within a census block that are completely separate from each other and that they also don't know where the people actually live. Mr. Byrne said he'd be willing to stick with the larger one, and being aware of it when we do mapping that this is a sensitive area. Chairman Sweet asked if they were going to eliminate some and keep one or keep them all for now and Mr. Byrne said he personally thinks this is an area that is likely to have lines go through this area. Chairman Sweet said the committee will keep all four of these. The committee moved on to Lupe Road, with Mr. Byrne saying that one overlapped as well, possibly even overlapping on Surrey Junction. Chairman Sweet said we'll keep these for future reference so we'll have something to converse with when we get into the discussions on where the lines are to be. Next on the list was Mace Meadows; Chairman Sweet said there are two that look exactly identical – so #2 will be eliminated. The committee moved on to Moriah Heights (107 population) – Mr. Jorgensen asked if we could hear the populations listed as we go through the COI's to get an idea. The committee moved on to Mt. Echo (population 95) and left as is. Mt. Zion came in with a population of 530 and Andy Byrne, District IV, Regular Member, stated it overlapped with Pine Grove and Pine Acres. The committee decided to leave Martell as is. The Oaks is a newly plotted COI population of 473. Andy Byrne, District IV, Regular Member, found that one with another member of the public. The committee will leave as is. Mr. Bratan said there are two Prevatli's with #2 being bigger. Don Dowell, District V, Regular Member, asked if he was correct in that #2 extends all the way into Jackson. Andy Byrne, District IV, Regular Member, said he thought it was again the issue with the census block – that it just kind of runs you all the

way down there. He also said there is a big census block of it in the bottom. Mr. Dowell asked that if it was not towards Jackson and Mr. Byrne said that may be why one is marked as the top and one is marked at the bottom; because there's probably stuff on the top at the bottom and some portion of it that actually makes sense. He continued to say it's like Lockwood; if you cut that in half. Chairman Sweet asked if that bottom portion of the one on the screen is that not Prevatali Road and Mr. Byrne said that it was and mentioned if you're looking across Prevatali Road and you're on the other side of it, the next block over is the other side of that road. Chairman Sweet asked the County if there were was much residential housing to the south of Prevatali Road according to this map presented. Mr. Bratan said that Prevatali #1 has a population of 187 and Prevatali #2 has a population of 320. Mr. Jorgensen said he'd driven Prevatali Road at the bottom and there are easily 20 homes in that first part. Mr. Bratan said to keep in mind that the 320 includes all of Prevatali #1 and Mr. Byrne stated that the bottom half is roughly that same population range. Chairman Sweet determined the committee will keep them both. The committee moved onto Pine Grove #1, #2 and #3, which were arguably all the same. Mr. Byrne noted that we're in Pine Acres first which also overlaps and maybe they could be shown together. Chairman Sweet asked the committee if they wanted to retain Pine Grove #3 for purposes like we want to retain others that are included, also saying most of us would agree the largest Pine Grove would be the one to keep. Mr. Bratan provided the populations for Pine Grove #1 (4,170), Pine Grove #2 (4,048) and Pine Grove #3 (4,464). Mr. Byrne commented that the north east corner goes over Grinding Rock. Chairman Sweet asked the committee if anyone wanted to speak on if it's in Grinding Rock or Pine Grove. Ms. Heissenbittel, District V, Alternate Member, said she separated out Grinding Rock so it'd be recognized as a separate district/community so that if we had to draw lines within Pine Grove somewhere, it would be identifiable. Chairman Sweet asked if the suggestion of the light gray area which encompasses Grinding Rock (population 276) should be called Pine Grove and Ms. Heissenbittel said she'd be ok with that. Mr. Byrne added we should stick with the larger one because there are a lot of communities that under lay in the Pine Grove area that if we have to put a line there then we have the other COI's that you could use as a border. Next up was Pioneer and Chairman Sweet wondered why nothing to the right of Highway 88 on the map was included in Pioneer. Don Dowell, District V, Regular Member, said he believed he mapped that and used the CDP as a template and in general, once you leave Pine Grove it's all Pioneer until you get up to Dew Drop. Pioneer was left as is. The next COI discussed was the Ranch House Estates (population 146); Mr. Byrne commented that it falls in Pine Grove. Chairman Sweet asked if they had to draw a line if the committee would consider it Pine Grove or Pioneer. Mr. Byrne said yes absolutely, and it might end up on one side or the other because of population. Don Dowell, District V, Regular Member, commented on River Pines' sphere of influence (SOI) being larger than what it shows but limited by census blocks. Mr. Byrne said it wouldn't get bigger because if it did it would be giant. Mr. Dowell said this is designated by the commerce and done by census bureau that's why it's a census designated place. Chairman Sweet asked Mr. Beatty, Amador County Planning Director, why it's differentiated one place from another and how they are chosen. Mr. Beatty said it's determined by population clusters. Chairman Sweet indicated we have a map with 300 population clusters on it and asked why do they choose one population cluster and not another. Mr. Beatty didn't have an answer, but did say they don't always follow a census block. Mr. Baracco said they develop a data set that's very close with an incorporated city so you get more census data with a census designated place as you do with an unincorporated open area. Mr. Dowell said if you look at the CDP in Amador County's (Buckhorn, Red Corral) new ones for this year were Amador Pines and Lockwood. The

committee kept Running Gold #2 and moved on to Shenandoah Valley #1 and #2; keeping #1 because it's bigger. Next up was Sherwood Forest #1(population 115), #2 (population 236), #3 (population 226); keeping #2 as it was larger. Ms. Heissenbuttel said she has family living up there and thinks Sherwood Forest #1 is a community more than Sherwood Forest #2 because it doesn't go all the way up to Sugar Pines drive and that more of Sugar Pines Drive is included in Sherwood Forest #1. The committee decided that Sugar Pine Ridge fits right in (population 667). Surrey junction #2 (population 253) was left as is. The committee left Van de Hei as is and moved onto Volcano #1, #2 and #3; #1 and #3 were eliminated. Warner Road #1 (population 111) and #2 (population 122). Mr. Byrne stated that Warner Road actually crosses Volcano Road and overlaps into Grinding Rock. Ms. Heissenbuttel said it doesn't connect with roads surrounding Grinding Rock; the committee kept #2. Willow Estates (population 230); left as is.

**DISCUSSION ON SURVEY COMMITTEE SUMMARIES:** Chairman Sweet turned this over to Ms. Houghton and Ms. Heissenbuttel to discuss the results of the survey summaries. Ms. Houghton, District IV, Alternate Member, reported that there were 39 responses to survey. Ms. Heissenbuttel, District V, Alternate Member, said most responses were from residents who found it important they be their districts would be fairly evenly represented. Ms. Heissenbuttel also shared the committee needs better outreach if we want more input from the public. Ms. Houghton said the COI's consisted of geographic locations, and shared interests on wildfire danger concerns, roads and parks, snow piling and what it meant to them. An overall suggestion was to update the Redistricting website to make it more easily accessible, how to navigate it, use it and also adding a frequently asked question (FAQ) section. Chairman Sweet advised the committee to send their comments to Mrs. Peek by Friday, October 1<sup>st</sup>, so could make those updates. Ms. Heissenbuttel said she would be sending the shareable information document posted on the website to the Ledger Dispatch and Upcountry News for additional outreach.

**OTHER ITEMS/QUESTIONS:** Andy Byrne, District IV, Regular Member, posed his concern on some of the data that was coming in and Mr. Bratan updated the committee and said he'd first noticed that the 2020 data was available and looking at it you could tell there was something wrong with it. Mr. Bratan contacted ESRI directly filed a claim. Mr. Bratan said they got back to him with the same answers from another source – which California reallocated prison inmate data and there were errors they redid and fixed some things with more edits. ESRI has to do more work when the state makes edits, but it should be good next week.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Until Wednesday, October 13, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

---

Keith Sweet, Chairman, Redistricting Advisory Committee

ATTEST:

---

HEATHER PEEK, Deputy Clerk of the  
Board of Supervisors, Amador County,  
California