Dear San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to submit my comments on SLO County's current redistricting evaluation.

I am a 20+ year resident of South County in District 4, currently living in Arroyo Grande. I take the democratic process seriously and feel that I have done my due diligence in becoming informed and learning about the issue at hand.

My understanding is that the County's consultant found that the most recent (2020) US Census tract data for the County, which informs the redistricting process, did not change significantly enough from the previous Census data to warrant redrawing the supervisorial district boundaries.

For this reason, I strongly urge the Board to support Draft Map A, the No Change option. This option is just and complies with the State's Fair Maps Act of 2019.

If the board's current majority cannot resist the temptation to vote to redraw district boundaries in a way that would favor their political base and benefit their own political careers, it will be plainly obvious.

The result would be lawsuits that waste County taxpayer funds by requiring the County to defend itself against accusations of eroding democracy, caused by our own elected officials. Frankly, this would be disgraceful.

Given that the current board majority are on record as repeatedly promoting fiscal conservatism and desiring to reduce waste of taxpayer funds, I hope that these individuals will act to support democracy in SLO County by supporting the No Change redistricting option.

Sincerely,

Christopher Hamma
Arroyo Grande
I urge you to retain current supervisorial district boundaries, which will ensure continuity, keep existing Communities of Interest intact, and meet all statutory requirements. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted.

The new census data do not justify major changes to current supervisor district boundaries. Current districts meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness.

I live in the City of SLO and support its division into three supervisorial districts. The City has ties to all parts of the county, providing jobs, shopping, and education for folks who live in other areas and are connected through our central location and major transportation systems. Those who assert otherwise generally don’t live in the City. Don’t marginalize us into a single district.

While minor updates to the existing boundaries may be required, such changes should be minimal. Please reject the proposed “Patten map” and others that kettle the City of SLO into a single district.
I agree with the two former police chiefs that recently sent a letter to the Tribune. There is no need to significantly change the voting districts for the SLO County supervisors at this time. Therefore, I support plan B. It is important that government not only makes fair decisions, but also has the appearance of fairness in order to govern. Significant change would appear to be an attempt to shape election results on political lines even if that was not the intent.
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:28 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 144

RedistrictingID 144
Form inserted 11/17/2021 6:26:44 AM
Form updated 11/17/2021 6:26:44 AM
First Name Tim
Last Name Benne
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93405

Dear SLO County Supervisors... I totally agree with the following comments (below in quotes) offered by SLO’s former police chiefs. "You can write to the Supervisors at boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us and urge them to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration." Tim Bennett

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 218632
---Original Message---
From: Judy Stokely <j
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:22 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

> On Nov 16, 2021, at 7:52 PM, Judy Stokely wrote:
> This email is from Judy and Ed Stokely.
> After reviewing the proposed redistricting changes urge you to retain current supervisorial district boundaries, which will ensure continuity, keep existing Communities of Interest intact, and meet all statutory requirements. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted.
> The new census data do not justify major changes to current supervisor district boundaries. Current districts meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness.
> While minor updates to the existing boundaries may be required, such changes should be minimal. Please reject the proposed “Patten map” and others that kettle the City of SLO into a single district.
> We appreciate your consideration and support.

Judy and Ed Stokely
Cambria, CA 93428
I urge you not to redraw the current maps. It's an obvious ploy by the conservative members of The Board of Supervisors to gain clout by stacking votes in their favor, thereby pushing their reactionary agendas.

Myra Lathrop
Paso Robles

"We are all just walking each other home." Ram Dass
From: Paul Reinhardt
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:31 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please keep the existing boundaries.
Thanks for your work on this,
Paul Reinhardt
San Luis Obispo, California

Feel Flow
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:39 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 145

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistricting ID</th>
<th>145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/17/2021 7:38:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/17/2021 7:38:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Jason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Dornish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organization Represented</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>I strongly urge you not to drastically change the districts. Choose Plan A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Records Notice</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Check</td>
<td>218429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I urge you to adopt either Map A or Map B. None of the districts in SLO County changed very much from last census. Maps A and B ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the elections cycle, and meet statutory requirements.

Thank you,

Nancy Vimla

Los Osos, CA 93402
From: Hilary Norcross <*
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:43 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Requesting no redistricting changes

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisor members,

As a resident in district 4, I am requesting no change to our redistricting plan.

Per the county's consultant Redistricting Partners, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes.

Please leave the map as it is.

Respectfully,
--
Hilary Norcross

(texts are great and better than voice mail)
FW: [EXT]Redistributing

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:03 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Jan Kincaid <jan_kincaid@Cambria.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:56 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistributing

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please don’t separate the northern coastal towns. We are tied together with similar interests, concerns, goals. Similar size & objectives. Demographics. It makes no sense that we be separated & each have to loudly battle the bigger inland cities to even be heard. In my humble opinion. Thank you for considering my objection.

Jan Kincaid
Cambria

Sent from my iPhone
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 10 year resident of the coastal community of Cambria, I am astonished that a redistricting plan (Plan C) would even be considered by the Board for implementation. The coastal communities share almost no "community of interest" with the large city of Paso Robles. It is imperative that the new redistricting plan maintain continuity - and a voice - for the existing coastal communities.

I strongly urge the Board to act in a rational, thoughtful manner, reject Plan C and establish supervisorial districts which represent the interests of all coastal residents.

Sincerely,

Kevin Boylan
Hello:
I am a resident of San Luis Obispo county. As you are aware, our county does NOT need to legally change our district lines based on the new census data. Please do the right thing and leave things as they are.

Very truly yours,
~Ashley Hain
-----Original Message-----
From: Margaret Goddard <j
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:12 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Bad idea

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To whom it may concern

Our family’s two different households in the town of Cayucos are very concerned about the proposals of new REDISTRICTING lines which would chop up the coastline towns & combine them with inland communities for reasons that don’t make any sense. Please keep the districts as they currently are. This reflects one family of 5 adult voters from Cayucos. Thank you for listening.

The 2 Goddard family households

Any questions

Sent from my iPhone
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:04 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Dennis Loggins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:14 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Leave the voting districts alone. PLEASE.

Dennis Loggins
Dear County Commissioners:

Please rethink your plan to drastically re-draw district lines. They're fine the way they are. We don't need more politically-motivated gerrymandering.

Regards,
Tom King
Nipomo
Redistricting

After reviewing all the information available to the public, I urge the Board to not do any regarding changing district boundaries. This is a waste of time and taxpayers money.
The shape of districts matters because their borders determine who votes in an election — and if drawn in certain ways, a district could artificially inflate or restrict the representation of a group of voters of common interest. The Republican troika led by John Peschong essentially plans to game the system. They espouse election integrity yet they want anything but. With redistricting, the conservative supervisors want to pick the voters, rather than having the voters pick their representatives so as to maintain their hegemony.

Trump says “Republicans would ‘never’ be elected again if it was easier to vote”.
The redistricting plan to cleave up the current districts clearly is right out of Trump’s play book.
Laurance Shinderman

“Those who can make you believe absurdities, can make you commit atrocities.”...Voltaire
From: Jennifer Haupt <juliag Haupt@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:31 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I am a resident of Cambria and I oppose the redistricting of SLO County to combine Paso Robles with Cambria. Small coastal communities have a unique environment and I concur with the following letter that was sent expressing these views.

“Being unincorporated, we are significantly impacted” by county Board of Supervisors’ decisions, “such as land use, road paving priorities, garbage rates and vacation rental growth,” the draft letter states. “It is essential that this coastal corridor ‘community of interest’ remain in its current District 2 designation and not be redistricted to communities without shared commonalities.” “Realignment into any urban-based inland district would,” the letter states, “in effect, suppress the voice and needs of the coastal unincorporated communities, while damaging an historically defined community of interest.”

Jennifer Haupt
Dear Supervisors,

My wife Eileen and I strongly encourage you to retain the current supervisory district boundaries. We do so because we are afraid any alternatives will be perceived by the public as hyper-partisan and an excuse for violence - which seems increasingly to be the go-to means of addressing so many issues these days. Because redistricting has long-term implications, you have an unusually important responsibility to make a wise decision.

I think you will agree that the primary responsibility of the government is to protect its citizens. This responsibility extends beyond the federal government to other levels including county government. Please consider that at this time of unusually high public unrest, any change will likely be regarded as provocative which, as we all have lately been aware, may lead to threats and violence. I read in yesterday's SLO Tribune that two well-respected former local police chiefs also believe that leaving the current districts unchanged is best for the community. I hope you concur and will vote accordingly. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Daniel O'Grady, Former SLO County and City of Atascadero Planning Commissioner
Templeton
November 17, 2021
From: Janette Sofranko <janette.sofranko@arroyogrande.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:50 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <BoardofSups@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting - keep the current district boundaries

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I do not support your proposal for redistricting San Luis Obispo county for the Board of Supervisors.

I urge you to retain the current district lines. There is no real reason for the change that you have drawn up without a nonpartisan citizens' panel.

We don't need more partisan politics dividing this county, state or country.

Respectfully,
Janette Sofranko
Arroyo Grande
From: Krisin Eriksson >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Phone Call - Public Comment 11/17/2021

Kathy Keyes called to declare that she would like to keep the current supervisorial districts.
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

What precincts are in each district for redistricting Plan A?

Helene
As you consider redistricting, I would like to urge you to keep Cambria and the North Coast with the coastal communities and not to include this area into a North County district. Having lived in both areas I can attest to the different needs and interests between the north coast and the north county. I believe that my voice, my concerns, and issues that involve Cambria would be silenced and under-represented if our community were merged into a district with Paso Robles and North County. As an unincorporated area, we must rely on our county representation. Please do not redistrict the North Coast.

Thank you,

Diana Boles
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:00 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 147

RedistrictingID 147
Form inserted 11/17/2021 8:59:42 AM
Form updated 11/17/2021 8:59:42 AM
First Name Linda
Last Name Mayer
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City Cambria
Zip 93428
Comment I urge you to retain current supervisorial district boundaries which will ensure continuity, keep existing Communities of Interest intact and meet all statutory requirements. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted. The new census data do not justify major changes to the current supervisor district boundaries. Current districts meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness.
Public Records Notice True
Linda Mayer (Cambria resident) called to declare her desire that the Board maintain current supervisorial districts and keep current communities of interest intact.
Hello,

I urge you to retain current supervisorial district boundaries which will ensure continuity, keep existing Communities of Interest intact and meet all statutory requirements. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted.

The new census data do not justify major changes to the current supervisor district boundaries. Current districts meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness.

Regards,
Linda Mayer
Cambria, CA
Comment: Do not make major changes to our district boundaries. Changing will increase strife & distrust in our community. Compelling reasons to keep the boundaries as they are have been expressed by respected former police chiefs. Please demonstrate that you can put aside your own personal preferences and political ambitions and act for the benefit of the county as a whole. Keep the current district boundaries.
I want to express my support for keeping the current supervisorial district boundaries. We must continue, to the extent possible, to respect “communities of interest.” Moving any community on the Coast to an inland region makes very little sense.
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:10 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Hill <t>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:17 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please do not change the boundaries of our current districts. It is insanity to lump Cambria and our coastal regions with inland Paso Robles. Whose idea was this? They should be held accountable next election.
P.s. this is the first time I have ever written to any government agency.
Mary Hill, Cambria

Sent from my iPad
Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the work you do on our behalf.

Please retain the current district lines in San Luis Obispo County. They are efficient, fair and fully compliant with election laws.

Constance L. Moxness
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
Re. Friday’s 11/19 meeting:
As a representative of 3 voting citizens in our Nipomo residence, 1 Republican, 1 Democrat & one no party preference I feel we are a good cross section of district 4. We would like the district boundaries to remain the same. Vote for the good of the residents not for political gain!
Sheila, Tom & Bob Consoli
Trilogy Monarch Dunes
Nipomo, Ca.
First Name: mike
Last Name: toppe
Email: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented: Morro Bay
City: Morro Bay
Zip: 93442
Comment: Any maps beyond maps A&B are illegal as the census data does not support these radical changes.
Public Records Notice: True
Linda Busek (Arroyo Grande resident) called to declare that she would like the Board to maintain the current districts, supporting either County Staff Advisory Committee Plan A or Plan B, with a preference for Plan B. She indicated that she supports Plan B because it is an efficient and fair balancing of geography and population. She also stated that any other redrawing of supervisorial districts would be partisan gerrymandering.
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:11 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Shirley Cross [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:31 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I urge all of the board members to vote to keep leave the districts as they are now. Cambria does not belong in the north county. Coastal issues are unique to the coast. Do not change the boundaries for political gain.

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Board,

I am opposed to any and all gerrymandering and redistricting of our county and state.

Kierna Terrisse
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:43 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 150

RedistrictingID: 150
Form inserted: 11/17/2021 9:42:53 AM
Form updated: 11/17/2021 9:42:53 AM
First Name: Kierna
Last Name: Terrisse
Email: Hidden
Phone: Hidden
Name of Organization Represented:
City: ATASCADERO
Zip: 93422
Comment: I oppose all gerrymandering and redistricting of our state and county
Public Records Notice: True
Please retain Map B District Boundaries because the current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

New census data do not justify major changes to current supervisor district boundaries. The current districts meet all the state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness.

The Board of Supervisors must show the voters they are impartial and non-partisan by selecting Map B.

Thank you.

Linda Busek
Arroyo Grande
In light of the fact that SLO County’s demography has changed very little over the last decade, I see no reason why substantial changes in the supervisorial districts are necessary. In particular, Proposed Map C and the Patton Map are unacceptable perversions of our democratic process. The districts should remain more or less as they currently are.
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:58 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 152

RedistrictingID 152
Form inserted 11/17/2021 9:57:29 AM
Form updated 11/17/2021 9:57:29 AM
First Name Deidre
Last Name Basile
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented self/home owner
City Cambria
Zip 93428
Comment Please keep our districting the same. We are not in sync with Paso residents. All it takes is a trip to Walmart in Paso to see many with no masks, etc then come over to the coast, Cambria, Cayucos, etc and everyone is required to wear masks and does so voluntarily without being told. This would create so much more division in our county. Please consider keeping the districts the same.

Public Records Notice True
Dear Supervisors:

I urge you to keep the current supervisorial districts, which meet the state requirements. There is no good reason to alter these districts beyond whatever minor tweaking may be needed.

Retaining the current districts will make things easier for County staff, and most importantly for voters, who will not have to adapt to new districts.

Please, fulfill your obligation by adopting the simplest solution.

Thank you.

Mark Stengel
Atascadero, CA 93422
Dear Supervisors:

As a 35 year resident of Los Osos, I urge you maintain the option closest to our existing districting. As living in an unincorporated part of the County, and as being physically separated from much of the county, I urge you to maintain our connection to coastal communities of similar interests.

As I understand, supporting **Map A would keep us in the current District 2** and not dilute our voice in voting.

I refer you to the criteria outlined:

District lines will be adopted using the following criteria in order of priority:

1. To the extent practicable, supervisorial district boundaries shall be geographically contiguous.
2. To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of any local neighborhood 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 supervisorial district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. (This particularly applies to Los Osos.)
3. Supervisorial district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents.

What could be more understandable than our current designated district?

Thank you for your attention,

Paul Crafts
Bonita Zisla Crafts
Los Osos, CA 93402
I urge you to maintain the current district boundaries. There is no reason other than partisan politics to redraw the boundaries. Both Democrats and Republicans favor keeping the current boundaries. The Board of Supervisors is, after all, allegedly a non-partisan office.

John Anderson
Nipomo, CA
We ask you to NOT redistrict our Central Coast to add any inland area as part of our District 2 as we understand is under consideration.

The needs of the Coastal Community are unique and would be subverted by other areas inclusion in our District.

Please keep District 2 the same and whole.

We thank you for listening.

Richard G Dixon
Margaret E Dixon
Registered Voters in Cambria.

Dick Dixon Up in the iCloud
To whom it may concern,

I am writing today to voice my concern with the coastal redistricting proposal. I am a 4th generation Cambria resident, I feel that grouping Cambria with Paso Robles, and separating the coastal communities makes no sense, and would be detrimental to the area. Please keep the boundaries where they are, and the coastal communities together.

Thank you,
Jade Bodine
The redistricting map proposed by SLO County Supervisors represents an outrageous power grab by the majority to skewer future elections in favor of Republican candidates and issues. The proposed new map is in violation of California Elections Code 21500 (d), which states that election boundaries shall not be adopted that favor or discriminate against one political party. In its current form, the county's election boundaries are in alignment with the state's requirements to respect both the geographical integrity of cities and geographical 'communities of interest', and therefore, from a legal standpoint, does not warrant being altered. This shameful attempt at partisan gerrymandering undermines the election integrity of SLO county voters and should not be allowed.
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:29 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 153

RedistrictingID 153
Form inserted 11/17/2021 10:29:08 AM
Form updated 11/17/2021 10:29:08 AM
First Name Maureen
Last Name Beamish
Email [redacted]
Phone [redacted]
Name of Organization Represented
City Nipomo
Zip 93444
Comment I support Draft Map A. Based on the current census, there is no need or legal reason to change the district boundaries. No change is needed and the county's own consultant agrees. The California Fair Maps Act of 2019 does not require any change in existing boundaries if change isn’t justified by Census data. Census data between 2010 and 2020 DOES NOT necessitate change.
Public Records Notice True
I am a registered, voting resident of Arroyo Grande and am very concerned about reports in the local press that the Board is considering changing district boundaries in ways that seem intentionally or recklessly designed to give advantage to particular politicians or political parties. Gerrymandering is a dirty word and an illegal concept no matter the direction in which the advantage is tilted. If the current districts accurately reflect communities of interest and other recognized apolitical criteria for drawing districts, then those current districts should be retained. If the current districts require minor adjustment as a result of the latest census in order to reflect communities of interest etc., then the current districts should be modified accordingly. Making changes to the districts in order to benefit particular politicians or political agendas must not be implemented.

SLO County has been the embarrassed subject of national derision over the last couple of years for politically-motivated public actions. Newly-gerrymandered Supervisorial districts must not become another focus for local or national derision.

Thank you for your attention.

Steve Howarth
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

"If it ain't broke, don't fix it" is an old saying. It certainly applies to the current redistricting process in SLO County. Draft Map A is the best alternative. It is consistent with redistricting principles, and has been confirmed as totally compliant with requirements. It is also fiscally sound, since there are significant costs when radical boundary changes are made. Why do that?

In today's Tribune (11/16/21) there was an excellent "Viewpoint" piece by two former Chiefs of Police in SLO County. They make excellent points. As they say, "Citizen engagement is the difference between a democracy that works and a democracy in decay."

Please read the entire column at:
https://www.sanluisobispo.com/opinion/readers-opinion/article255837361.html#storylink=cpy

Lastly, the integrity of fairly elected representatives, such as our County Board of Supervisors, should be beyond question. Supervisors are supposed to be non-partisan, and we entrust them to act in the interest of all residents, regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, economic status, or political party. Please do not violate our trust.

Thank you,

Maureen Sharon,
Arroyo Grande
Maureen Sharon
Arroyo Grande CA 93420
FW: [EXT]Needless redrawing of district lines to benefit the BOS partisan majority

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:13 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:51 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Needless redrawing of district lines to benefit the BOS partisan majority

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To Supervisors Compton, Arnold and Peschong:
If you haven’t noticed, everyone is talking about your partisan and dirty tactics of trying to redraw the voting district boundaries/lines to benefit you and your right wing agenda. The newspaper, online and among civic groups, who are also planning to show up at your board meeting and call upon you to abandon this dirty tricks plan to get yourselves re-elected in future years. You are so obviously transparent. Also, apparently afraid you can’t get the votes in any other way than gerrymandering the voting districts. The districts are completely and legally compliant as they are. We saw how you refused to have a nonpartisan citizens group work on this and advise. We know Lynn Compton (and we are in her district) is afraid she will lose to Jimmy Paulding and that is her immediate reason for trying to change the district configurations to benefit herself. If you can’t win on your own merits, what’s the point
of trying to pass yourself off as a representative of the county through these dirty tricks? It’s sad and pathetic. I urge you to leave the district lines as they are and try to act honorably and with integrity for once. The legacy of this tactic will be remembered and it will energize the voters who will work to oust you. Rachael Hazen, 1347 Black Sage Circle, Nipomo/ Black Lake, 93444. 
Sent from my iPhone
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Chairperson Compton and Board Members,

I ask your board to refrain from changing any district boundaries, especially given the deep and pervasive distrust the electorate has in partisan politics generally, and in the growing distrust it has in the Board majority.

I wholeheartedly endorse all that former police chiefs Jim Gardner and Rock Terbouch had to say in their op ed in the November 16 Trib.

I also support the recommendations of the nonpartisan League of Women Voters.

As an ardent Independent and cofounder of the Nonpartisan Voting Alliance PAC in 2016, I strongly urge your board to adopt Plan A.

Nick Alter
Arroyo Grande
---Original Message---
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:52 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for pledging that the redistricting process would be transparent. I hope you adhere to that goal.

I will be brief. I think that because of the small change in population in San Luis Obsipo County over the past 10 years, it makes sense to keep the district lines close to or the same as they are currently drawn. Thus, I recommend that you select either Plan A or B to set the lines for the next 10 years.

Thank you for considering my opinion.
Sincerely,

Susan Updeqrove

SLO, CA. 93401
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

To the Board of Supervisors:

I urge you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

Thank you for your immediate attention

Sincerely,
L. JoAnn Moore
Los Osos, CA 93402
Dear SLO County Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of San Luis Obispo, District 3, currently represented by Supervisor Dawn Ortiz-Legg. I am writing to you today to request that the county adopt Plan A, the district maps for San Luis Obispo County that remain mostly as-is, following the 2020 census. We have not had any major population changes that would warrant a big re-drawing of the current Supervisors map, and the current maps are more representative of the population of SLO County than the alternatives currently being considered. Thank you for your service and for considering my comment.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Klay
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors of SLO County,

I am unable to attend the public meeting on November 19th, at 9 a.m. at the San Luis Obispo County Center, but wanted to express my grave concern for decisions that might be made on that day.

I wholeheartedly ask that of the many proposed redistricting ideas on the table, please choose Map A. It is the only option that meets Federal mandates and keeps the North Coast communities together.

The proposed Map C, which I am vehemently opposed to, tears us apart from the other coastal communities and makes my village of Cambria part of District 1, which is Paso Robles. We do not belong there, and request Map C be dropped from consideration. Please don't let Cambrians, lose our voice!

As you view the room during the meeting...please picture one more person in the room asking you to do the right thing.

Many thanks,

Martha Goodwin
Cambria Resident
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:13 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:59 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

-----Original Message-----
From: ronald.becker2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 7:17 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I am in favor of the Richard Patton map number 74786. It complies with all of the criteria.
Ronald Becker
Paso Robles
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Currently the SLO County district lines are not in compliance with the criteria. The current map must be changed. San Luis Obispo city should not be divided into three districts. It is NOT fair to other communities in our county to have SLO city represented by three supervisors.

I support the Richard Patten map ID74786. It meets all the criteria.

Additionally, I am concerned about the number of redistricting emails posted on our county website from individuals NOT registered to vote in our county. I sincerely hope these emails are given a little credence, our supervisors need to represent the voters registered in our county.

Linda Becker
Paso Robles
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

To: San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors
From: Connie Bennett Dreisbach, resident of Paso Robles
Re: Redistricting

I recently read the letter from the two former SLO County police chiefs. I agree with them whole heartedly and hope you will carefully consider their comments.

I come from a different point of view than the former Chiefs. I consider myself an Independent politically and am probably part of the great majority of voters in this county who quietly listen and read about political candidates and vote for our choices. But then, we support the winners, our Local, County, State and Federal leaders, regardless of party, hoping they will work for all of their constituents, even those of us who don’t scream and demonstrate at meetings. Sounds old fashioned, doesn’t it.

I realize you hear mostly from those who want to stand up for “their freedom” and rights while trampling on the rights and freedoms and the opinions of those of us who work hard and try to make life better for everyone in our communities. We have become DIVIDED, not UNITED. We do not need to cause any more division at this time. In the political climate of today, drastic redistricting of the Board of Supervisors will seem like favoritism for one party over the other, no matter how it is done.
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I strongly urge you to not make major changes to the boundaries of our current districts. Specifically I strongly object to moving Cambria and San Simeon from District 2 to District 1. Please listen to the majority of voters.

Sent from my iPhone
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:06 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: District 5 Supervisor Debbie Arnold Question/Issue

For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 4:58 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: District 5 Supervisor Debbie Arnold Question/Issue

Topic: District 5 Supervisor Debbie Arnold Question/Issue

Your Name: T. Hopkins
Your Email: [obfuscated]
U.S. phone number: [obfuscated]
Message: I urge you to retain the current district lines, or the next closest map to the existing map during the redistricting process.
Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 642739
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2756
Form inserted: 11/16/2021 4:57:07 PM
Form updated: 11/16/2021 4:57:07 PM
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Attention: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Darlene <darker@domain.com>
Date: November 16, 2021 at 6:47:05 PM PST
To: supers@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Redistricting

To the Supervisors,

I urge you select Map A and retain the current district lines which efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest and party registration.

The old adage fits: “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

As 2 former chiefs of police recently wrote in THE TRIBUNE:
“You will be standing up for democracy, fairness and good government.. Keep our local politics healthy and not driven by conspiracies and rage.”

It is the moral thing to do.

Darlene Tunney Rosene
A resident of Shell Beach
since May 9, 1969

Sent from my iPhone
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Subject: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Stephen Rath

Your Email: (hidden)
U.S. phone number: (hidden)

Message: Subject: SLO County Supervisor Districts Dear Supervisors, Please, don't break something that's not broken. Support current District boundaries/maps. Thank you, Steve Rath Paso Robles

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 603009

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2757

Form inserted: 11/16/2021 9:08:14 PM
Form updated: 11/16/2021 9:08:14 PM
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

To all County Supervisors,

I urge you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. Moving to change the district lines at this time will look like a partisan move that would move me to work to vote all current Supervisors out of office. Let's continue to have fair elections.

Robert Merritt
Arroyo Grande
FW: [EXT] Why redistrict?

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:14 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:12 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Why redistrict?

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Why are you planning to redistrict without the input or a non-partisan citizen’s panel? Do you not think we are watching your attempted fascist and totalitarian maneuvers? This is an OUTRAGE. Cease this effort to stack the Board and elections in your conservative, Chevron and Koch Brothers Trumpian Dystopia!
No to redistricting!

Heather Dine, M.S.; Certified California Naturalist; Outreach and Education Consultant; Certified Yoga Instructor, 1997, Virginia, USA; Certified Mat Pilates Instructor, 2018, London, England.
— sent from mobile
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:13 AM
To: BOS_Legislature Assistants Only <BOS_Legislature-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Comments, Hearing #3 scheduled for November 19, 2021

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Christopher Hamma
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:31 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Comments, Hearing #3 scheduled for November 19, 2021

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to submit my comments on SLO County's current redistricting evaluation.

I am a 20+ year resident of South County in District 4, currently living in Arroyo Grande. I take the democratic process seriously and feel that I have done my due diligence in becoming informed and learning about the issue at hand.

My understanding is that the County's consultant found that the most recent (2020) US Census tract data for the County, which informs the redistricting process, did not change significantly enough from the previous Census data to warrant redrawning the supervisorial district boundaries.

For this reason, I strongly urge the Board to support Draft Map A, the No Change option. This option is just and complies with the State's Fair Maps Act of 2019.

If the board's current majority cannot resist the temptation to vote to redraw district boundaries in a way that would favor their political base and benefit their own political careers, it will be plainly obvious.

The result would be lawsuits that waste County taxpayer funds by requiring the County to defend itself against accusations of eroding democracy, caused by our own elected officials. Frankly, this would be disgraceful.
Given that the current board majority are on record as repeatedly promoting fiscal conservatism and desiring to reduce waste of taxpayer funds, I hope that these individuals will act to support democracy in SLO County by supporting the No Change redistricting option.

Sincerely,

Christopher Hamma
Arroyo Grande
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:13 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:20 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Dennis Pezzato

Your Email: ******************

U.S. phone number: ********

Message: I want to urge you to RETAIN the current Districting lines, PLEASE!

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 508788

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2758

Form inserted: 11/17/2021 5:18:55 AM

Form updated: 11/17/2021 5:18:55 AM
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:14 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Charles Varni <redacted>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:28 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Nov 17, 2021

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Charles Varni and I have been a property owner and resident of Oceano for over 20 years. Oceano is the largest Latino community in the County.

On April 7, 2021 the County of San Luis Obispo signed a contract with Redistricting Partners, LLC to serve as consultants to the redistricting process for County Supervisors. In this contract there are lofty claims and golden promises which, from my personal knowledge, have not been achieved. I called attention to this issue at the Oct 26 hearing and have received no feedback from the County or Redistricting Partners. Specifically, there has been an epic failure to outreach to the Latino community in Oceano. As far as I and my Latino neighbors can determine, there has not been any outreach at all. Not a single one.

In their contract with the County, Redistricting Partners promises a robust collection of deliverables. To whit, the contract reads as follows (pp.10-11):

“Working in Partnership with Imprenta Communications, Redistricting Partners will provide a robust public outreach program. Imprenta specializes in outreach personalized and curated for the specific community we are
reaching. Our community outreach efforts are aimed at truly translating information that is clear, digestible, and personal, making accurate information easily accessible. Imprenta can help support this project by bringing their expert knowledge of reaching the Latino community in a culturally competent and successful manner. Efficient translation outreach moves beyond language and into culture. Imprenta is able to do this by focusing on specific partnerships with Community Based Organizations, community and government leaders to help engage the Latino community in San Luis Obispo. We will use a grassroots/grasstops approach where we rally the grassroots community while additionally identifying trusted leaders from the Latino communities to further amplify our messaging to these specific populations.

...In order to efficiently share resources and collaborate with the community and our networks using our “New Normal” methods and technologies, we have developed a set of alternative strategies:

—Zoom town halls, redistricting meetings, and workshops

—Partnerships with businesses to provide PSA-type messaging via bilingual posters, flyers, and social posts.

—Business owners, government officials, and local leadership can each host a special Webinar with live translations in English and Spanish

—Webinars hosted by Latino community leaders and trusted voices

—Church outreach-Write-ups, posts or post materials in church newsletters/social media/website or announcements during services

I want to repeat that, as far as we can determine, not one single instance of any of the above has taken place in the largest Latino community in the County. In the contract of almost $80,000 signed with Redistricting Partners, $35,000 is earmarked for the above types of outreach.

The community of Oceano knows very well what it is like to be second class citizens, to be overlooked, to be marginalized, to have our homes and streets flood, to have our children dodge cars while walking in the streets to school because we lack the basics of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. And, it appears, the Supervisors and their consultants have ignored us again.

The Coastal Commission Staff characterized Oceano as the “poster child for environmental justice on the California coast.” I believe the issue raised above is just another example of decades of institutionalized racism, social injustice, and inequitable economic development which has repressed our community. When will it end?

Charles Varni
Vice Chair, Oceano Advisory Council
Member, Oceano Beach Community Association
Oceano
FW: [EXT]Redistributing

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:15 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:16 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistributing

For your review, I was unable to find this constituent in Voter Reg. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728129229185219%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=mZGJzV9Ap6R2GsY9A8ajFvSC7v79gaZqRGEFYZl2TBk%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Liz Parker >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:23 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistributing

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Since there is no legal requirement to change boundaries due to only a minor change in population, I want the boundaries to remain as they are now. Free and fair elections are the cornerstone of our democracy.

Sent from my iPhone
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:16 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]District lines

For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Myra Boone <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]District lines

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To Whom this May Concern:
I am writing to urge you to retain the current district lines. As they stand now, they are fair and balanced politically and geographically and demographically. I am very concerned about manipulation of district lines to align to political purposes. Thank you.
Myra Boone
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Dear SLO County Supervisors...

I totally agree with the following comments offered by SLO’s former police chiefs.

I am astounded by the sheer number of lies being told primarily by the majority of GOP national politicians regarding January 6th and Trumps’ “big lie.” I’m am shocked by the arrogant and aggressive redistricting maneuvers to attempt to give Republicans greater voting advantages in GOP-states like Texas.

I believe like our former police chiefs that our Democracy is under attack. Not just through “voices” but also through violence, threats and outright hostility. The vehemence shown to school board members, healthcare professionals and county officials, like Mr. Gong, must stop. You must speak out loudly and often about these behaviors.

"You can write to the Supervisors at boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us and urge them to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration."

Read more at: https://www.sanluisobispo.com/opinion/readers-opinion/article255837361.html#storylink=cpy
I am happy to speak to you or your representatives about my feelings and concerns.

Regards,

Tim Bennett
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
FW: [EXT] Retain current district lines

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:15 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:18 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Retain current district lines

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7C5eb0ca143b3a41513e1d08d9aa5adb2c%7C84c3c37747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728129454903685%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=9MWzFt7x7KF8bUG6RiZWyCnSw846jGlgv1exxIk0HE%3D&reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Carolyn Phares <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:55 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Retain current district lines

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

SLO County Supervisors,

Based on minor changes in population, there is no legal requirement to change any district boundaries. Current boundaries are fully compliant with election law. Do not allow our county to be convulse time again by hyper partisanship, protests turned riots, and other political mayhem. Our own democracy is at risk when win-at-all-costs mentality rules, and too many elected bodies are taking actions that will impede our ability to have free and fair elections. Please retain current district lines.
Sincerely,
Carolyn and Gordon Phares
LaVerne Daniels, and many others here in our county
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:18 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Re: Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Chris Smith <chris.smith@...>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:09 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Re: Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

We have lived in SLO County since 1975, and in District 5 since 1978. As best as I can recall, our District has had generally similar boundaries, including over the Grade into San Luis Obispo itself. We always considered it a point of pride that our Supervisor had to appeal to a wide range of interests to get elected. It typically produced a leader that had to dig a little deeper to balance these varying interests and hammer out fair compromises that moved us forward.

We strongly support keeping our District 5 with same boundaries that have served us (and the larger County) well. While we are not as familiar with the boundary lines of other Districts, the general ebb and flow of the “3 vs. 2” split (i.e., liberal vs. conservative predominating, if you will) has kept this County vibrant. We would be saddened by boundaries designed to cement this ebb and flow in one direction. It doesn’t seem like representative government at that point.

Please don’t be swayed by just the louder voices; we quieter types are out here, we take note and we vote.

Christopher Smith
Mary Cristine Smith
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:15 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:19 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, I was unable to find this constituent in Voter Reg. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7C4d88f37705dc40906db908d9aa5ae33a%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728129590458223%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=It%2BkVtf9uyXYsuYcV4rFJ7HIAX5dADERdUpub54yRqjq%3D&reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Ralph Hopkins
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:27 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I support the redistricting shown in map B. I urge the supervisors to select the option with the least changes to the existing boundaries.

Allen Hopkins

[Redacted]
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am very concerned about the proposed redistricting maps. There is no legal requirement to change the boundaries. Why did you not appoint a nonpartisan citizens panel to advise on drawing boundaries?

It appears that your majority wants radically new boundaries to secure a partisan advantage for yourselves.

I urge you to retain the current district lines. They fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest and party registration.

To merge north coast communities with the Paso district is disturbing, in the least.

Please continue have the City of San Luis Obispo represented by more than one supervisor given its size and importance as a government and major employer site and the negative impacts on communities of interest in other districts should the city become its own district.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ed and Loretta Grondahl
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:29 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Amanda Sherlock <[redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:13 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Republicans, please stop being "the party of sore losers" and changing the rules of the game so that you can find a chance to win.
This country is supposed to be a democracy. Please have the decency to keep it that way.
Thank you,
Amanda Sherlock, naturalized citizen and voter.
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:31 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Joyce Knight <Arroyo Grande, CA 93420>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:24 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Supervisors,

Please keep the current fully compliant and fairly balanced redistricting lines.

Joyce Knight
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:31 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Retain current districts!

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Myra Lathrop <myralathrop0000@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:43 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Retain current districts!

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hi-

I urge you to retain current district lines in our county. It is fairly balanced with respect to our population, geography, and party registration.
And they are compliant with current law.
Let's stop all this bipartisan nonsense once in for all.

Myra Lathrop

--
***********************

Myra D. Lathrop

"We are all just walking each other home." Ram Dass
From: Adam Hain
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hello:
I am a resident of San Luis Obispo county. As you are aware, our county does NOT need to legally change our district lines based on the new census data. Please do the right thing and leave things as they are.

Adam Hain
FW: [EXT] Redrawing voting districts

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:16 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:42 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redrawing voting districts

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7C5bbd5cc41e374c56356408d9aa5afcde%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728130020608658%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;sdata=DYcj%2BxsOVM3RpgYkU%2F0ldJNwGB3gVYb8J8bP%2FfHpcm0%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Adrienne Donaldson >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Redrawing voting districts

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Greetings,
Please consider keeping the current district lines for voting. Planning to redraw just because of partisanship isn't a valid reason. Now the lines are fairly well balanced by population and interests. Please spend your valuable time and energies working toward needed solutions to real problems.
Adrienne Donaldson
Atascadero CA

Sent from my iPad
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:16 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:42 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

We have been residents of San Luis Obispo County for more than ten years and would like to state our firm opposition to the redistricting proposal for our county that is currently in the works. We have reviewed the current district boundaries and ethnicity/population numbers provided by SLO County. There's a great saying that definitely applies here, "if it's not broken, there no need to fix it." Putting elected officials in charge of drawing their own districts, especially during the reelection campaigns of some of those officials, creates an incentive for those officials to draw districts that are favorable either to them or to their political allies. This sometimes leads to districts that are purposefully drawn to enhance the influence of certain groups and/or to reduce the influence of other groups - for example racial and ethnic minorities or members of a favored political party. This is simply referred to as "gerrymandering." We believe that the current SLO County Supervisorial districts are working well for
"all" of the residents of SLO County now. Let's stop this blatant attempt at partisan gerrymandering in it's
tracks!

Respectfully,

Scott and Heidi DiSalvo

Nipomo Mesa
FW: [EXT]Redistricting
Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:16 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:42 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7C4d2ac8d021344b42b9a208d9aa5b0161%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C637728130096943339%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=QfWxQfSrcnWjwLLhZGFS6rTa015oZ5xY%2FvMU6SrLX0%3D&amp;amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Scott DiSalvo <Scott.Disalvo@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:46 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

We have been residents of San Luis Obispo County for more than ten years and would like to state our firm opposition to the redistricting proposal for our county that is currently in the works. We have reviewed the current district boundaries and ethnicity/population numbers provided by SLO County. There's a great saying that definitely applies here, "if it's not broken, there no need to fix it." Putting elected officials in charge of drawing their own districts, especially during the reelection campaigns of some of those officials, creates an incentive for those officials to draw districts that are favorable either to them or to their political allies. This sometimes leads to districts that are purposefully drawn to enhance the influence of certain groups and/or to reduce the influence of other groups - for example racial and ethnic minorities or members of a favored political party. This is simply referred to as "gerrymandering." We believe that the current SLO County Supervisorial districts are working well for
"all" of the residents of SLO County now. Let's stop this blatant attempt at partisan gerrymandering in it's tracks!

Respectfully,

Scott and Heidi DiSalvo

Nipomo Mesa
Current proposed new redistricting plan seems unreasonable and unwarranted at this time. Please do not vote to pass same.
Art & Cindy Fries Trilogy/Nipomo
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:17 PM
To: Mei-Lin Gee <mgee@co.slo.ca.us>

From: Francesca Fairbrother
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:48 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

As a long-time resident of San Luis Obispo County, I strongly urge you to retain the current district lines. They fairly balance the population and communities of the county. There has been far too much divisiveness and hyper-partisanship. Gerrymandering districts will only increase both. Please do the right thing.

Francesca Fairbrother

Arroyo Grande, CA
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:48 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Michael Klingler
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:47 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: 
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I completely agree with former San Luis Obispo Police Chief Jim Gardiner and former Arroyo Grande Police Chief Rick TerBorch. I urge you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

Regards, Michael

Michael Klingler

Mobile: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:17 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Colby
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:53 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I wrote to ask you all to leave the current Supervisorial districts as they stand.

Sent from my iPhone
FW: [EXT]Comment on redistricting plans

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:17 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Thomas Gutierrez
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:55 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Comment on redistricting plans

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear SLO County Board of Supervisors,
I am a resident of San Luis Obispo, District 3, currently represented by Supervisor Dawn Ortiz-Legg. I am writing to you today to request that the county adopt Plan A, the district maps for San Luis Obispo County that remain mostly as-is, following the 2020 census. We have not had any major population changes that would warrant a big re-drawing of the current Supervisors map, and the current maps are more representative of the population of SLO County than the alternatives currently being considered.
Thank you for your service and for considering my comment.

Sincerely,
Thomas Gutierrez
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Dear Supervisors and Redistricting Board Members,

My wife and I live in Arroyo Grande and we are urging you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. To significantly redraw the boundaries could result in even more political polarization and we oppose that.

Warmest regards,

Reid K. Hester, Ph.D.
Be Kind to Each Other
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To the board:
I support plan A.
The county doesn’t need to change district boundaries since the population has not shifted beyond legally allowable limits. Therefore, I support plan A which basically maintains current boundaries. I strongly oppose breaking up district 2 which needs to remain intact to support coastal interests. I also support leaving district 4 intact with Oceano remaining in the district.
The process must legally proceed without political maneuvering’s or gerrymandering. We will be watching.
Lee Andrea Caulfield district 2

Sent from my iPhone
My name is Tyler Brown and I have lived in the City of Arroyo Grande for more than 27 years. I would like my input on the current county Redistricting effort to go on the public record for the November 19th hearing.

I call on your Board to do the right thing for the entire community; for all of your constituents, when selecting and adopting a final map. Do not make any significant changes to current district boundaries – adopt Map A, which reflects status quo and makes only minor tweaks to account for changes in census blocks.

Existing districts, as they are currently set, meet the State standards and do not need to be changed. Any significant change to existing boundaries (as reflected in Map C, the Patten Map and others submitted by the public) do not comply with the criteria set forth in the Fair Maps Act in that these break up current communities of interest, a criteria which supersedes the criteria to respect geographic integrity of cities and census designated places.

The Patten map, and others designed to place San Luis Obispo in one Supervisorial District clearly violate the Fair Maps Act in that they are designed to favor one political party and disadvantage another. The Patten Map, as an example, packs democratic voters into one district, thus diluting their votes. These maps are illegal and violate all the major principles of the Elections Code.

The City of San Luis Obispo has been represented by multiple Supervisors for many years – for good reason: it is centrally located along the major population corridor of the County and has the largest population of all 7 incorporated cities in the county.

Also - San Luis Obispo is a community of interest for many county residents as it is the County seat, a major employment hub with many of the county’s largest employers, and a cultural and shopping hub for the County.

Again – I call on your Board to do the right thing here – comply with the principles and provisions of the elections code and make no significant changes to current district boundaries. Adopt Map A.
From: L A Donate
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:22 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Richard Patten Map. ID 74786

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I have looked at all the maps, and it appears that only the Patten map meets the majority of the criteria for drawing district lines. Please adopt the Patten map.
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

With no real change in the population dynamics of San Luis Obispo County, I urge the Board of Supervisors to choose Map A or Map B in the redistricting process. These two maps most closely reflect where people live. Vote for Map A or Map B.

Thank you.
Diane Sibbach
Atascadero
I’m glad to see that the redistricting process is starting to garner more attention from the public. It is disturbing to me that some members of our community are proposing radical changes to district boundaries that have served us quite well over the years. Such proposals seem particularly anomalous given the fact that there is no legal requirement to change the boundaries unless they are warranted by significant changes in the latest Census data. Nothing in the 2020 Census data requires a change to current boundaries. There have been very modest increases in population and each board member represents approximately the same number of constituents. The deviations are well within the 10% variance requirement. The current boundaries are also consistent with the California Fair Maps Act and federal Voting Rights Act and have withstood legal challenges for a decade. The boundaries are well established, easily identifiable and understood by County residents. They do a good job of preserving the integrity of local communities of interest that have been in place for decades. In short, the current boundaries seem to serve their purpose well and can continue to serve us for the upcoming decade with only minor adjustments.

Your selected consulting firm, Redistricting Partners, has confirmed the viability of the existing boundaries and worked with staff to capture them in Map A. Map B takes into account the recent expansion of student dorms at Cal Poly and tries to reunite dorm residents as one COI in District 2. This makes sense to me. I can support the adoption of either Maps A or B. I am strongly opposed to County Maps C and D, as well as other maps submitted by constituents, as they have no compelling underlying rationale and appear to violate one or more redistricting principles.

I urge you to take the prudent, conservative approach by largely maintaining the current district boundaries, thereby protecting the integrity of existing population diversity and communities of interest. A radical overhaul of the existing boundaries will introduce unnecessary confusion, strife, expense and legal challenges that the County can ill afford.
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

If the purpose of district boundaries is to accurately represent the people of the county, then the official assessment says it all: we're done. The current districts fairly and accurately balance population, geography, and party registration. Therefore, there's no reason to change the boundaries this year--which means that you can move on to other pressing county business, which there is always plenty of.

Redrawing the boundaries at this time will look only like political greed and shenanigans. I strongly urge you to leave them alone.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,
Bonnie Thompson
Los Osos
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

I do not support your proposal for redistricting San Luis Obispo county for the Board of Supervisors.

I urge you to retain the current district lines. There is no real reason for the change that you have drawn up without a nonpartisan citizens' panel.

We don't need more partisan politics dividing this county, state or country.

Respectfully,
Janette Sofranko
Arroyo Grande
Mr. Horton, I have looked at several of the maps for redistricting our area. It seems most of them are not following the state guidelines. They are splitting up cities and communities of interest, which does not make sense and does not follow the guidelines. As I have reviewed these maps, Richard Patton's seems to make the most sense. It splits up the cities less and helps to keep communities of interest together. Please review and consider his ideas. Thank You, Rod Blackner.
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:18 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:09 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7C7C5657f5203a4c45af723e08d9aa5b3fd4%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728131144212911%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=8tDn0uwdGACZRW1qeUURkCbo45KydyIncOq7kVsz%2FMg%3D&amp;amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Ruth Peterson <REDACTED>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

This letter is an appeal to maintain district boundaries as they currently exist. There is no legitimate reason to make a change as the population has not increased or decreased to the extent redistricting would be called for. Partisanship should play NO role in decisions regarding district boundaries. I am a registered voter in Nipomo. - Ruth Peterson
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:18 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:12 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

-----Original Message-----
From: Kate Montgomery
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:56 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To my Board of Supervisors:
Please do not change the boundaries of our 5 County Supervisor Districts. They are already well drawn, fair, and balanced. As a very concerned citizen and resident of the county for over 50 years, I implore you to leave the districts as they are and get on with the important job of governing, which we have trusted you with.

Thank you,
Kate Montgomery

Atascadero
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:13 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Ann Hou <AnnH@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:05 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please keep the districts as they are.
Ann Hou
NIPOMO
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:18 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:14 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7C09c22afbcc8b49b07bab08d9aa5b4bea%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728131375407325%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklkWzIiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=1WryOA%2FaYVZ04oJsQUFgtXpC1OJFUNeWiAY92JIAv4%3D&

-----Original Message-----
From: Mindy Trask <MindyTrask@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:12 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I support Plan B.

From,
Mindy Trask, Los Osos, CA
I’m glad to see that the redistricting process is starting to garner more attention from the public. It is disturbing to me that some members of our community are proposing radical changes to district boundaries that have served us quite well over the years. Such proposals seem particularly anomalous given the fact that there is no legal requirement to change the boundaries unless they are warranted by significant changes in the latest Census data. Nothing in the 2020 Census data requires a change to current boundaries. There have been very modest increases in population and each board member represents approximately the same number of constituents. The deviations are well within the 10% variance requirement. The current boundaries are also consistent with the California Fair Maps Act and federal Voting Rights Act and have withstood legal challenges for a decade. The boundaries are well established, easily identifiable and understood by County residents. They do a good job of preserving the integrity of local communities of interest that have been in place for decades. In short, the current boundaries seem to serve their purpose well and can continue to serve us for the upcoming decade with only minor adjustments.

Your selected consulting firm, Redistricting Partners, has confirmed the viability of the existing boundaries and worked with staff to capture them in Map A. Map B takes into account the recent expansion of student dorms at Cal Poly and tries to reunite dorm residents as one COI in District 2. This makes sense to me. I can support the adoption of either Maps A or B. I am strongly opposed to County Maps C and D, as well as other maps submitted by constituents, as they have no compelling underlying rationale and appear to violate one or more redistricting principles.

I urge you to take the prudent, conservative approach by largely maintaining the current district boundaries, thereby protecting the integrity of existing population diversity and communities of interest. A radical overhaul of the existing boundaries will introduce unnecessary confusion, strife, expense and legal challenges that the County can ill afford.
Holly Sletteland  
Templeton, CA 93465  
November 16, 2021  

San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors  
County Government Center  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408  

Subject: Comments Regarding County Redistricting Hearing November 19th  

Dear Supervisors,  

I’m glad to see that the redistricting process is starting to garner more attention from the public. It is disturbing to me that some members of our community are proposing radical changes to district boundaries that have served us quite well over the years. Such proposals seem particularly anomalous given the fact that there is no legal requirement to change the boundaries unless they are warranted by significant changes in the latest Census data. Nothing in the 2020 Census data requires a change to current boundaries. There have been very modest increases in population and each board member represents approximately the same number of constituents. The deviations are well within the 10% variance requirement. The current boundaries are also consistent with the California Fair Maps Act and federal Voting Rights Act and have withstood legal challenges for a decade. The boundaries are well established, easily identifiable and understood by County residents. They do a good job of preserving the integrity of local communities of interest that have been in place for decades. In short, the current boundaries seem to serve their purpose well and can continue to serve us for the upcoming decade with only minor adjustments.  

Your selected consulting firm, Redistricting Partners, has confirmed the viability of the existing boundaries and worked with staff to capture them in Map A. Map B takes into account the recent expansion of student dorms at Cal Poly and tries to reunite dorm residents as one COI in District 2. This makes sense to me. I can support the adoption of either Maps A or B. I am strongly opposed to County Maps C and D, as well as other maps submitted by constituents, as they have no compelling underlying rationale and appear to violate one or more redistricting principles.  

I urge you to take the prudent, conservative approach by largely maintaining the current district boundaries, thereby protecting the integrity of existing population diversity and communities of interest. A radical overhaul of the existing boundaries will introduce unnecessary confusion, strife, expense and legal challenges that the County can ill afford.  

Sincerely,  

[Signature]
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Message: In advance of the Nov. 19 meeting on County Redistricting, I request that the Board vote for Plan B because of the following reasons: Complies with the criteria stipulated in state law and the Voting Rights Act. Follows a process that is fair and perceived to be fair. Results in fair and balanced districts that do not favor or discriminate against any political party. Avoids radical changes to district lines that might cause confusion or nurture distrust and/or apathy among voters. Respects the communities of interest as voiced by those who share common social and economic interests. Minimizes disruption to the election cycle and the number of voters whose ability to vote in an election would be deferred or accelerated. Places Cal Poly student housing in one supervisorial district. Continues to have the City of San Luis Obispo represented by more than one supervisor given its size and importance as a government and major employer site and the negative impacts on communities of interest in other districts should the city become its own district. Of the maps being considered currently, Plan B most closely accords with these criteria. Thank you in advance for considering my opinion.
Security Check: 317059

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2759

Form inserted: 11/17/2021 9:13:46 AM

Form updated: 11/17/2021 9:13:46 AM
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:20 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:15 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please do not change the boundaries of our current districts. It is insanity to lump Cambria and our coastal regions with inland Paso Robles. Whose idea was this? They should be held accountable next election.
P.s. this is the first time I have ever written to any government agency.
Mary Hill, Cambria

Sent from my iPad
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:20 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:16 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cfff9e9da0a744fe361deo8d9aa5b965b%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C63772813259595859%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=ug9s1tEb9AfvXJhziuQarStacsTm9VEbNq%2FFqKXX%2FEI%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Carol Brookshire >
Sent: Wednesday 11/17/2021 9:18 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originatedated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Board of Supervisors,
I support retaining the current district lines in Arroyo Grande. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest and party registration. I am surprised and disappointed you have not appointed a nonpartisan citizens panel to advise on redrawing the district lines.

Sincerely,
Carol Brookshire
Arroyo Grande

Sent from my iPad
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to retain the current district lines, they are compliant with election laws and fairly balanced. There has been no legal requirements to change and district boundaries, therefore they should remain the way they are for fair representation.

Thank you, Carol Paulsen
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting 

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Linda Busek
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:37 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting -

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As you consider the new census data and districting lines, please incorporate my views into your decision:

The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. The new census data do not justify major changes to the current supervisor district boundaries.

The current districts meet all the state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness.

I urge you to retain either Map B or A. My preference is version B, but A is also acceptable.

Thank you.

Linda Busek
Arroyo Grande
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Dear BOS,

I am writing today to urge you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. I am also concerned that the BOS chose to ignore best practices and did not appoint a nonpartisan citizens’ panel to advise on drawing the district boundaries.

It's time for the supervisors to stop partisan behavior in our community and represent all citizens of SLO County. This is especially important of my supervisor, Lynn Compton. Do the right thing for all of us in District 4...not just to get yourself reelected.

Victoria Ramos
Arroyo Grande, California
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:17 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: M Parker <masparker@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I urge you not to gerrymander, as stated in the paper the current districts address everything that fair voting districts should.

Please have the county's best interest in your decision making, not just the best interest of your party. You each represent not just your district, not just your base but the entire county.

I am saddened at how several of you have made your office partisan. Furthermore I resent how you have wasted tax dollars.

Enough is enough.

Thank you

Mary N. Parker
San Luis Obispo, CA
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

If your reasons for changing uncontested, existing District boundaries are for political gain then you are a threat to democracy and, as such, you should be censured and stripped of office.

Dan Woodson
The League urges the Board of Supervisors to adopt district maps that:

1. Comply with the criteria stipulated in state law and the Voting Rights Act.
2. Follow a process that is fair and perceived to be fair.
3. Result in fair and balanced districts that do not favor or discriminate against any political party.
4. Avoid radical changes to district lines that might cause confusion or nurture distrust and/or apathy among voters.
5. Respect the communities of interest as voiced by those who share common social and economic interests.
6. Minimize disruption to the election cycle and the number of voters whose ability to vote in an election would be deferred or accelerated.

7. Place Cal Poly student housing in one supervisorial district.

8. Continue to have the City of San Luis Obispo represented by more than one supervisor given its size and importance as a government and major employer site and the negative impacts on communities of interest in other districts should the city become its own district.

--
Deanna K. Straugh
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Message: Supervisors: San Luis Obispo County’s population has changed little in the past 10 years. Current Supervisory Districts are reasonable and meet state requirements for population on balance, fairness of representation and compactness. Incremental changes could reduce population deviation. Los Osos, where I live, Morro Bay, Cayucos and Cambria are a community of interest. They should continue to be in the same Supervisory District. Also, these communities are connected by South Bay Blvd. and Highway 1. I urge you to adopt Map A. Carrie Pardo

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 624190

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2760

Form inserted: 11/17/2021 9:53:50 AM
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:20 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Our County Districting Laws

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Teresa Rubin <>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:04 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Our County Districting Laws

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hello!

I feel that our county should keep the current districting lines!!!

Thank you for all that you do!

Teresa J. Rubin
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please keep the Northern coastal counties from Morro Bay to San Simeon in one district so that our shared interests can be represented fairly. Thank you.

Cambria resident,
Kathy Oberg
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:21 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 155

RedistrictingID 155
Form inserted 11/17/2021 1:20:44 PM
Form updated 11/17/2021 1:20:44 PM
First Name K.
Last Name Ellingson
Email
Phone
Name of Organization Represented
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93401
Comment
Please retain the current district lines. My understanding is that there is no legal requirement to change district lines since there were such minor changes in population. Furthermore, I believe it to be reprehensible that supervisors chose to not appoint a nonpartisan citizens' panel to advise on drawing boundaries even if boundaries were needing to be redrawn.

Public Records Notice True
FW: [EXT] Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:34 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:23 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redistricting

For your review, I was unable to find this constituent in Voter Reg. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7C409d1ee8c8e342854ef708d9aa5d6daf%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728140519369996%7CUnkno
-----Original Message-----
From: Robert Higgins <Robert Higgins@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:05 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Sirs,

I support the Richard Pattern map ID74786

Thank you,

Robert Higgins
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,
We feel the current district lines should be retained. They are fully compliant with the election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. We see no reason other than the partisan board-majority has decided to take advantage of their positions to alter these districts for the express purpose of controlling future elections to their own party's interests for the next ten years. This board majority should not be allowed to carve out district borders that are not fair & equitable for the residents.

San Luis Obispo county has no need for a redistricting of voters based solely on the partisan political tactics of the board-majority to gain the upper-hand in elections. Please retain the existing district borders.

Thank you for your consideration,
Marcia and Dale Johnson
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:24 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:13 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business
Your Name: Steve Howarth
Your Email: 
U.S. phone number: 
Message: I am interested in the Board's investigation into possible changes to the current Supervisorial districts. Gerrymandering is a dirty word no matter who does it, and I do not support any intentional or reckless or negligent effort to draw or redraw Supervisorial districts in a manner that works to the advantage of specific politicians or political parties and not to the advantage of the communities that are represented within the districts and the county. If the current districts accurately reflect fair representation of the county's constituents, then the current districts should not be redrawn. SLO County has attracted national derision for governmental actions that were obviously and unnecessarily partisan and which did not reflect the views of the majority of its citizens. Gerrymandering the SLO County Supervisorial districts must not become another focus of national attention and derision. Thank you for your attention.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 363009

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2761
I oppose the current plan because it attempts to merge Cambria and points north on the coast to Paso Robles.

This is a bad solution: there are far too many differences between the coastal villages and Paso Robles, and Paso is already its own city. This could cause difficulties managing the proposed District 2 since Paso has its own issues, responsibilities, and priorities.

—

I wonder if pirates would have better enrollment if it didn't involve singing.

Rick Auricchio / Macs Only support /
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:26 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting meeting, Friday, November 19, 2021

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:16 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting meeting, Friday, November 19, 2021

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I urge the Board of Supervisors for the County of San Luis Obispo to retain the current district lines which are fully compliant with election laws. Any changes to the existing district lines will show the current board majority has decided to promote their personal political advantage with a disregard for election laws and what is best for the citizens of this county. Margaret Smits, Nipomo, CA
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Paul Reinhardt
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:19 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please keep the current district boundaries.
Thanks,

Paul Reinhardt
San Luis Obispo, California

Feel Flow
To the Honorable Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

**Please do the right thing to represent all county residents properly and retain our current district lines.**

Best regards to you and yours,

Joan Henry
San Luis Obispo County Resident
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:28 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: marjorie curtsinger
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:29 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I encourage you to maintain the current district boundaries. I see no benefit to the population at large and see this attempt to redistrict as an extremely partisan move by those with special interests.

Please consider this very seriously.

Thank you,
Marjorie Curtsinger
Twelve years property owner in Templeton.
FW: [EXT] Redistributing for SLO county

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:40 PM
To: Mei-Lin Gee <mgee@co.slo.ca.us>

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:28 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redistributing for SLO county

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cfa49f66c282247a0222a08d9aa5e3ed9%7C84c3c7747fdf40e22a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728144012375216%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=MtcbeeNv97zl3XkiAFG1ZCenniRPIHT57sXmc%2B0Xkg8%3D&amp;preserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Lorraine Cagliero >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:43 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Redistributing for SLO county

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I support Richard Pattent's Redistricting map...ID 74786 . Thanks very much .
Lorraine Cagliero

Sent from my iPad
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Dear BoS,

I oppose changes to the 2022 SLO County election districting map that radically alter the current boundaries, as does the version being considered at the November 19 hearing. Any alterations to the current map are required to adhere to California Elections Code 21500, stating that boundaries respect both the geographical integrity of cities and geographical 'communities of interest' without regard to partisan influence. The heavily altered districting map under consideration is clearly gerrymandered to affect partisan advantage. This would therefore be in violation of State Code,
which states that election boundaries "shall not be adopted that favor or discriminate against one political party".

It is understandable that adjustments to the current map may be necessary due to growth and changes in population over the past ten years. However, I urge you to maintain the geographic and communities of interest integrity of the current map.

Sincerely,

Annet Dragavon
Paso Robles, CA. 93406
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:31 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redistricting Comment from a Local Taxpayer

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Larry Bolef <bolef@lisabar.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:57 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Debora B. Schwartz <dschwart@calpoly.edu>; Jimmy Paulding for Supervisor <hello@jimmypaulding.org>
Subject: [EXT] Redistricting Comment from a Local Taxpayer

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to leave the current San Luis Obispo County districting lines as they are currently drawn. I see no benefit to changing them.

Any change to districts would involve substantial taxpayer expense and cause unnecessary voter confusion.

I am a resident of San Luis Obispo City. Why put our city in a single supervisory district when our city government already does an excellent job of representing our interests? That is what we pay them to do.

Throughout rural California and in other western states, large towns are always split so that supervisory districts have equal populations.

This is a well-accepted and sensible practice. We do not need to incur taxpayer expense to change it in San Luis Obispo County.

In short, changing current districting lines is a solution without a problem.

-Regards, Lawrence Bolef
Dear Supervisors:
The 2021 SLO County redistricting process is taking place under unusual circumstances. There was serious delay in the release of and public access to new census data, and new statutory criteria must be considered and applied. The County's public hearing process is highly compressed; your staff and the county's professional consultant have been severely hampered in their ability to implement the robust outreach effort contracted for and required by law. **The key question to ask and answer under these circumstances is: do radical map changes make sense if they are not required?**

I urge you to adopt Draft Map A or Draft Map B. Draft Map A represents the most cost-effective and least expense-incurred alternative to redistricting, and would not alter the election schedule for when voters choose their supervisors in 2022 and 2024. Draft Map B is supported by the respected nonpartisan League of Women Voters of SLO County.

**Draft Maps A or B would preserve North Coast and South Coast communities of interest as geographically and functionally distinct from inland communities placed in Districts 1 and 5.**

Your Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners have confirmed on the public record that Draft Maps A and B are valid, legal, compliant, and defensible district boundary maps. They are the most "litigation-proof" pathway forward. Your Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners have also confirmed that 2020 census data and application of the California Fair Maps Act essentially do not require change to existing...
district boundaries, and that Draft Map A is consistent and complies with all governing criteria found in California's Fair Maps Act. Draft Maps A and B are consistent with traditional redistricting principles and there has been no successful legal challenge to the existing supervisorial district boundaries over the last ten (10) years. Draft Map A is consistent with requirements of the federal Voting Rights Act. Unlike other suggested maps including the "Patten Map", Draft Maps A and B do not create any "crack and pack" issues that might subject a map to litigation challenges. Although touted by some because of its apparent avoidance of deviation/mal-apportionment issues, the "Patten Map" is fundamentally flawed in many respects and smacks of classic gerrymandering. It packs, it cracks, it dilutes, and it divides, all in pursuit of achieving party advantage. Why, one must wonder, has the Patten map reportedly been the focus of two Republican party sponsored workshops? Your decision must not favor one political party!

Sincerely,

/s/Alex Mintzer

Los Osos 93402
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:32 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]District Lines

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: David Butcher < Exec VP Consulting >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:06 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]District Lines

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please retain current District lines. There no good reason to redraw, as they are fair.

Regards,

David Butcher
Exec VP Consulting
For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

I urge you to retain and not change the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws.
The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.
Jan Howell Marx
City of San Luis Obispo
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:37 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Linda Corley <forbid@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

It is our household opinion that the redistributing map, Plan B, is the most fair map for voters in SLO County. It takes into consideration fair and balanced districts that do not favor or discriminate against any political party which is the most important idea for our family. In addition, Plan B appears to minimize election disruption, respect communities common social and economic interests and avoids radical changes to district lines. Please hear our voices and take our opinions to heart.

Thank you,
Arroyo Grande Voters
David, Linda and Jordan Corley
Sent from my iPad
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Chairperson Compton and Board Members:

I’ve been trying to wrap my head around a good reason to change the district maps from the current one. From my point of view, there is no good reason. Our population has not changed significantly and certainly not enough to warrant drastic changes. So the only reason to redraw the lines is for political purposes, which is illegal.

There are many other bad reasons to change the boundaries, everything from poor representation to no representation at all. Pitting the needs of a coastal community against those of an inland wine country, for example, is a losing proposition for those on the coast. Breaking up the city of San Luis Obispo to form just one district is short sighted. The County seat is in a unique position to be able to represent all of our diverse interests - coastal, agricultural, education, urban, rural – which encourages a cohesiveness in policy making and this must be maintained.

But the worst reason to change is what it would do to our common psyche. Have you noticed the mood of our community? It is quite truthfully frightening. I hope you have read the letter penned by two of the County’s former police chiefs. They too are concerned about the aggressive confrontations from parents, teachers, even students. This effort to further cut up the community for no apparent good reason will further degrade the public discourse and trust in our community. I’m looking for County leadership to take the lead and change the course of our county, because right now it’s headed in a very dark direction. We should be able to have differences of opinion without fear and the Board can take that first step by not making changes to our representation. There comes a time when you have to say, enough is enough.
Right now, this redistricting process is encouraging each district as well as neighbors to fight amongst each other. And for what? We should be taking the fight to a much bigger platform where each and every one of us is affected but where an individual’s voice is woefully inadequate. That fight is in Sacramento or Washington DC. But if we continue to cut up our representation, our voice will be drowned out by other bigger, richer, and more well-known counties that have coalesced. Our voices are so much stronger when we put those voices together as one.

I’m really hoping you will leave the districts as they are and focus your attention on issues like housing, water, health, safety, homelessness, economic development, mass transit, air quality and a host of other challenges.

Jonni Biaggini
For your review, this is District 5 constituents. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

November 17, 2021

Dear Honorary Members,

After reviewing draft maps under consideration for redistricting, we have several comments and one over-riding question.

First, the question, quite simply: Why?

Have the demographics of our county changed dramatically in the past ten years? I think the answer is clearly, "No, they have not." What about 'communities of interest', a standard tool of guidance when considering district apportionments? It appears that existing 'communities of interest' have remained steady over the past decade.

What exactly, then, motivates the majority membership of this current board to push redistricting, and to make the process so complex and opaque at this time?

Several concerns lead to an unfortunate conclusion:
*Why was not a bipartisan commission - as is standard practice - appointed to review maps and come up with recommendations?

*Why is this process compressed into a such a tight time-frame over the Thanksgiving holiday... when citizens are hard pressed to attend to the minutiae of unfamiliar details and map options?

These are only a few of our questions and concerns, leading to a crucial fact: The California State Election Code mandates that redistricting neither favor nor disfavor partisan interests.

We have reached a simple, clear conclusion. Despite efforts to obfuscate, rush and complicate this process, the actions of the three majority board members appear to be motivated by one overriding purpose: to solidify their political power base for the next ten years by splitting communities of interest and reducing alternative viewpoints.

Not only is this motive against the laws of the State of California, it is unacceptable and shameful.

After reviewing maps and commentaries from others more knowledgeable than we are, it is clear that there is no reason to alter the current maps.

Plain and simple, this is an autocratic reach and a power-grab. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

(signed)

Susan Pyburn
San Luis Obispo

Howard Gillingham
Atascadero

Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.
Martin Luther King Jr.

A Lens of Her Own  [www.aloho.us](http://www.aloho.us)
also: [http://herownlens.smugmug.com](http://herownlens.smugmug.com)
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:40 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Reid K Hester <r>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:59 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Supervisors and Redistricting Board Members,

My wife and I live in Arroyo Grande and we are urging you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. To significantly redraw the boundaries could result in even more political polarization and we oppose that. Warmest regards,

Reid K. Hester, Ph.D.
Be Kind to Each Other
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: kim Lindbery
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:10 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Please Support the Richard Patten Map ID74786 for Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear County Supervisors:

I support Richard Patten’s redistricting map ID74786 because it meets all the criteria for County Redistricting which are:

1. Each district shall be reasonably equal in total resident population to the other districts, except where deviation is required to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 or allowable by law.


3. Districts shall be geographically contiguous.

4. The geographic integrity of city, local neighborhood, or community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.

5. To the extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria in this subdivision, supervisorial 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.

In addition to the above criteria, districts shall not be drawn for or purposes of favoring or Discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate or political party.

Sincerely,
Kim Lindbery
District 5
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:41 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:13 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

The current districts efficiently & fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest and party registration. We STRONGLY URGE ALL OF YOU TO RETAIN THE CURRENT DISTRICT LINES!!! There is no legal requirement to change any district boundaries.

WE DO NOT NEED A RADICAL REDRAWING OF DISTRICT LINES!!

We DO WANT a nonpartisan citizen's panel appointed. We DO NOT WANT the board compressing a complicated process, jamming the three most critical public hearings into a five week span, leaving little time for analysis. We DO WANT MORE THAN 3 DAYS for an EXPERT REVIEW of the maps!!

Gary & Donna Donovan
Los Osos, CA
FW: [EXT]Redistricting maps and plans

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

Wed 11/17/2021 10:47 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:42 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting maps and plans

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I have been a resident and voter in this county for 44 years. For 37 of those years I had a law practice in Arroyo Grande/Grover Beach.

It remains our law that a primary goal in redistricting is to keep communities of interest together.

The current district boundaries (Plan A) as well as the minor changes to those boundaries in Plan B accomplishes this and therefore, please choose either Plan A or Plan B for the supervisor redistricting plans.
Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

Margaret R. Stone
Attorney at Law (retired)

San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Dear Supervisors,

I urge the Board of Supervisors to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

The recently published Tribune editorial by two former police chiefs from SLO county succinctly explains why the wise course is to leave well enough alone. Their rationale is all the more relevant when considering the hypercharged political environment we are all enduring these days.

Redistricting our county only serves to increase local discord. Surely the majority of your constituents prefer a hospitable and collaborative community compared to the alternative we see elsewhere in the country.

Sincerely,

Bruce G.Ray
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:43 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Liz Horton <Liz Horton>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:37 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To the Board of Supervisors of San Luis Obispo County,

I am writing to urge you to keep our district lines as they are. I feel the current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

The maps that I have looked at in the Tribune feel like a very contrived way to tilt the electorate in a partisan way which reflects the political leanings of three of our Supervisors. Is this really the legacy that you want to be remembered by?

Please do not do this to our wonderful County of San Luis Obispo.

Lizabeth Horton
Atascadero
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:44 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting
<Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Lindy L Jung
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:38 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

I wish I were able to appear in person to urge you to do this but neither my husband nor I are going to crowded indoor spaces as he is immune compromised.

Lindy Jung

Nipomo
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:44 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]redistricting

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Rodney blackner >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear supervisors,
I have looked at several of the maps for redistricting our area. It seems most of them are not following the state guidelines. They are splitting up cities and communities of interest, which does not make sense and does not follow the guidelines. As I have reviewed these maps, Richard Patton's seems to make the most sense. It splits up the cities less and helps to keep communities of interest together. Please review and consider his ideas. Thank You, Rod Blackner. Paso Robles, CA 93446
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

I want the Board to leave the district line as they are. There is no reason except to mess with the election results to change them.
Richard Lasiewski, D.O., Arroyo Grande
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:49 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:45 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cbdfab164d9b548499ad908d9aa5f984b%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a849767b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C6377281498155429097CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=aeQDmaf2wFfcUZN6CB87qkWSsU6s2HydFBfqHPVHWBA%3D&reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: KATHLEEN FISHER>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:29 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear SLO Supervisors:
We have lived in this beautiful county for the past 21 years and have enjoyed this little slice of paradise. We understand that the current districts within the county fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, AND party registration. These current district lines are fully compliant with election laws.

We urge you to retain these current district lines. To do otherwise is an assault on our democracy. It isn’t broken. Don’t try to “fix” it.
Thank you,
Pete and Kathleen Fisher

Sent from my iPad
There is no reason to change a system that is working very well.

DO NOT DO A MAJOR OVERHAUL OF OUR COUNTY DISTRICTS!

Janis S. Scott
District 4
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to tell you that I do NOT want any changes done to the areas currently being represented by our County Supervisors. It is just fine the way it is and there do NOT need to be any changes made. AGAIN, my request is for you to NOT MAKE ANY CHANGES to the current supervisor district lines.

Thank you,
Jana Hunstad-Sarver
Oceano, CA 93445
FW: [EXT]Redistricting Map

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:51 PM
To: Mei-Lin Gee <mgee@co.slo.ca.us>

1 attachments (15 KB)
REDISTRICTING SLO County.docx;

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:50 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Map

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Cheryl Wieczorek
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:37 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Map

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please see the attached explanation why I support Richard Patten’s redistricting map ID74786. It is open and transparent, geographically contiguous and minimizes the division of community of interest.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wieczorek
Paso Robles
I support Richard Patten’s redistricting map ID74786 because it meets all the criteria for County Redistricting which are:

1. Each district shall be reasonably equal in total resident population to the other districts, except where deviation is required to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 or allowable by law.
2. Districts shall comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965
3. Districts shall be geographically contiguous
4. The geographic integrity of city, local neighborhood, or community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.
5. To the extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria in this subdivision, supervisorial 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.

In addition to the above criteria, districts shall not be drawn for or purposes of favoring or Discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate or political party.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wieczorek
Paso Robles
(residential address not mandatory)
Supervisors,

I would like to strongly urge you all to vote for either map A or map B at your upcoming meeting this Friday. The census showed that our county's population did not increase significantly enough to necessitate any radically-amended redistricting plan, and I hope you all will consider that in your discussions.

Some of the proposed maps seem to strongly favor political affiliation lines and appear to be an outright attempt to redistrict in order to give one party - Republican - an advantage over another - Democrat. This would be a blatant attempt at disenfranchising some currently-represented constituents by erasing the existing district boundaries.

There is speculation that Mr. Peschong might retire from his seat after redistricting, fueling the idea that he only sought reelection in order to appoint his successor and to ensure more conservative policies and views by the Board. I have been surprised, saddened and angered over the past few years by the deepening political battleground in what I used to believe was a generally fair and unbiased Board of Supervisors.

It would be a terrible misuse of the Supervisors' powers and roles to radically change district boundaries in a year where no redistricting seems to be required. Please listen to all public comments. Please consider that it's your elected duty to provide fairness to your constituents as a whole when making your decision.

Respectfully submitted,

Kay Miller

District 3
To: County Board of Supervisors:
Because this item is up for discussion/action presently, I am strongly weighing in AGAINST PLAN C. The dramatic changes put forth in that plan do not keep the communities of interest together as the stated goal has always proposed.

From: Alston Paff
District 5
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:23 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]SLO Chamber of Commerce re. SLO County 2030 Redistricting Map

For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Molly Kern <g>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:59 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Jim Dantona <jim@slochamber.org>
Subject: [EXT]SLO Chamber of Commerce re. SLO County 2030 Redistricting Map

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Chair Compton and SLO County Board of Supervisors,

Attached please find a letter from the SLO Chamber Board of Directors regarding the SLO County 2030 Redistricting Map.

Please don’t hesitate to reach out with any questions. We so appreciate your hard work and service to our County.

Best,
Molly

Molly Kern
Director of Governmental Affairs
San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce
Subject: SLO County 2030 Redistricting Map

Dear Chair Compton and SLO County Board of Supervisors,

As the largest business organization in San Luis Obispo County, representing nearly 1,300 members that employ approximately 35,000 individuals throughout our County, the San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce respectfully submits our support for the proposed SLO County 2030 redistricting map.

Through months of work, members of a dedicated taskforce, our Legislative Action Committee, and our Board of Directors brought their experiences as business leaders who live in different districts, work in different industries, and have a wide range of political perspectives to the table to craft the proposed SLO County 2030 map. This map meets the legal requirements and takes into account the challenges and opportunities faced by each of the quique, vibrant communities throughout our County. We appreciate the opportunity to share with you the thought process behind the choices made in drawing the map.

As with the stated goal of redistricting, we wanted to ensure that our map would keep communities of interests together. There are four specific communities of interest that we prioritized in the SLO County 2030 map. The first and most significant of the examples is the Cal Poly community - both the off campus students and other neighbors who live near the campus, and those who live on campus itself. This community of interest has had 5th District Supervisor as its representative for the past decade and so we adjusted the Western line of District 5 across Santa Rosa/Hwy 1, to include the area that includes a significant amount of student housing, to ensure that the community of interest is not bifurcated.

Additionally, the communities of Santa Margarita, Garden Farms, Creston and Shandon share similar interests as small, rural, independent communities and were able to bring Shandon into District 5 to keep these communities together in one district.

The North Coast communities from ragged point to Los Osos share common industries, assets and face similar challenges and should be kept together in District 2.

Finally, Oceano should be included with the communities to the South and East of it to ensure that their agricultural interests and roots are represented by the same Supervisor in District 4.

Agriculture, as a major industry spread throughout the entire county and a significant part of our County’s culture and history, requires that every supervisory district to have a significant operational agriculture in its boundaries. To achieve this, we pulled the second district border East along the Highway 46 and 41 arteries to ensure that we grew the agricultural influence in the Second District while respecting the geography and infrastructure that allows all parts of the district to be easily accessed.
Similarly, we strove to ensure that each district contained a mix of more urban, incorporated cities and unincorporated, less densely populated areas as experiences of each type of resident are important to keep in mind for a variety of decisions that Supervisors are entrusted with.

This helped drive our approach to the City of SLO. After considering many ways to divvy up the County’s most populous city, we chose to look at the commercial, residential and Cal Poly communities of interest and are proposing that the Cal Poly Community of Interests as mentioned before be represented by District 5, the business/downtown/industrial interests in the south of the city be represented by District 3, and the almost entirely residential portion Northwest of the 101 in District 2.

The same approach - prioritizing communities of interest over municipal boundaries as directed by law - drove our consideration of the City of Atascadero. We drew dividing lines that split Atascadero into two communities of interest, the ranchettes and larger residential lots in the West going into District 2, while the downtown and more commercial areas remain in District 5.

Finally, we considered two of the most significant opportunities and challenges facing our County over the next decade: the planned closure of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant and changes to the type of uses allowed at the Oceano Dunes. Each of these changes deserves to be a top priority of the supervisor representing the area so it is essential that they remain in separate districts that have historically represented the areas.

Thank you for considering the business community’s perspectives in this essential and nuanced decision.

Sincerely,

2021 SLO Chamber Board of Directors

**Jessica Steely**  
Chairperson of the Board

**Hillary Trout**  
Immediate Past Chairperson of the Board

**Liz Summer**  
Treasurer

**Brad Brechwald**  
Economic Development Vice-Chair

**Cheryl Cuming**  

**Jessica Darin**  

**Kelly Donohue**  

**Tim Dossa**  

**Courtney Haile**  

**Bryan Idler**  

**Brendan Morris**  

**LeBren Harris**  
Chairperson Elect & Vice-Chair, Membership

**Dave Juhnke**  
Secretary

**Joe Benson**  
Vice-Chair, Legislative Affairs

**Jeff Buckingham**  
Vision Vice-Chair

**Stephanie Stackhouse**  

**Dr. Jill Stearns**  

**Mary Verdin**  

**Wendy Wendt**  

**Phyllis Wong**  

**Leigh Woolpert**
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Topic: District 1 Supervisor John Peschong Question/Issue
Your Name: Carol Eorio
Your Email: [mask]
U.S. phone number: [mask]
Message: In regards to the redistricting map, I've reviewed Richard Patton's and believe it is the best option. It follows all the guidelines which the current map does not. Please vote in favor of his proposed map.

Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 738298
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2762
Form inserted: 11/17/2021 2:19:30 PM
Form updated: 11/17/2021 2:19:30 PM
FW: [EXT]Cambria redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:55 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:25 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Cambria redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I am a Cambria resident and am very concerned about the proposal to place Cambria in the same district as Paso Robles. The proposal of Map C removes us from other coastal communities where we have the same interests. We are unincorporated and I am afraid that changing the redistricting boundaries to Map C would ultimately cause the loss of our voice as a community with the very unique concerns we have here and would compromise the power of our vote. It is my understanding we are not mandated to change the boundaries due to population, so how would this benefit our community? I would hope that this isn’t just a case of gerrymandering.
Please leave the boundaries as they are now.

Sincerely,
Karen Hoeschen
Cambria, California
Sent from my iPhone
FW: [EXT]Opinion

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Wed 11/17/2021 10:57 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Pat Taylor
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:01 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Opinion

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Board of Supervisors, I have read articles and looked at maps for possible redistricting and am very much against major changes. I live in Cambria and have for 31 years. The current map has worked for a number of years so I see no major need to change unless we are just talking politics. To place the coast in with Paso Robles makes no sense at all. We have nothing in common. We are such a divided country right now and two of the maps do make big changes which will just add to the divisions felt. It would be a comfort if the board could do something positive for the communities, the people you represent, instead of thinking of your politics and your future. Think about what leaders are suppose to be doing. Pat Taylor
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I have reviewed the redistricting reports and maps on the county website and agree with the conclusion that no action needs to be taken. Per the report, the minor changes in population that have occurred do not require changing any district boundaries and no compelling reason for making changes has been presented.

There have been minimal demographic, population, or communities of interest (COI) changes in SLO county since the last census was taken. Current districts are compliant with election laws and meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness. Maintaining the current boundaries will ensure continuity of representation, keep existing Communities of Interest intact, and meet all statutory requirements.

If the Board wants to make minor changes to reduce the deviation in the population of districts, then the option that minimizes changes should be adopted. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted. Specifically, there is no justification for splitting the coastal communities and pairing them with inland areas of the county. Please reject the proposed “Patten map” and others that group the City of SLO into a single district.

Since the current districts are compliant, redistricting should only occur for a compelling reason. No such reason has been presented. Instead, the proposed radical changes to districts give the appearance that redistricting is an opportunity for the Board of Supervisors to pick the voters they want. Let's not make San Luis Obispo county the poster child for gerrymandering. I urge you to retain the current district lines.

Sincerely,

Joanne Schultz
Pismo Beach
These comments are a follow-up to the Citizens for Preserving District #4 position paper submitted on October 22, 2021.

The purpose of the following is to explain why Citizens for Preserving District #4 strongly supports and endorses the formal adoption of Draft Plan A. Embedded within the comments are a series of questions that, when answered appropriately through a non-partisan lens, serve to substantiate our position.

Introduction:

A. The 2021 redistricting process is taking place under an extraordinary set of circumstances: new census data was seriously delayed in release and availability to the public; new statutory criteria must be considered and applied; the public hearing process is very tight and highly compressed; and there has been widely-reported challenges for the public to easily and successfully access meaningful information about proposed maps. Further, while required by law and contracted for, the county’s professional consultant (supported by staff) has been severely hampered in implementing any robust outreach effort to underrepresented communities. The question to ask is: Under these circumstances, does radical change make sense, especially since it is not required?

B. Existing supervisorial district boundaries do not have to be changed unless new census data and application of governing statutory provisions require change. The question to ask is: Aren’t the existing district boundaries ok as is?

C. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) has the authority to approve an ordinance and a map establishing supervisorial district boundaries, but it also has the ability to delegate that authority to a citizen
redistricting commission, like has been done in Santa Barbara County and many other counties. You, as the SLO County BOS, rejected that idea. The question to ask is: Why might your board majority, with only one of you running for re-election, desire to keep the final decision essentially to yourselves?

D. Earlier this year you, as the SLO County BOS, authorized a staff advisory committee and an experienced outside consultant to oversee the redistricting process. These parties should be viewed as independent and be permitted to focus on fulfilling their responsibility to present map options that are consistent with census data, traditional redistricting principles, requirements of federal voting rights laws, federal and state constitutions, case precedent, and the California Fair Maps Act. The question to ask them at the November 19th hearing is: Of the four (4) redistricting maps you have prepared and presented toward fulfillment of your obligations, which of the draft plans – if you had to choose just one -- is the most factually and legally compliant and defensible considering current census data, traditional redistricting principles, requirements of federal voting laws, federal and state constitutions, case precedent, and the California Fair Maps Act -- and why?

Why Draft Map “A” should be adopted:

1. Draft Map A is the first map, and one of four (4) prepared and presented by the Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners. Draft Map A (also referred to as Draft Plan A) is a marker “as is” map and uses original/existing district boundaries as a framework. The only changes in map boundaries were minor, and made to adhere to P.L. 94-171 census block boundary lines that deviate slightly from current district boundaries.

2. The Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners have confirmed on public record that Draft Map A is a valid, legal, compliant, and defensible district boundaries map. It is the most “litigation-proof” pathway forward.

3. The Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners have confirmed on public record that 2020 census data and application of the California Fair Maps Act criteria essentially do not require any change to existing district boundaries.

4. The Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners have confirmed on public record that Draft Map A complies with presumptively valid deviation percentages (i.e., under 10.0%) for local elected offices. In other words, there is no “malapportionment” problem with this map that could result in a successful litigation challenge. As stated above, Draft Map A uses existing county district boundaries, with minor changes made in order to adhere to a small number of census block boundary modifications.

5. The Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners have confirmed on public record that Draft Map A is consistent and complies with all governing criteria found in California’s Fair Maps Act.

6. Two of the most important criteria in the California Fair Maps Act include the word “respected,” creating and essentially acknowledging a clear bias favoring continuity versus change. According to Elections Code Sec. 21500(c)(2): “To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of any local neighborhood or local community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.” And Elections Code Sec. 21500(c)(3): To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of a census or census designated place shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.” Draft Map A shows the respect required and preserves geographic and other significant forms of communities of interest.

7. Draft Map A is consistent with traditional redistricting principles, and there has been no successful legal challenge to the existing supervisorial district boundaries over the last ten (10) years.

8. Draft Map A is consistent with requirements of the federal Voting Rights Act.
9. In presenting the Draft Map A as a valid, legal, compliant, and defensible map, Staff Advisory Commission and Redistricting Partners are at least implicitly confirming that a decision to adopt the supervisorial district boundaries depicted in the map would not be for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.

10. The Draft Map A alternative represents the most cost-effective and least expense-incurring alternative for completing the redistricting process.

11. Unlike other suggested maps including the “Patten Map,” the Draft Map A alternative does not create any “crack and pack” issues that might subject a map to litigation challenges.

12. Unlike many other proposed maps, the Draft Map A alternative does not create any “acceleration and deferral” issues that might subject a map to litigation challenges and adversely impact the ability of county citizens to exercise their right to vote.

13. Draft Map A honors and preserves a decades-long practice of “supervisorial sharing” of the county center, county seat, and county’s largest population collection in the City of San Luis Obispo. Counties up and down the state of California have done exactly the same thing, and most likely for the same reasons. Strength of effective representation of county interests is assured, not lessened, by such sharing arrangements.

14. Although supported by many, partly because of its superficial avoidance of deviation/malapportionment issues, the “Patten Map” is fundamentally flawed in many respects and smacks of classic gerrymandering. It packs, it cracks, it dilutes, and it divides, all in pursuit of achieving party and incumbent advantage. Why, one must wonder, has the Patten map reportedly been the focus of two Republican Party-sponsored workshops?

15. Three key geographic and multi-faceted communities of interest in District #4 are the City of Arroyo Grande and the unincorporated Census Designated Places (CDPs) of Oceano and Nipomo, which arguably benefit from receiving and relying on county level attention for many services and important land use and coastal zone planning decisions under the county’s Local Coastal Plan. It would be an absolute travesty – not to mention makes no sense – to dilute and diminish the relative strength the Oceano and Nipomo communities currently have by being together as part of District #4. The travesty would be compounded if any move was made to weaken the voice of voters in Oceano by moving the CDP into a district where more decision-making influence comes from incorporated cities.

16. Draft Map A depicts an existing supervisorial district where the vote differential between candidates in the last election was a mere 60 votes. It is balanced yet diversified and uber-competitive as-is. With existing District #4 having a 2020 census deviation of just 3.19% -- and otherwise meeting all criteria of the California Fair Maps Act -- what possible legitimate and rational basis would an incumbent supervisor have for wanting to modify district boundaries – or lending support to others who have that as a key component of their mission?

Citizens For Preserving District #4

Submitted November 17, 2021 for November 19, 2021 Redistricting Hearing #3
Just read in today's SLO Tribune there is thought to change the district boundaries for Cambria CA.

**PLEASE do NOT include us with Paso Robles.**

I believe our Cambrian community will be best served if it stays connected with other coastal towns (ie. Los Osos, San Simeon, Cayucos). We are a cold weathered and forested area, of mostly retirees & tourists, with very limited employment, much unlike the larger city of Paso.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kathleen Guthrie

=^..^=
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Don't change any of the boundaries of our 5 districts. If you do so, it can only be perceived as trying to assure the current majority stays in office and a politics that reflect our current mess in Washington. SLO is better than that. Thank you.
Sally Kruger

SLO
From: Beth Oates <*
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:32 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I urge you to retain current supervisorial district boundaries, which will ensure continuity, keep existing Communities of Interest intact, and meet all statutory requirements. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted.

Elizabeth Oates
Los Osos

Get BlueMail for Android
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [redacted]
Date: November 17, 2021 at 2:25:20 PM PST
To: redistricting@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Cambria redistricting

unique concerns
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:38 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Holly McCain
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:31 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I am writing because I am not able to attend Friday's meeting on redistricting, and I wish to state my strong opposition to many of the proposed changes to our current plan. Gerrymandering for political gain is illegal, and I hope that is not the goal of these proposed plan options. I strongly urge you to vote for plan A. Cambria is a very different community with different needs than Paso Robles. Please vote for plan A. Thank you. Holly McCain, Cambria
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Supervisors,

It looks like you’ve received a number of map options to consider, and some are more creative than others. There does not appear to be any need to be super creative this time around.

In particular, you should reject any map that isolates Morro Bay from its neighbors to the north and south (e.g., the Richard Patten map and its variations). Morro Bay has much less in common with the city of San Luis Obispo than it does with Los Osos and Cayucos and it is ridiculous to even consider separating it out. Morro Bay and Los Osos share their middle and high schools, so students from one community attend school in the other. As a resident of Los Osos, I am much more attuned to the coastal issues of Morro Bay, Cayucos, and Cambria, than I am to the inland issues of SLO City. Keep the north coastal communities in the same district - there is no need to crack, dilute, or divide along the north coast.

I encourage you to choose Map A or B and make the fewest changes in redistricting this time around.

Sincerely,

Carole Mintzer
Los Osos, CA 93402
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:40 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:52 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Carol L Michael

Your Email: 

U.S. phone number: 

Message: I am not in favor of any redistricting plans at this time. There is not enough change in the minor populations to require redistricting at this time. The Supervisors have not allowed enough time for review and expert analysis.. I urge you to listen to our communities and retain the current the current district lines.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 447817

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2763

Form inserted: 11/17/2021 2:50:59 PM

Form updated: 11/17/2021 2:50:59 PM
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Board of Supervisors,

I request and urge the Board to keep the County district boundaries as-is as the current boundaries already comply with election law, and not change them for partisan and political purposes. The Board is there to serve the citizens of the County, not its own political interests.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles R. Stup, Jr.

Nipomo, CA 93444
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Sandra Lee
Your Email: [REDACTED]
U.S. phone number: [REDACTED]
Message: I urge the Board of Supervisors to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. I have lived, voted and worked in the County for more than 20 years and am adamantly opposed to changes in the map.

Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 165060
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2764
Form inserted: 11/17/2021 2:55:17 PM
Form updated: 11/17/2021 2:55:17 PM
To Whom It May Concern,

I live in the City of SLO and support its division into three supervisorial districts. The City has ties to all parts of the county, providing jobs, shopping, and education for folks who live in other areas and are connected through our central location and major transportation systems. Those who assert otherwise generally don’t live in the City. Don’t marginalize us into a single district.

While minor updates to the existing boundaries may be required, such changes should be minimal. Please reject the proposed “Patten map” and others that kettle the City of SLO into a single district.

Cordially,

Cameron Jung-Fagan

--

Cameron M. Jung-Fagan, MS, RD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Web Notifications <a href="mailto:webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us">webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Redistricting <a href="mailto:Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us">Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Public Comment - ID 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RedistrictingID</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/17/2021 3:42:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/17/2021 3:42:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Barbagiovanni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organization Represented</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Nipomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Please maintain the current supervisorial district boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Records Notice</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:43 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]SLO County Redistricting - No changes needed

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Joanne Schultz [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:02 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]SLO County Redistricting - No changes needed

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I have reviewed the redistricting reports and maps on the county website and agree with the conclusion that no action needs to be taken. Per the report, the minor changes in population that have occurred do not require changing any district boundaries and no compelling reason for making changes has been presented.

There have been minimal demographic, population, or communities of interest (COI) changes in SLO county since the last census was taken. Current districts are compliant with election laws and meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness. Maintaining the current boundaries will ensure continuity of representation, keep existing Communities of Interest intact, and meet all statutory requirements.

If the Board wants to make minor changes to reduce the deviation in the population of districts, then the option that minimizes changes should be adopted. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted. Specifically, there is no justification for splitting the coastal communities and pairing them with inland areas of the county. Please reject the proposed “Patten map” and others that group the City of SLO into a single district.

Since the current districts are compliant, redistricting should only occur for a compelling reason. No such reason has been presented. Instead, the proposed radical changes to districts give the appearance that redistricting is an opportunity for the Board of Supervisors to pick the voters they want. Let's not make San Luis Obispo county the poster child for gerrymandering. I urge you to retain the current district lines.

Sincerely,
Joanne Schultz
Pismo Beach
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:46 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Re-Districting

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Phil Bailey <[redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Re-Districting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

There is so much in the news about re-districting all over the country based on the recent census and the affect it could have on voting, reasonable representation and indeed democracy itself. Our county is under scrutiny as well and has had plenty of embarrassing press on many subjects in recent months. I hope we can be role models in the re-districting process and do it in a fair manner that will bring pride to the county.

Thanks for reading.

Phil

*****************************************************************************

Philip S. Bailey
Director of the Frost Fund
Dean Emeritus,
College of Science and Mathematics
Professor Emeritus,
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Mailing Address
College of Science and Mathematics
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA  93407

Office Location:
Faculty Offices East (BLDG 25), Office 120

Phone:
My Office Direct: [Redacted]
College Office: [Redacted]
For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please retain the current district lines, which (1) comply with the applicable election laws, and (2) balance key factors including geography, population, party registration, and communities of interest.

Sandy Ahearn
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hello,

I am writing to advise you of my thoughts about redistricting. I have heard that there is some talk about adding San Simeon and Cambria into the inland district that includes Paso Robles. I do not understand the logic of this proposal and am very much against it.

Previously, I completed and submitted a questionnaire stating that, in my opinion, the central CA coast (including Cambria & San Simeon) should be kept as one district, as we share common interests, concerns and contiguous boundaries. I remain more convinced than ever that this is correct. In addition, I believe that all Cal Poly students should be within one district due to their being a community of
interest. You may be aware of the League of Women Voters opinion that Map Plan B is the most fair, non-political proposed district map for San Luis Obispo County. It definitely appears to be most compliant with the Fair Maps Act. Thus, I urge you to move forward with adopting it.

I appreciate your reading of my thoughts on this important matter and considering my opinion as you make your decision about our district maps for the next 10 years.

Yours sincerely,
Nancy J Carter

Sent from my iPad
FW: [EXT]Redistricting - maintain current district boundaries as much as possible

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Thu 11/18/2021 7:13 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:49 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting - maintain current district boundaries as much as possible

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmgee%40co.slo.ca.us%7Ca3bf88932dcd421ea34608d9aaa5f8ad%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C6377284520726974217CUknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=fK1x73vSTGRVNM7VVyfvdADEu6BTQGbmwEiT1zwgUcnc%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Todd Katz <Todd.Katz@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:46 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting - maintain current district boundaries as much as possible

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Honorable Supervisors —

I’m writing in support of maintaining current district lines or at least respecting their general contours as closely as possible given population changes over the last decade. By taking this conservative action you will be supporting consistency, knowledge of current general boundaries and reassuring the general public of the Board's commitment to a fair election rather than looking for ways to “fix” future elections in one political direction or another.

I would take the same position if so-called "liberal" members were trying to redraw the map in their favor.
Thank you for considering this opinion.

Sincerely,

Todd Katz
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:48 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Kathleen Guthrie

Your Email: [REDACTED]

U.S. phone number: [REDACTED]

Message: Do NOT mix Cambria with Paso on redistricting. They are nothing alike...keep Cambria with other like coastal small towns.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 479563

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2765

Form inserted: 11/17/2021 3:47:14 PM

Form updated: 11/17/2021 3:47:14 PM
Good afternoon, SLO County Board of Supervisors.

I am writing to express my thoughts and to address my concerns regarding any redistricting boundary changes within SLO County. I was disappointed that the Board majority chose not to appoint a non-partisan independent commission of citizens to advise on drawing district boundaries, unlike our neighboring County of Santa Barbara and others in our state. For me, that leads to the question of why not, and to the question of trust?

The current boundaries are in full compliance with election law; there is no legal requirement or justification based on data from the 2020 census to change the current boundaries already in place. Abide by the saying, "if it ain't broke don't fix it." By doing so, you stand the chance of creating a situation in our County that you may not have given really serious thought to. We are seeing evidence across our country, the likes of which we have not witnessed in our lifetimes; the consequences of your votes, matter!

**State-based requirements** *(source, Ballotpedia)*

In addition to the federal criteria noted above, individual states may impose additional requirements on redistricting. Common state-level redistricting criteria are listed below.

1. **Contiguity** refers to the principle that all areas within a district should be physically adjacent. A total of 49 states require that districts of at least one state legislative chamber be contiguous (Nevada has no such requirement, imposing no requirements on redistricting beyond those enforced at the federal level). A total of 23 states require that congressional districts meet contiguity requirements.[10][11]
2. **Compactness** refers to the general principle that the constituents within a district should live as near to one another as practicable. A total of 37 states impose compactness requirements on state legislative districts; 18 states impose similar requirements for congressional districts.[10][11]
3. A **community of interest** is defined by FairVote as a "group of people in a geographical area, such as a specific region or neighborhood, who have common political, social or economic interests." A total of 24 states require that the maintenance of communities of interest be considered in the drawing of state legislative districts. A total of 13 states impose similar requirements for congressional districts.[10][11]

4. A total of 42 states require that state legislative district lines be drawn to account for **political boundaries** (e.g., the limits of counties, cities, and towns). A total of 19 states require that similar considerations be made in the drawing of congressional districts.[10][11]

As a full-time resident of Cambria, I see no logical justification for our community to be considered within the boundaries of District 1, Paso Robles, and surrounding areas, or within the boundaries of District 5, Atascadero, and surrounding areas. Additionally, I can find no justification for the Coastal areas within District 2 to be changed to any other District. Below, are my comments on what the Board of Supervisors must give serious weight to before arriving at a decision on November 30.

**CONTIGUITY:**
Communities in District 2 simply cannot be considered to be contiguous to Paso Robles (District 1) or to Atascadero, (District 5), as some maps are proposing. It is a preposterous idea!

**COMPACTNESS:**
Any consideration of Cambria, San Simeon, Cayucos, Morro Bay, and Los Osos, being placed into other Districts, doesn't meet the principle of constituents living as near to one another as practicable. The current boundaries apply, so why change them?

**COMMUNITY of INTEREST:**
I cannot find any justification for the Coastal communities located within the boundaries of District 2, to be placed in either District 1 or District 5 (or any other District). District 2 does not have commonality with those Districts in political, social, or economic interests. **Tourism in Cambria, San Simeon, Cayucos, Morro Bay, and Los Osos, brings visitors to the Coastal areas for very different reasons than those of District 1 and District 5 (or SLO). Each one of the 5 communities in District 2 is unique characteristically, but all are connected to the ocean, bays, and estuaries. **Tourism, in the coastal areas, is primarily centered around their close proximity to the ocean, which allows for residents and tourists to enjoy what many coastal communities have to offer: spectacular beaches, opportunities for whale watching, visiting a rare stand of Monterey pine trees in the forested areas of Cambria, numerous walking/hiking trails, campgrounds in close proximity to the ocean, estuaries, and bays,
opportunities for birding and nature enthusiasts, surfing, paragliding, kayaking, sailing, fishing, and many other sources that provide pleasure and enjoyment, almost none of which are available inland. Beautify Cambria is making headway in having Cambria become a "Dark Skies" community--that would not be available to us in cities that are much more heavily populated and artificially lit, making that opportunity impossible.

Another factor that affects tourism, and thereby the economy as well, is the geographic location of the areas that are within the boundaries of District 2, where the mild, temperate climate, draws huge numbers of visitors from the inland areas, the valleys, as well as from around the state, country, and the world. We are known for being destinations to "beat the heat!" The same cannot be said for Districts 1 and 5!

POLITICAL BOUNDARIES:
"In redistricting, political boundaries are the boundaries of other governments, such as cities, towns, or counties, and political divisions, such as city council wards or state legislative districts. In drawing electoral districts, a state may take these political boundaries into account in order to keep existing constituencies in one district rather than splitting them across multiple districts."[1]
(source: CapRadio, Sacramento, Oct. 28, 2021)

From SLO County election results, Districts 1 and 5 lean more Republican, whereas District 2 tends to lean more Democratic. The BOS majority is Republican, yet the majority of voters in the County are Democratic. So I have to ask, why is this even being considered? Is the majority on the BOS not content with being the majority? Is there an underlying reason for not being transparent by having an independent commission, as mentioned above? Is this a form of Gerrymandering by members of the majority of the BOS to aid in the retention of incumbents' seats in the next election? That is the appearance I perceive from what I have witnessed so far in this process. I hope that will NOT be the case!

Gerrymandering (source, Ballotpedia)

"The term gerrymandering refers to the practice of drawing electoral district lines to favor one political party, individual, or constituency over another. When used in a rhetorical manner by opponents of a particular district map, the term has a negative connotation but does not necessarily address the legality of a challenged map. The term can also be used in legal documents; in this context, the term describes redistricting practices that violate federal or state laws.[1][13]" (bold enhanced)

From another source on gerrymandering, CapRadio, Sacramento, October 28, 2021

What is gerrymandering?
Until 2010, California's legislative and congressional districts were
drawn by state lawmakers. While some states have implemented
independent commissions, lawmakers oversee redistricting in
most other states.

“Politicians have been able to choose their communities, rather
than communities choosing their representatives,” Sadhwani
said.

Redistricting experts say this leads to an inherent conflict of interest
during the decennial process and can lead to what's known as
gerrymandering when boundaries are drawn in a way that benefits one
group over another.

If my comments need further clarification, please read (if you haven't already), the
"Viewpoint" in today's Tribune, written by two conservative Republican
retired police chiefs (see attached).

I would ask that each of you come to a rationally based just and fair decision as
you vote for hundreds of thousands of individuals whom you represent. Your
decision must not be about political partisanship. We are a
democracy for a reason; it was what our country was founded
upon--please respect that as you make your decision on November
30.

In appreciation for your service.

Tina Dickason

Resident of Cambria
Two retired police chiefs warn against ‘radical redrawing’ of SLO County supervisor districts

BY BY JIM GARDINER AND RICK TERBORCH
NOVEMBER 16, 2021 5:30 AM

The San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors will meet Friday for another hearing on redistricting.
LINDSEY HOLDEN LHOLDEN@THETRIBUNENEWS.COM
Over the four decades we have spent in law enforcement, we have seen our country convulsed time and again by hyper-partisanship, protests-turned-riots and other political mayhem — yet America always regained its footing.

We both have been lifelong conservative Republicans, and believed in the values of collaboration, compromise and the rule of law. But too many Americans have rejected those values and replaced them with a win-at-all-costs mentality.

Now, almost a year after the Jan. 6 insurrection, we fear for the survival of our democracy.

SLO County gas prices are at an all-time high. Here are the cheapest spots to fuel up

We had hoped that America would regain its balance, that cooler heads would prevail.
But the raging has only grown worse, fueled in large part by too many elected bodies taking actions that will impede our ability to have free and fair elections.

$2 for 2 months
Subscribe for unlimited access to our website, app, eEdition and more

CLAIM OFFER

In fact, we fear that conservative scholar Robert Kagan’s concerns about our democracy are spot on. As he wrote recently in the Washington Post, America has “a reasonable chance over the next three to four years of incidents of mass violence, a breakdown of federal authority, and the division of the country into warring red and blue enclaves.”

Even here in our own county, aggressive confrontations and threats of violence are on the rise.

Look no further than the recent disruptions and harassment of local school boards, and abuse of minority groups. Our county elections official, Tommy Gong, was hounded by extremist and racist accusations.

A violent event like the Jan. 6 insurrection could happen anywhere, including here. We are concerned for everyone’s safety, but particularly the safety of law enforcement personnel who will inevitably be called to quell confrontations.

How do we stem the rage?

‘It’s always sad to see the end of an era’

Popular SLO County fish taco stand is closing after 2 decades

READ MORE

Every citizen must become more vigilant.

Citizens must actively engage in the practice of democracy – not merely voting, but also attending government meetings and making your voices heard in a
respectful, civil way. Citizen engagement is the difference between a democracy that works and a democracy in decay.

Staying on the sidelines simply surrenders the field to the extremists.

Where to start?

Start with the SLO County Board of Supervisors, who have an immediate opportunity to help quell the rage – or make it worse.

Every 10 years, with respect to the latest census, the supervisors review how the county’s five supervisor districts are drawn. The board majority has promised an open and transparent process, but we are skeptical because:

- Based on the minor changes in population, there is no legal requirement to change any district boundaries.
- The supervisors chose to ignore best practice and did not appoint a nonpartisan citizens’ panel to advise on drawing the district boundaries.
- Even though the current boundaries are fully compliant with election law, a majority appears to favor a radical redrawing of district lines that would lock in partisan advantages for the next 10 years.
- The board has compressed a complicated process, jamming the three most critical public hearings into a five-week span, leaving little time for analysis.
- At a critical point later this month, the board is allowing only three days for expert review of the maps.

If the majority opts for radically new district boundaries simply to secure a partisan advantage for themselves, they will be fueling the rage.

Though we are concerned about the current process, we also know this board can be persuaded to do the right thing when confronted by concerned citizens.

Recently, for example, after a majority of the board indicated it was open to selecting an unqualified and openly partisan person to oversee local elections, hundreds of citizens spoke up in protest. One supervisor reconsidered, and the board ended up selecting a well-qualified elections official.
What can you do?

You can write to the Supervisors at boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us and urge them to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

You can show up at one of these two public hearings at the County Government Building (1055 Monterey St, San Luis Obispo, CA 93408):

9 a.m. Friday, Nov. 19

9 a.m. Tuesday, Nov. 30

By showing up and speaking up, you will be standing up for democracy, fairness and good government. Keep our local politics healthy, and not driven by conspiracies and rage.

A centuries-old aphorism remains true: All it takes for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing.

Now is the time. Get informed and get involved. Our democracy depends on all of us.

Jim Gardiner served as chief of police for the city of San Luis Obispo from 1987 to 2002 and is a past president of the California Peace Officers Association. Rick TerBorch served as chief of Police for the city of Arroyo Grande from 1989 to 2005 and is a past president of the California Police Chiefs Association.

RELATED STORIES FROM SAN LUIS OBISPO TRIBUNE

SLICE-OF-LIFE

SLO County redistricting plans could combine Cambria, Paso Robles. Why that’s a bad idea

NOVEMBER 17, 2021 5:05 AM

POLITICS-GOVERNMENT

Should one supervisor represent both Paso Robles and Cambria? A guide to redistricting

NOVEMBER 15, 2021 5:00 AM
Will supervisors respect SLO County's regions – or carve them up for political gain?

OCTOBER 29, 2021 5:15 AM

9 Comments

Add a comment...

Robert Lewin
Thank you Chiefs for a presenting a moderating thoughtful position.

Like · Reply · 1 · 2h

Lauren Brown
Thank you, Jim Gardiner and Rick Terborch, for this forceful statement of concern regarding the redrawing of supervisorial district boundries. The conservative majority on the Board have certainly shown an inclination to support measaures that appear to make voting more difficult: polls only open on election day, no early voting, absentee ballots only on request. They claim to be making elections safer but the unstated impact is to discourage voting by blocks of voters unlikely to support conservative positions. Now this same conservative majority is signaling an intention to gerrymander the... See More

Like · Reply · 1 · 16h

Pat Pemberton
Well put. The attempts to replace Tommy Gong with unqualified, politcially biased candidates clearly represent an attempt to -- as one man would say -- "rig" future elections. Luckily, that didn't happen, but it should make residents more vigilant.

Like · Reply · 2 · 21h

Pete Pepper
I believe these two gentlemen are the best examples of what we desperately need right now, leaders who have the courage to speak truth to power. Well done and yes please follow their example.

Like · Reply · 4 · 23h

Fezan Ali Fezan Ali
dollars making is so simple and easy in 2021. all
SLO County supervisors should keep current district lines | San Luis Obispo Tribune

businesses is going online after pandemic and now there is lots of opportunities to Jobs from home and earns more than $15k every month. i joined this job 3 months ago and in my first month i made $13941 and i just gave this 1 or maximum 2 hours per day online. just go to this website noe for details.

===>> Www.Works77.Com⁰⁰

please do not use this " ⁰⁰ " to open the website

Russ Byler
Call or write and request that the districts be left as they are.

Diane Clement
Well stated! The supervisor districts should be left as they are. There is no legitimate reason for change.

Rick London
Grateful for this viewpoint!

Two SLO County leaders call for keeping Diablo open to help meet clean energy goals

BY JORDAN CUNNINGHAM AND DAWN ORTIZ-LEGG CALMATTERS
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Thu 11/18/2021 7:14 AM
To: Mei-Lin Gee <mgee@co.slo.ca.us>

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:51 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Dan and Beth [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:47 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

The new census data do not justify major changes to current supervisor district boundaries. Current districts meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation, and compactness.

Daniel Oates
Los Osos

Get BlueMail for Android
The attached letter signed by 542 County residents is for consideration by the Board of Supervisors prior to the November 19 hearing. Please redact my email address, if this note is forwarded to the Board. Thank you.
November 17, 2021

Dear Chairperson Compton and Board Members:

We are 542 citizens of San Luis Obispo County who have been actively following the redistricting process. We wish to share some concerns about the process and offer some specific recommendations and observations about the maps. We ask that you consider this information before your November 19, 2021 hearing.

The Process

Redistricting best practices typically include non-partisan redistricting commissions charged with reviewing map options and making apolitical recommendations to boards of supervisors. No such commission was formed here – a choice that has created mistrust. While the County has secured the support of a reputable redistricting consultant, this consultant has not been used to the maximum advantage of the public.

For example, the board majority declined a simple request to ask the consultant to flag maps not legally conforming before your hearing of November 19th. This idea was waved off as something to be done on the 19th. This placed yet another unreasonable burden on a public already challenged by a blizzard of proposed maps, a complex arena demanding highly specialized technical and legal expertise, and a compressed, fast-moving process.

Multiple and confusing maps, a demanding technical and legal arena, and a sprint to the finish during the Thanksgiving holidays has many wondering if the stage has been set for the introduction of a new, last-minute map favored by the board majority. We sincerely hope that this is not the case and that you will act in good faith and abide by your promise to be “open and transparent.” It is not too late to engender confidence and trust in the process.

The Maps

We offer the following comments about the map options, with more detailed observations about some of the maps in the attached “Additional Review of Some Redistricting Maps.”

- Many maps proposing drastic boundary revisions have been introduced during this process, some quite recently. They are poorly conceived and pose threats to proper and fair representation. For example, the Patten map would radically alter current district lines creating legally dubious impacts, especially on San Luis Obispo and north coast communities of interest.
- Map C would have similar negative impacts, as outlined in the attached review.
- Some maps break up racial and socio-economic communities of interest.
- Given our county’s relatively small population growth since the last census, the current district boundaries are fully compliant with state law. No changes are legally required. Therefore, there is no compelling case – legal or moral – for radical revisions.
- The current boundaries (Map A) have worked reasonably well for many years and they can continue to serve so for many more. There may be minor revisions that would be warranted, but certainly not radical changes of questionable motivation.
Our Recommendations

Therefore, aligned with most of the recommendations of the non-partisan League of Women Voters of San Luis Obispo County, we strongly ask that your board:

1. Complete the redistricting process in a way that is faithful to state law (e.g., CA Elections Code Section 21500 and the California Voting Rights Act).
2. Adopt fair and balanced districts that do not favor or discriminate against any political party.
3. Avoid radical changes to district lines that might cause confusion or nurture distrust and/or apathy among voters.
4. Respect the communities of interest as voiced by those who share common racial, social and economic interests.
5. Minimize disruption to the election cycle and the number of voters whose ability to vote in an election would be deferred or accelerated.
6. Do not entertain the radical notion of isolating San Luis Obispo into one district. This would marginalize a very large population within our county.
7. Retain three districts for San Luis Obispo, given the city’s size and daytime population surge as the county employment hub, government and education center, and tourism host. Retaining three districts is also necessary to avoid rippling negative impacts on communities of interest elsewhere in the county, as detailed in the attached review.

In closing, it should be noted that over the last 15 years the board has leaned conservative (3-2) for 11 of those years, including the last six years. Advocating for retaining the current boundaries, with minor modification is, therefore, not about “flipping” partisan advantage. Our input is based solely on good government principles and the board’s moral duty to follow the law, in letter and in spirit, and lead in a fair and unifying way.

Thank you for your consideration.

Attached: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN REDISTRICTING MAPS (11-12-21)

Sincerely,

[Signatures of members]

Dave Abrecht  Los Osos  Charles Anders  Nipomo
Deborah Abrecht  Los Osos  Claudia Andersen  SLO
Marcy Adams  SLO  Erica Andrade  Nipomo
Barbara Adler  SLO  Anna Atta  SLO
Delores Adoff  SLO  Elie Axelroth  SLO
William L. Ahlgren  Karen Aydelott  SLO
Ryan Alaniz  Shell Beach  Sandy Baer  SLO
Larry Allen  SLO  Kenneth Baldwin  Arroyo Grande
Stephanie Allen  Cayucos  Susan Baldwin  Arroyo Grande
Teresa Allen  Paso Robles  Kathryn Barnes
Bill Almas  SLO  Michael Barnes
Karen Almas  SLO  John Beccia  Santa Margarita
Nick Alter  Arroyo Grande  Linda Beck  Nipomo
Marcia Alter  Arroyo Grande  Renelda Becker-Wade  Nipomo
Kathy Benedict  Los Osos
Steele Bennett  Los Osos
Dayna Bennett  Arroyo Grande
Brian Bennett  SLO
Jonni Biggini  SLO
Jesse Bilsten  SLO
Monica Bischof  Morro Bay
Edward Bischof  Morro Bay
Mar Blackler  SLO
John Blattner  SLO
Suzan Boatman
Sonja Bolle  Templeton
Michael B Bossenberry  SLO
R.D. Bowlus
Beverly Boyd  Los Osos
Justin Bradshaw  SLO
Quinn Brady  Los Osos
Cindy Brandenburg  Pismo Beach
Lynne Breakstone  SLO
Jerry Breakstone  SLO
Walt Bremer  SLO
Judith Bremer  SLO
Susan P. Breznay  SLO
George B. Breznay  SLO
Leslie Brigham Moss  Paso Robles
Nicolle Brocking  Atascadero
Lauren R. Brown  SLO
Andrea Brown  Los Osos
Christine Brown  Los Osos
Marty Brown  Atascadero
Gail Bunting  Cambria
Diane Burkhart  Paso Robles
Steve Burt  Arroyo Grande
Judy Caldwell  SLO
Michelle Call  SLO
Mike Callahan  Avila Valley
Robert Campbell MD  Avila Beach
Theresa Jean Carr  SLO
Wyatt Cash  SLO
Deborah Cash  SLO
Don Chaffin  Santa Margarita
Michelle Chariton  Arroyo Grande
Peggi Charlesworth
Chris Chaves  Cayucos
Alicia Chaves  Cayucos
Gail Cheda  SLO
Andrea Chmelik  Pismo Beach
Katherine Christensen  Avila Beach
Dave Christy  SLO
Chris Clark  Arroyo Grande
Kevin Clark  SLO
Marty Claus  Pismo Beach
Diane Clausen  SLO
Deborah Cleere  SLO
Barrie Cleveland  SLO
Thomas Cliff
Elizabeth J. Clover  Los Osos
Robert C. Clover  Los Osos
Suzanne Clover Dean
Liz Cofer  SLO
Beverly Cohen  SLO
Daniel Conroy  SLO
Paul Courcy  Avila Beach
James T Courtney
Orris Cowgill  Morro Bay
David Cox  SLO
Maggie Cox  SLO
Caitlin Cox  SLO
Karen Crole  Morro Bay
Dave Cumberland  Arroyo Grande
Michael Cussen  Paso Robles
Dorothy Cutter  Morro Bay
Leila Daniel  SLO
Suzan Dargahi Hampian  SLO
Francis Davidson  SLO
Gwen L. Dean
Shirley Jean DeCosta  Atascadero
Susan Devine  SLO
Amanda Dillen  SLO
John Dilworth  Los Osos
Dr. Janae Dimick  SLO
Joel Diring  SLO
Kamber Doucette  Arroyo Grande
Chris Doucette  Arroyo Grande
Susan Dressler  SLO
James M. Duenow  SLO
Diane N. Duenow  SLO
Sandra Duerr  SLO
Jim Duffy  SLO
Michael A. DuFresne  SLO
Peter DuFresne  Los Osos
Tom Duggan  SLO
Juliette Duke  SLO
John Dunn  Avila Beach
Sharon Dvorak  SLO
Skip Dyke  AG
Toni Edwards  Los Osos
Barbara Ehrbar  Arroyo Grande
Jesse Englert  SLO
Jimmy Rusty Evans
Linda Falkenstein  Atascadero
John Falkenstein  Atascadero
John Farhar  Atascadero
Kitty Farhar  Atascadero
Ray Feeseer  Avila Beach
Ann Feeseer  Avila Beach
Calvin Fernandes
Harold M. Ferguson  Los Osos
Val Ferrero  Los Osos
Mailee Flower
Toni Kathleen Flynn  Arroyo Grande
Erin Foote  SLO
Melinda Forbes  Atascadero
Jami Fordyce  Arroyo Grande
Paul Fordyce  Arroyo Grande
Elizabeth Fordyce  Arroyo Grande
Emily Francis  SLO
Julie Frankel  SLO
Richard Frankel  SLO
Steve Freyaldenhoven  SLO
Misha Freyaldenhoven  SLO
Reese Galida  SLO
Jim Gardiner  SLO
Elaine Gardiner  SLO
Michelle Garner  Los Osos
Dave Garth  SLO
Sandy Garth  SLO
Mary Genevieve  SLO
Barbara George  SLO
Wendy George  Morro Bay
Michael E. Gibson  SLO
Bethany Giles  Pismo Beach
Oliver Giles  Pismo Beach
Pam Gillette  SLO
Beverly Gingg
Devon Goetz  Los Osos
John Goetz  Los Osos
Bob Goldman  SLO
Robert Grayson
Cynthia M. Green
Margaret Greenough  Avila Valley
Andy Greensfelder  SLO
Jean Greensfelder  SLO
Kami Griffin
Slice Griselle
Judy Groat  SLO
Loretta Grondahl
Melissa Guise
Robin Guittard  Atascadero
Lawrence Guittard  Atascadero
Courtney Haile  SLO
Alta Hall
Lissa A Hallberg  Pismo Beach
Ken Hampian  SLO
Sally Harker Young  Los Osos
Carol Harlow  Templeton
Jim Harlow  Templeton
Mary Ellen Harper  SLO
Pat Harris  SLO
Robyn Harris  Oceano
Shirley Hathaway  SLO
Neil Havlik  SLO
Ann Havlik  SLO
Asher Hayes  SLO
Kelly Heffernon
Christopher Helenius  Avila Beach
Sandra Heller
Eleanor Helms  SLO
Joanne Henry  Arroyo Grande
Pelin Hepcilingirler  SLO
Alisa Heraldo  SLO
Doug J. Heumann  SLO
Amy Hewes  SLO
Mike Heyl  SLO
Sallie Higgins  SLO
Travis Higgins  SLO
Debbie Highfill  Morro Bay
Kenneth Hill  Arroyo Grande
Nancy Hill Cunha  Atascadero
Tina Hino  SLO
Yvonne Hoffmann  SLO
William Hoffmann  SLO
Martha Jane D. Holcomb  Los Osos
Carolayne Holley
Audrey Hooper  Atascadero
Cynthia M. Hudson  Santa Margarita
Loretta Hudson  Atascadero
Gale Hutchins  SLO
Nancy Hyman  Atascadero
Paul Hyman  Atascadero
Duane Inglish  Atascadero
Natalie Interian  Cayucos
Jamie Irons  Morro Bay
Monica Irons  Morro Bay
Ali Jansen  SLO
Colleen Jenssen  Arroyo Grande
Prisila Johnson  SLO
Richard Johnson  SLO
Amanda Jones  SLO
Jeff Jorgensen  SLO
Jane Jorgensen  SLO
Mart Jorgensen Lindholm
Evy Justesen SLO
Judy Kaatz
Marian Kaser
Dr. Anne Kennard  SLO
Betsy Kiser  Arroyo Grande
Robin Kisinger  SLO
Tamara Kleeman  Santa Margarita
Charles Kleeman  Santa Margarita
Alicia Klein  SLO
Sharon Klempen  SLO
Shannon Klisch  SLO
Jeff Knapp  SLO
Christy Knapp  SLO
Noha Kolkailah  Arroyo Grande
Bob Koob  SLO
Louise Kraemer
Dr. Richard J. Krejsa  SLO
Carla Lalley  Los Osos
John Lalley  Los Osos
Jill Lanes  Atascadero
Melissa Lapidus  SLO
Audrey Lariz  SLO
Sean Lariz  SLO
Denise Larsen  SLO
Ryan Lawrence  SLO
Karen Lawson MacLaurin  Paso Robles
Steve Lerian  SLO
Lori Lerian  SLO
Robyn Letters  SLO
Barbara Levenson  Pismo Beach
Harvey R. Levenson  Pismo Beach
Robert Lewin  SLO
Heidi Lewin Miller  Atascadero
Henry Louis  Cayucos
Jacob Lewis  SLO
Janis Lewis  Cayucos
Whitney Lewis  Cayucos
George Libby  SLO
Katie Lichtig  Pismo Beach
Wendy Liepman SLO
John P. Lindsay  SLO
Kim Lisagor Bisheff  SLO
Leigh L. Livick  Atascadero
John Ljung  SLO
Mary Ljung  SLO
Mary Lodge
Nancy Loe  SLO
Martin Lomeli Morro Bay
Kathy Longacre  SLO
Vivian Longacre
Clarett Longden  SLO
Roger Longden  SLO
Mindy Lorenz
Kim Love  SLO
Wendy Lucas
Bob Lucas
Martin Luschei  SLO
Chris Macek  Pismo Beach
Peggy Mandeville Morro Bay
John Mandeville Morro Bay
Diane Martin  Nipomo
James Martin  Nipomo
Bernadette Martony
Bill Martony
Don Maruska  Los Osos
Liz Maruska  Los Osos
Peter Sebastian  Pismo Beach
Carole Maurer  Los Osos
Rick Mayfield  SLO
Juliane McAdam
Peter McAdam
Cynthia M. McCabe  Los Osos
Kelly McCleary  Santa Margarita
Suzy McDonald  Cambria
Steve McGrath  SLO
Paula McGrath  SLO
Sara McGrath  SLO
Patrick McGrath  SLO
Whitney McIlvaine  SLO
Diane McKeague  SLO
John McKenzie  SLO
Deborah McKrell  Atascadero
Jennan A. McLenan
Alice McNeely  SLO
Marlys McPherson  Morro Bay
Len Medel  SLO
Ash Mehta  Pismo Beach
Karen Merriam  Arroyo Grande
Brian Metcalf
Kathy Metcalf
Mary Anne Meyer  Los Osos
Sara Mikkelson  SLO
ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN REDISTRICTING MAPS (11-12-21)

Introduction. Rather than following redistricting best practices by appointing a non-partisan commission to review map options and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, the Board has chosen to manage the process itself and encourage the submission of a myriad of community created maps using online mapping tools. As of November 12, 2021, there are more than 20 proposed maps posted on the County’s website.

Some of these maps recommend only minor changes to the existing boundaries. Many others, however, propose significant changes, some of which are of dubious legality and possibly motivated by partisan interests. As you examine these many submissions, we strongly recommend your board consider the principles and recommendations outlined in the cover letter to this review. Radical redistricting is simply not required.

We offer the following specific comments on some of the maps that seem to have garnered particular interest to this point.

The existing district boundaries (Map A) meet legal requirements and do not need significant adjustments. The County’s population growth has been relatively small. Therefore, under redistricting law, no significant adjustments to the current districts are required or warranted to balance population or other demographic considerations. The California State Election Code stipulates that redistricting should neither favor nor disfavor partisan interests. The current boundaries accomplish this balance.

A few minor adjustments to the existing boundaries would be sensible (Map B). Specifically, the new dorms at Cal Poly on Grand Avenue split the on-campus population into two districts. This can be cured by a minor adjustment to place the entire campus within a single district.

The map submitted by Richard Patten (now revised as of 11/5), which some supervisors deemed “interesting,” radically reconfigures the traditional districts for no compelling reasons.
• It separates Morro Bay from Los Osos, two communities that have many similarities and common interests. For example, they share the shoreline boundaries of the Morro Bay National Estuary. While severing Los Osos from Morro Bay, the plan links Los Osos to Avila Beach in a convoluted, newly configured district.

• To make the Los Osos to Pismo Beach and Avila Beach linkage contiguous, this district encompasses a significant portion of the City of San Luis Obispo – but along new district lines that are radically different from existing ones. These changes to existing San Luis Obispo district boundaries are confusing and not necessary. The proposed lines force disparate communities of interest into a new district, a result precisely opposite the intentions of state redistricting law.

• The Patten map divides the historic north coast district among three radically re-shaped districts such that Los Osos ends up in one district, Morro Bay in another, and Cayucos, Cambria and San Simeon in yet a third. These communities have a long history of common interests, inextricably linked by their coastal environmental and economic features (e.g., tourism) and, for Morro Bay, Cayucos, Cambria and San Simeon especially, their sharing of the Highway 1 corridor. The connections and interests among these communities are much stronger than interests with inland areas.

• This map appears to remove Oceano from the district with Nipomo, ignoring that these two unincorporated communities have several shared interests and issues related to county governance. These areas comprise a much stronger and obvious community of interest than Nipomo does with areas adjacent to San Luis Obispo.

• Furthermore, Oceano and Nipomo have significant Latino populations; putting Oceano and Nipomo into separate districts will dilute Latino representation and influence.

• All of these proposed modifications appear to be politically motivated.

**Map C is unnecessary, ahistorical, and requires an egregious reconfiguration of District 1 that separates Cambria from the other north coastal communities. Further, it ignores strong ties between San Luis Obispo and nearby communities.**

• Map C is intended to remove any portion of the City of San Luis Obispo from District 5. This adjustment is not demanded by demographic changes, but rather seems politically motivated and for the benefit of certain incumbents. This is inconsistent with Election Code 21500(d), which states “The board shall not adopt supervisorial district boundaries for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.”

• San Luis Obispo has been divided among three districts historically and this seems warranted for several reasons:
  
  o It is by far the county’s largest city, especially when the on-campus population of Cal Poly (technically outside the city limits) is considered.

  o It is the county seat, the location of key state and district offices and home to Cal Poly’s main campus, as well as many businesses and services of a regional nature.
Thus, its relationship to adjacent areas is strong in terms of education, employment and services.

- For these reasons, District 5 communities of Atascadero and Santa Margarita are closely linked to SLO, as are Morro Bay/Los Osos and Avila Beach/Pismo Beach. All are areas where many residents commute to San Luis Obispo for work and regularly visit the city to obtain regional services. Continuation of the division of the city among these three districts serves their respective communities of interest and is more important than any attempt at strict adherence to existing city limits.

- Without its traditional San Luis Obispo population, District 5 must expand to the north and south, triggering undesirable outcomes, notably:
  - The new District 5 would take Templeton from District 1. Templeton area has traditionally had especially strong connections with Paso Robles (for example, their abundant vineyards and many wineries and related activities).
  - To make up the population loss in District 1, it must incongruously expand to the coast to encompass Cambria and San Simeon, separating these coastal areas from the rest of the north coast communities (see above). The geographic, economic, social and environmental interests linking Cambria to the other coastal communities are clearly stronger than those to the inland communities.
  - No objective analysis of the proposed changes in Map C would conclude that removal of portions of San Luis Obispo from District 5 are so compelling as to justify the severing of Cambria from the north coast communities.

For all the reasons outlined in this review, the Board of Supervisors should follow the California State Elections Code and make only minor refinements to the existing district boundaries. To embrace more radical revisions in order to advance partisan political interests will not be consistent with the law or the Board’s moral obligation to fairly represent the interests of all County residents.
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:13 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: District 5 Supervisor Debbie Arnold Question/Issue

For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: District 5 Supervisor Debbie Arnold Question/Issue

Topic: District 5 Supervisor Debbie Arnold Question/Issue

Your Name: Geoff Auslen
Your Email: 
U.S. phone number:
Message: Please add Richard Patton's map to be considered as one of the final 3 maps
Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 967066
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2766
Form inserted: 11/17/2021 3:56:14 PM
Form updated: 11/17/2021 3:56:14 PM
Based on the minor changes in population, there is no legal requirement to change any district boundaries. Therefore I strongly urge you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

---

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I urge you to keep the current district lines as they are legal and compliant with the law.

They reflect a fair balance of the population, communities and party registration.

Thank you,
Cynthia Welden
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

---

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

As a county resident for over 30 years I would like to urge you to maintain the current boundaries for districting. They abide by election laws and have worked successfully for a long, long time. Please do not make changes that haven't stood the test of time.

Sincerely,
Shirley Holgate
Arroyo Grande
FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Thu 11/18/2021 7:26 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:15 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors

-----Original Message-----
From: Jan Seals >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:13 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Supervisors Peschong, Gibson, Ortiz-Legg, Compton, and Arnold:

Please leave SLO County’s district lines as is. The 2020 Census shows minimum population change, making the current boundaries fully compliant with election law. If boundaries are to be changed it should be done by a non-partisan citizens’ advisory panel, not the Board of Supervisors. Please do not become part of the gerrymandering problem in this country.

Sincerely,
Jan Seals
District one resident
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:27 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Susan Levine
Your Email: [REDACTED]
U.S. phone number: [REDACTED]
Message: Please keep the redistricting to Plan A. Thank you. Susan Levine

Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 189505
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2767
Form inserted: 11/17/2021 4:25:49 PM
Form updated: 11/17/2021 4:25:49 PM
Hello SLO County Board I’d Supervisors:
I believe the current district boundaries fairly represent the citizens of this county. Please keep the districts as they currently are because they legally meet election criteria. There is no justifiable reason to change district boundaries.
Thank you for your time.
~Amy Salas

Sent from my iPhone
From: S D Phipps
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:36 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Comments for November 19th Hearing

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear SLO County Supervisors,

Based on the 2020 Census date, NO change is needed for the Supervisors Districts! I support Draft Map A which preserves existing communities of interest and is the most litigation-proof and economically prudent choice. The Board of Supervisors has Redistricting Partners under contract and this apolitical consultant has confirmed that Draft Map A complies with the 2019 Fair Maps Act.

Thank you for making an impartial and apolitical choice and select Draft Map A.

Sheila Phipps
From: Jonathan Roberts >
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Re: Please Do Not Change The Current District Map

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please do not change the current district map. If there is ever a legitimate need for redistricting, I urge you to use an independent, bipartisan organization or group to determine those changes.

Thank you,

--

Jonathan Roberts
San Luis Obispo CA, 93401
FW: [EXT]District 4

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Thu 11/18/2021 7:29 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: LENA 
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:46 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]District 4

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Redistricting should be done by independent commission if deemed necessary. The Board of Supervisors should NOT be involved.

I strongly oppose any redrawing of SLO county District 4 as there is no necessity thereof.

Lena Anderson
Arroyo Grande
lenaburing@charter.net
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors and Redistricting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential
Board of Supervisors
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Honorable Supervisors:

I just read the Nov 16, 2021, article in the Tribune: Two retired police chiefs warn against 'radical redrawing' of SLO County supervisor district.

It is chilling to read how our SLO Board of Supervisors is choosing to ignore best practices and is possibly fueling the rage that unfortunately is becoming more commonplace everywhere.

No redistricting is required. Please, do the right thing.

~Heather Nelson
Resident, Third District

The article states:

"The board majority has promised an open and transparent process, but we are skeptical because: Based on the minor changes in population, there is no legal requirement to change
any district boundaries. The supervisors chose to ignore best practice and did not appoint a nonpartisan citizens’ panel to advise on drawing the district boundaries.

Even though the current boundaries are fully compliant with election law, a majority appears to favor a radical redrawing of district lines that would lock in partisan advantages for the next 10 years. The board has compressed a complicated process, jamming the three most critical public hearings into a five-week span, leaving little time for analysis.

At a critical point later this month, the board is allowing only three days for expert review of the maps. If the majority opts for radically new district boundaries simply to secure a partisan advantage for themselves, they will be fueling the rage. Though we are concerned about the current process, we also know this board can be persuaded to do the right thing when confronted by concerned citizens."

https://www.sanluisobispo.com/opinion/readers-opinion/article255837361.html#storylink=cpy
Dear County Board of Supervisors,

Retired police chiefs Kim Gardiner and Rick Terborch wrote an excellent op ed in The Tribune asking you to resist radical redistricting. I, a 70 year San Luis Obispo County resident, am in complete agreement with everything they have written. Please do the right thing. Retain the current district lines.

Respectfully,

Gracie Tedone Manderscheid
San Luis Obispo
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:24 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 158

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistricting ID</th>
<th>158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/17/2021 5:23:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/17/2021 5:23:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Bonner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organization Represented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Grover Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Since the latest census did not indicate a need for changing our districts, I would like to see no action be taken to make changes when no action is needed. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Records Notice</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Vicki Janssen <vjanssen@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:03 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For November 19th

VICKI JANSSEN, Legislative Assistant
First District Supervisor John Peschong
1055 Monterey St., D430
San Luis Obispo, CA  93408
(805)781-4491/Fax (805) 781-1350
vjanssen@co.slo.ca.us

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Linda Barra 
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:39 PM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Supervisor Peschong,

I strongly urge you to oppose efforts to redraw our current supervisorial districts. No major changes to the district boundaries are needed. Keeping the current districts will help to ensure continuity and keep intact communities of interest.

Our current districts meet all state requirements for fairness of representation, population balance, and compactness. The new census data does not justify major changes to district boundaries. While very minor changes to district boundaries may be required they should be minimal. Please reject the proposed pattern map and other changes that make the city of San Luis Obispo into a single district.

I urge you to vote to ensure that our supervisorial districts remain intact. The current proposed changes to district boundaries appear to only benefit political interests and not the needs of the residents of San Luis Obispo County.

Linda Barra
Oil and water don’t mix, either!
I urge you to retain the current district lines, which are fully compliant with election laws. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

I have to say I completely agree with former San Luis Obispo Police Chief Jim Gardiner and former Arroyo Grande Police Chief Rick TerBorch.

Please do not move the lines
Thanks
Monica Barricarte
San Luis Obispo
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I am appalled at and opposed to any redistricting of the County in order to forward an agenda, which is the only goal, no matter how it gets honey-coated. As a SLO County resident and US citizen, I am embarrassed when I see politicians and governmental bodies use dishonest measures to gain advantage, whether it is challenging an election as fraudulent, supporting the storming the Capitol, or gerrymandering.

Do not allow this proposed change to take place.

Deborah Wright

Sent from my iPad
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:37 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 160

RedistrictingID 160
Form inserted 11/17/2021 7:36:59 PM
Form updated 11/17/2021 7:36:59 PM
First Name Meg
Last Name Evans
Email
Phone
Name of Organization Represented County Resident
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93405
Comment
I urge the board of supervisors adopt Plan A which keeps the district boundaries as close to what they are now. This plan respects the 'communities of interest' and since there has not been much change in population, the current districts meet the criteria.

Public Records Notice True
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Respected Board Members,

PLEASE opt for Draft Map A. It is the only map that maintains the existing communities. To choose any other map would disrupt existing communities and suggest that the board members are more interested in gerrymandering for political gain.

Thank you,

Tomas and Muriel Machin

Nipomo, CA 93444
FW: [EXT] No redistricting.

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Thu 11/18/2021 7:33 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Darlene <[redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:46 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] No redistricting.

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Cambria and all the unincorporated coastal towns Should not be put in with a large incorporated city like Paso Robles. Our values, needs for the community are so different and we need to protect the land we call home.
Please protect our coastal communities and vote NO on redistricting.
Ronald and Darlene Wadsworth

Sent from my iPad
To be read at the Board Meeting on November 19, 2021:

My name is Linda Finley and I have been a resident of Cambria since 1982. I have recently done much research on the redistricting for the County. I attended the Zoom meeting by the League of Women’s Voters as well. I have learned there is NO reason to change the boundaries of the current Supervisorial Districts so I strongly recommend keeping the same map that we currently have, Plan A. And furthermore I absolutely do not want Cambria included with our over the hill neighbors in North County. We want to continue as District 2 with Bruce Gibson at the helm.

Thank you for your time,

Linda Finley
-----Original Message-----
From: Susi Bernstein  
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:23 PM 
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board Chair Compton and SLO County Board of Supervisors

I prefer Map B as my first choice, but would accept the adoption of either Map A or Map B as the new redistricting map for San Luis Obispo County.
Both maps are fair maps that ensure continuity, respect communities of interest, minimize disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements.

Thank you very much for considering my opinion.

Susanne Bernstein
Arroyo Grande, CA
District 4
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:49 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 161

RedistrictingID: 161
Form inserted: 11/17/2021 9:48:21 PM
Form updated: 11/17/2021 9:48:21 PM
First Name: Judy
Last Name: Avery
Email: [redacted]
Phone: [redacted]
Name of Organization Represented: Private citizen
City: Paso Robles
Zip: 93446
Comment: I am commenting on the redrawing county distracng lines....... I would like to support the map that Richard Patton has submitted. His map doesn’t split up cities like Templeton, and keeps cities in one district. Thank you

Public Records Notice: True
From: Diane Mayfield <[redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:23 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Map A

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Map A makes the most sense. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. I live on Highway 46 West between Templeton (my mailing address) and the coast. I taught for 27 years in Templeton schools, and have lived in this home for over 32 years. I love living halfway between the old ranching communities of Paso and Templeton, and the artsy and scenic beach communities of Cambria and Cayucos. They are so different, so I can always enjoy a different vibe whether I go east or west, depending on my mood. The idea that the coastal communities are in the same "communities of interest" as the inland communities is ridiculous. They belong in different districts. Please keep them that way.

Thank you,
Diane W. Mayfield
Templeton, CA 93465
Greetings,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comment on redistricting.

I support Map B.

Thank you,
Christopher Rose
Arroyo Grande
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

November 19, 2021

San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors:

Attached please see my letter regarding the redistricting issue.

Betty Swierk

Cambria, CA 93428
November 19, 2021
San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors:

I am very concerned regarding the proposals for redistricting in our County. Our current SLO County districts have been formed according to the following requirements: 1. ‘equal communities of interest,’ a population that shares common social or economic interests. 2. districts are drawn to encourage geographical compactness in the manner that nearby areas of populations are not bypassed in favor of more distant populations. 3. districts’ populations shall not deviate more than 10 percent from one another.

Several of the newly proposed redrawn district maps do not adhere to the above requirements.

By placing our towns in a geographically very large district, ranging from the ocean to the Kern County line, we would not only be separated from our coastal neighbors, but joined with Paso Robles and neighboring agricultural towns. To reach those towns requires a thirty-mile drive on Route 46, over the Santa Lucia Mountains.

Cambria and the Paso Robles area have no common economic interests -- Paso Robles is part of a large vital agricultural region, situated over a natural aquifer, while Cambria, along with its northerly neighbor, San Simeon, and Cayucos, Morro Bay, Los Osos to the south, focus on the coast and tourism.

Our current district situation is well suited to the above description of equal, compact communities of interest. The status quo is the best alternative.

Elizabeth Swierk
Cambria 93428
FW: [EXT]Redistricting in SLO County, District 2

Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Thu 11/18/2021 1:02 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: John <jhn_1234@abc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:43 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting in SLO County, District 2

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To: San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors

I am a resident and homeowner in Cambria, District 2, and I urge you to:

1. Preserve the current boundaries of District 2.
2. Reject any plan that remaps other Districts to the coast, diminishing our voice.
3. Reject any plan that puts Cambria in the same district as Paso Robles or Atascadero.

Please take into account the following:

The coastal communities of interest in District 2 share unique characteristics, challenges, and concerns:

* A fierce, shared commitment to protecting coastal environments and ecologies;
* Economies that are largely tourist-based, rather than agricultural;
* Unique challenges in rising sea levels, along with saltwater intrusion in wells;
* Uncommon demands in balancing recreational access to the coast with maintaining the beautiful environment for residents and wildlife;
* Unparalleled needs and vulnerabilities associated with unincorporated towns;

* A shared bond with the California Coastal Commission and other agencies, and the need to maintain a strong voice with the Coastal Commission.

The coastal communities of interest in District 2 need and deserve their own representation on the Board of Supervisors.

* Our coastal communities need their own Supervisor who will be attentive to our unique challenges and needs.

* The interests of our coastal communities in District 2 must not be crushed or dismissed by the interests of larger populations, which would occur in any redistricting.

* The boundaries of District 2, and its current Board representation, are fully compliant with existing law and do not need changing. There is no legal justification for redistricting because the 2020 Census did not reveal any major population shifts in SLO County. The fact that the Board of Supervisors is considering unjustified redistricting suggests to me that this agenda is something that is being done to us, rather than a process that is being done with us and for us.

* The voice of coastal communities of interest must be protected. Unfortunately, the Board of Supervisors has already threatened voter representation, because the Board is not being advised on this issue by an independent, nonpartisan citizen’s panel that is representative of the County’s population. This erodes public trust in your process and does not foster the transparency and fairness that you promised. Redistricting should not happen at this time; and, if it needs to be done in the future, it must not be done by officeholders or Supervisors.

Please do not follow the path of politicians who manipulate the redistricting process to expand or protect their power.

Sincerely,

John Dickason

Cambria, California