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

Mostly directed at the 3 of you who know who you are.

It would seem that your motive for looking at this and not using an independent citizen group to develop plans is to preserve your 3 vote conservative majority to ruin our county. Stop being so partisan and consider ALL the people of SLO county. Your attempt to rig the election office leader selection was awful.

Ron Tarica
My name is Kay Gore and I live in Arroyo Grande. (I am not a paid troll, but an actual registered voter in San Luis Obispo County, unlike too many recent speakers, and, I suspect, even a large number of people submitting written comments.)

I am appalled at the blatant, arrogant attempt of three members of the Board of Supervisors to redraw county district boundaries for partisan advantage. The citizens of San Luis Obispo County will not stand by silently and permit the partisan redrawing of district lines to dictate the outcome of local elections for the next 10 years. We demand fair and verifiable elections.

The California Fair Maps Act of 2019 does not require any change in existing boundaries if change is not justified by Census data. The Census data between 2010 and 2020 did not change sufficiently to necessitate any boundary changes. The county’s own redistricting consultant derived the same conclusion.

Draft Map A is the “No Change” option. Draft Map A adheres to existing district boundaries, with only minor changes in order to adhere to a small number of census block boundary lines which deviate from current boundaries. NOTHING IN THE 2020 Census data requires a change to the current boundaries.

Perhaps the most compelling argument for adopting Draft Map A is that it is compliant with redistricting requirements and, thus, does not invite legal challenges (as well as rousing citizens to take up pitchforks and procure buckets of tar and large bags of features), especially given that Supervisor Compton is on record for saying that she wants Oceano out of her district since its voters voted for her opponent in large numbers.

Hubris is a fickle mistress and the level of hubris on the part of the three nakedly partisan supervisors may finally bring an end to the tragedy performed regularly by the San Luis Obispo County Board of
Supervisors to the detriment of their very constituents and the future of the county. Enough is enough.
****Original Message****
From: Paul Amir <amir90505@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:04 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Leave Cambria alone no changes

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

Leave Cambria alone
No changes
No need for redistricting
Signed
Parviz Amirpanah
Resident of Cambria

Sent from my iPhone
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

San Luis Obispo

93405
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

As a voting constituent in SLO County, I urge “all” the Supervisors to “LEAVE THE EXISTING VOTING DISTRICTS IN PLACE” knock off this urge to Gerrymander voting in the county!!!
Cambria, for example, is NOT INTERESTED in becoming part of the “North County” voting district!!! Leave it alone.

Regards,

Geoffrey Brown
To the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors,

According to the criteria delineated on the Board of Supervisors website for the redistricting in the county:

“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. Areas that meet only at the points of adjoining corners are not contiguous. Areas that are separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not contiguous.”

Although the North Coast may appear on a map to be geographically contiguous to the Paso Robles or inland areas, these areas are separated by a mountain range and completely different climate and economic endeavors.

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. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.”

The North Coast shares similar economies with other coastal communities that differ considerably from the inland communities of Paso Robles, Atascadero and even San Luis Obispo. The inland areas strongly rely on agricultural interests while the coastal areas are predominantly oriented toward tourism. Dividing the North Coast from the other coastal communities such as Cayucos and Morro Bay denies our fair representation with the Board of Supervisors. A perfect example of this would be the years long process of enacting a vacation rental ordinance for several of the north coast communities. This was a vital process to preserve the integrity of our local community in Cambria that would have been disregarded had our area been represented by interests in Paso Robles.
3. “To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of a city or census designated place shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.”

4. “Supervisorial district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents. To the extent practicable, supervisorial districts shall be bounded by natural and artificial barriers, by streets, or by the boundaries of the county.”

It is clear that splitting the North Coast from other coastal areas such as Morro Bay and Cayucos would create division from other similar economic and geographic communities. Places such as Cambria and San Simeon are unincorporated and rely on the county supervisors for their governance. A supervisor representing a populous, agricultural based area such as Paso Robles is not going to be concerned about the issues facing a small coastal area such as Cambria. We will not receive adequate representation in such a situation.

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.”

Obviously, the population of inland areas would subsume the voice of the North Coast. Not only would sheer numbers drown our voices, but large commercial interests (such as agriculture, wineries, etc.) would hold greater sway with a supervisor’s attention. The North Coast faces very different challenges than are faced by the inland areas, but we face the same challenges as other coastal areas such as Morro Bay and Cayucos.

Please respect the geographic integrity of the communities of interest. We favor Map A or B.

Thank you,

John & Leslie McGarry
We need and benefit from balanced and strong San Luis Obispo County government. Please maintain current supervisory districts. Large changes to the districts is not required and changing the current boundaries can separate communities of interest. Given the size of San Luis Obispo, the split into the three districts continues to make sense. Please avoid blatant gerrymandering and maintain fair democracy in San Luis Obispo County.
I am deeply concerned about the blatant attempt by some in our county to twist our voter districts to take our elections from the will of the people to the will of those in power. Keep our map the way it is. If you cannot win fairly, you aren't on the right track.

Barbara Jackson
Atascadero
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting  
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:11 AM  
To: Maria G. Brown  
Subject: FW: Public Comment - ID 165

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:02 AM  
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
Subject: Public Comment - ID 165

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RedistrictingID</th>
<th>165</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/18/2021 8:01:46 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/18/2021 8:01:46 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Hightower</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>REDISTRICTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Nipomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment

Redistricting I strongly urge the Board of Supervisors NOT to change the current voting district boundaries. The current lines are fully compliant with election laws and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. Changes would be a clear sign of political motivation that does not represent voters' wishes.

Public Records Notice

True
Dear County Supervisors,

It is clear that the best redistricting option for north coast residents is Map A. I’m requesting that you choose Map A and keep coastal San Luis Obispo county, coastal.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Lopez
Cambria

Sent from my iPhone
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:30 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 2 constituent. This email was 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: sloshopper@aol.com <sloshopper@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:18 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 County Board of Supervisors,

Retired police chiefs Jim 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: Maria G. Brown
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:12 AM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]re: Redistricting Plan as it impacts Cambria!

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:32 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 Plan as it impacts Cambria!

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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: Pat Riley <riley.allart@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:47 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]re: Redistricting Plan as it impacts Cambria!

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

SLO County Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern:

I am unable to attend Friday, November 19th meeting and discussion about redistricting in the county.

I have been a resident of Cambria for 37 years!

I DO NOT SUPPORT changes to the current district designation that Cambria is covered by!

That one/anyone would even conceive of lumping Cambria in with Paso Robles is clearly agenda driven and not in the best interests of Cambria residents/voters and this small coastly community!

Please decide wisely with clear conscience and honest hearts.

Regards,
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C7Cec428049d69444fc030308d9aab68464%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728523135788166%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;data=x0FXeFXOJHvNf%2FRJUBt0GcXr3I10h74Ky3hvUFPc%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

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

I am a resident and voter in SLO County and I urge the Board of Supervisors to keep the current district lines. It makes no sense to change them...unless it is for political reasons and that does not serve your community.

Thank you,
Victor Hyde
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:33 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 2 constituent. This email was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C58b8304dd954ce8950808d9aab68956%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C7C637728523231239789%7CUnknown%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%3D%3D&amp;reserved=0

Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard <rmanderscheid@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:03 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 Board of Supervisors,

As a seventy plus year resident of San Luis Obispo County I 100% agree with the recent op ed by Jim Gardiner and Rick Terborch published in the Tribune urging the Board of Supervisors to maintain the current district boundaries as there is no justification to make major changes other than politics which is reprehensible. Remember Tommy Gong?

Thank you,

Richard Manderscheid
San Luis Obispo since 1949
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Redistricting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:12 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Maria G. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>FW: [EXT]Redistricting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| From: Peggy Heathcote <pegheathcote@hotmail.com> |
| Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:45 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.

Dear Supervisors,

Please retain the current county district lines. They fairly represent our country and thus benefit all SLO County citizens.

Thank you for your attention to this issue.

Peggy Heathcote
Nipomo Resident
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:13 AM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting criteria

From: Daniel Phillips <dweslephi@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:53 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting criteria

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

Dear Supervisors,

When it comes to the redistricting criteria for San Luis Obispo County's supervisorial districts, it is probably best to start in the middle, with state criterion #3: not dividing cities or Census-designated places. The law explicitly states: “To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of a city or census designated place shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.” By my reading, this means that your default position should be to keep every incorporated city or unincorporated community undivided, unless it is not practicable to do so because you must follow higher priority criteria. So let me walk through those higher priority criteria in turn.

First we have the criteria that come from federal law. The first of these is that the districts should be equal in population, which would be about 56,000 each. However, there is no place that has more than this number, as the largest, San Luis Obispo, is only 47,000. Therefore, there is no need to split any place to meet this requirement. The other federal stipulation is following the Voting Rights Act, but there are no sizable concentrations of racial or ethnic minority groups that would require added protection under that legislation.

Next we have the criteria that, like the criterion of undivided places, come from state and law, but are ranked higher in priority. The first of these is to draw contiguous districts, but this criterion does not pose any issues of impracticability because one can easily draw five contiguous districts that keep places undivided; there may not be road connections between all parts of the district, but the law just defines contiguity as spatial connectedness. That leaves the second criterion: not dividing neighborhoods or communities of interest. This is how the law reads: “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. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.” In this case, if you were to recognize a particular neighborhood or community of interest that does not conform to place boundaries, preferably via a formal vote, then you would be justified in splitting a place in order to ensure that that neighborhood or community of interest is kept undivided.

After the criterion of undivided places come the lower priority criteria of easily identifiable boundaries and compactness, in that order. The idea here is that, all else being equal, you should draw districts that follow natural boundaries and are compact in that they do not bypass nearby populations to get to more distant ones. However, you should not draw such districts if it must split places to do so, because keeping places undivided is a higher priority criterion.
Finally, many have supported staying close to the current plan because that is the way it has traditionally been, the districts have worked well in their current form, and there is no need to shake things up too much. These arguments have no weight as far as the law is concerned. The requirements of the Fair Maps Act (from which the state and county redistricting criteria are derived) supersede all these considerations. This legislation was passed after the current districts were adopted in 2011, so it is not unreasonable to expect a major change in the district configuration in order to meet the newly enacted legal requirements.

Thank you for your consideration,

Daniel Phillips
I urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt map A or map B, which are very similar to the current map. According to census, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes. This was confirmed by the County's redistricting consultant. Maps A and B ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements.

Desiree Newman
San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors,

We are residents of District 4 and have a concern over the potential partisanship in the upcoming redistricting process.

In a recent editorial, the San Luis Obispo Tribune opined on the politicization of the redistricting process and quoted Mike Brown, Executive Director of COLAB, “The biggest threat to conservative and rational values comes from some city of SLO precincts, Cal Poly Precincts, Oceano and some of the large planned golf communities in Nipomo”. Herein lies the heart of the conservative agenda and the reasoning behind the Board of Supervisors decision to take control of the redistricting process rather than trust it to a non-partisan committee. With this usurping of the redistricting responsibility, the Board could turn the process into a political agenda with the goal of ensuring that three current members of the board, who comprise majority of the board’s voting power, retain their majority by Gerrymandering the 5 Districts.

Gerrymandering is illegal!

Any major or significant change to the boundaries can only be to gain a political advantage for a political party or an incumbent, both of which purposes are expressly prohibited by the Fair Maps Act.

Over the past 10 years, the overall population of SLO County has not grown precipitously nor are the existing districts so out of balance that redistricting is required by law. San Luis Obispo County's own consultant says that no change in boundaries is justified if the Census data supports "no change." And, the facts are that Census data between 2010 and 2020 does not support change. Of the plans submitted for consideration, only Plan A represents a “no change” position to the current structure. A vote by the Board of Supervisors for anything other than Plan A is a clear attempt at Gerrymandering to ensure the three conservative members of the board can redraw districts in their favor.

Redistricting is supposed to be a non-partisan process. Without facts to support redistricting the non-partisan approach would be to retain the
status quo. Therefore, any move other than to support Plan A is pure politics to ensure the current members of the board retain their seats.

We support Plan A, the status quo map. Please keep partisan politics and personal political gain out of the redistricting process.

Your job is to serve the citizens of San Luis Obispo County, not to guarantee your own employment as County Supervisors.

Thank you.

Thomas and Gail Ryan
Nipomo, CA
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To: SLO County Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to not change the boundaries of the current voting districts in SLO County. The census indicated that districts in SLO County did not grow enough to necessitate a change. Maps A and B make sure that the communities of interest are not disrupted and statutory requirements are met.

Respectfully,
Mitchel Terkildsen
SLO resident
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:18 AM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:16 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 was 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 6:26 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: Jackie
Your Email: ************
U.S. phone number:
Message: Cambria & Paso?? Oil and water don't mix, either. NO to redistricting!
Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 504047
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2768
Form inserted: 11/17/2021 6:25:53 PM
Form updated: 11/17/2021 6:25:53 PM
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsup@co.slo.ca.us>  
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:17 AM  
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
Subject: FW: [EXT]Keep Current district lines

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email was 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: Monica Barricarte <mbarricarte@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:29 PM  
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsup@co.slo.ca.us>  
Subject: [EXT]Keep Current district lines

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

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.
Sent from my iPhone
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:18 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 was 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: Jean Baker <jbakerlcsw@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:33 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:

As a resident of SLO County, I want to express my concern regarding redrawing district lines to enable partisan advantage. My understanding is that there have been minor changes in population in our county and therefore there's no legal requirement to change district boundaries.

Please retain the current district lines which are compliant with election laws. As you know, there is a movement in our country to manipulate boundaries in order to "win at all cost." Please don't let our county be a part of this inappropriate behavior and decision-making. Vote to keep boundaries as they currently exist.

Sincerely,
Jean Baker
Nipomo, CA 93444
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

November 18, 2021

Chairperson Lynn Compton:

Please find attached the following: *Letter addressed to you dated 11-18-21*

Thank you

patricia
November 18, 2021

via email to boardofsuprs@co.slo.ca.us

Chairperson Lynn Compton
San Luis Obispo, County Board of Supervisor

Re: REDISTRICTING
Board of Supervisors Special Meeting 11/19/2021

Dear Chairperson Compton and Supervisors:

On November 3, 2021, the supervisors: Cayucos Citizens’ Advisory Counsel unanimously passed the following resolution:

“We urge the Board of Supervisors to refrain from redistricting and remain with the status quo, Map A. There is no legal mandate nor reason to make changes to the current boundaries - there have not been enough demographic shifts to warrant moving boundaries. The current district boundaries have continuity and support regional communities of interest, including the North Coast. Cayucos is a part of the North Coast and should remain in a North Coast district that includes all coastal communities from the Monterey border to Montana de Oro State Park. Any significant changes at this point, such as breaking apart the North Coast, are clearly for gerrymandering purposes. We call on the Board of Supervisors to reject such changes and approve Map A.”
I cannot stress how seriously Cayucans’ do not want to have our district boundaries changed. We urge you to follow the will of the people and establish a Non-Partisan Commission to conduct the next redistricting and leave the Districts now as they are.

Lead us into healing and not division.

Respectfully,

JOHN M. CARSEL
President, CCAC

JMC:pp
cc: Supervisor Bruce Gibson (bgibson@slo.ca.us)
    Supervisor John Peschong (jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us)
    Supervisor Dawn Ortiz-Legg (dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us)
    Supervisor Debbie Arnold (district5@co.slo.ca.us)
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C26345bc2fccc248e087c508d9aabb5664%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C6772854389088299%7CUnknown%7Ctwfppbgzsb3d8eyjwjoimc4wljawmdaiLCJQjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwicmJxci6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;sdata=SjphbtcmuKFAiovjyogRZk2MQoE4FtG5Y5F9zoPTUHA%3D&amp;reserved=0
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:

We are strongly opposed to you changing the supervisor district boundaries.

There have been only minor changes in the population of the county so legally it is NOT necessary to change the boundaries.

In addition you have ignored best practices and refused to appoint a NONPARTISAN citizens' panel to give you advice about the boundaries.

It is obvious that you are planning to redraw the district lines to lock in a PARTISAN advantage.

Doing this will have the unfortunate effect of further dividing the county.
I strongly suggest that you leave the boundaries the way they are.

Yours Sincerely,

Susan C. Robinson, MD
Dave C Peterson
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:22 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 was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C22f6967d595d45c7a7fa08d9aabb5ddeb%7C84c3c7747fd4e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728543978069068%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=sgzrZWA%2BQIwxf%2FXLakc52ITk3cY8BuulRt7m3ysIvK4%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Roxanne Scott <1roxannes@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:07 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.

Sent from my iPad
Subject: Redistricting
>
> Dear Supervisors:
>
> As a resident of SLO County, I want to express my concern regarding redrawing district lines to enable political advantages where there has been very little change in the population of our county and this would be implemented for 10 years. Therefore there seems to be no legal requirement to change district boundaries if indeed the population has not varied enough to show the need for this.
>
> Please retain the current district lines which are compliant with election laws. As you know, there is a movement in our country to manipulate boundaries in order to "win at all cost." Please don't let our county be a part of this inappropriate behavior and decision-making. Vote to keep boundaries as they currently exist.
Sincerely,
Roxanne Scott
Nipomo, CA 93444

Sent from my iPad
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email was 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

My name is Jeff Bonner and I am of the opinion that the present boundaries, Map A, meet all the local state and federal requirements. As such no changes to the San Luis Obispo county district boundaries are needed.
The results of the year recent census do not require any changes and Ibelieve the present county district boundaries should be left as is.
Like we used to say in the US Navy; “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Jeff Bonner
District 3
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email was 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:

Taking into consideration all the criteria stipulated in state law and the Voting Rights Act, and following the priority criteria as outlined on the SLO County Redistricting website, I join the Women's March SLO in urging the Board of Supervisors to adopt map A or map B, which are very similar to the current map. According to census, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes. This was confirmed by the County's redistricting consultant. Maps A and B ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements. I fully support a robust democracy in which people feel confident that their voices and votes will be heard. As a resident in District 1 for 20 years, I would strongly urge you to do what’s in the best interest of the entire SLO county and adopt map A or map B.

Sincerely,
Monica Schechter
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:24 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 am unable to find this constituent in Voter Reg. This email was 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: john snetsinger <jgs512slo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:11 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.

My spouse and I reside in your supervisorial district. Our address is 510 Serrano Drive in the city of San Luis Obispo. I believe in government that represents those in the district. As you might guess, I am very upset at the idea of a county-wide coalition of members of the board trying to play around with the make-up of the five districts. I will NEVER vote for any supervisor in my district who plays this political game in some effort to change election results. I will watch carefully in the next few weeks to see how the Supervisors play fairly or try and cheat for political purposes.

Please drop me a line if you agree with me. Or if you do not agree with me.

john snetsinger
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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

Your Name: Judy Walters
Your Email: 
U.S. phone number: 

Message: I respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors retain the current supervisorial districts. From all information I have gathered it appears that no changes are necessary, and that the county would be in compliance. Since the board majority declined to create an independent citizen advisory board, the proposed changes reflect a political move rather than what is best for the constituents of the various districts. Please read opinion piece in Tribune written by former police chiefs. Any radical changes to district boundaries will add to further acrimony and divisions in a time of great political volatility. Please do not add to it!

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 770188
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2769

Form inserted: 11/17/2021 8:19:19 PM

Form updated: 11/17/2021 8:19:19 PM
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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 am for retaining the current district map for the five districts in the county. Please vote to retain them.

Thank You, Richard Strassel, Cambria.
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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 of SLO County,

Please leave the districts as they are, or at the minimum choose Map A for redistricting. The main purpose of voter districts is the fair representation of those who live in them. The North Coastal District 2 consists of an area, economy, and environment that is unique within SLO County, and its needs and concerns are different from those of the other 4 districts. Our 5 districts are all different, and each has its own particular landscape, economic engine, and distinctive needs.

Preserve District 2 by ensuring that its boundaries include only the coast up to the Monterey County line. Leave it as it is, or modify it to Map A at the very minimum.

Sincerely,

Marvin Josephson
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C732d5481bdd34a95878608d9aabcd0f7c84c3c7747fd40e2a590b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728550136792673%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMjIiLCJBTiI6Ik1hdGh1YnkiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=b%2FyfTyUtvepsSIY1MARwK43aV59Sl3ANFThyv%2FvwdVU%3D&amp;reserved=0
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
Leave the current district boundaries as they are currently. The consultants stated that they are legal. Any attempt to change them would be a blatant power grab.

--
Thomas Nickelson
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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

As a Cambria resident for the past 40 years, I think that staying with the current districting is the best option for the town of Cambria. We should be included with other smaller coastal communities. Putting us with Paso Robles would do the town of Cambria a HUGE disservice. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration.

Sincerely,
Shelley Woeste
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:28 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 5 constituent. This email was 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 10:05 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: Rick Derevan

Your Email: [REDACTED]

U.S. phone number: [REDACTED]

Message: Please do not gerrymander supervisorial districts. The current districts have worked well, and no population changes require a revision. Leave the districts as is. Thank you.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 838050

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2770

Form inserted: 11/17/2021 10:04:19 PM
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email was 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: After careful study and consideration, as a voting citizen of San Luis Obispo County, I recommend you adopt Draft Plan A in the SLO County Redistricting. The Staff Advisory committee and outside consultant you selected have confirmed on public record that Draft Map A is a valid, legal, compliant, and defensible district boundaries map. 2020 Census data and the application of the CA Fair Maps Act criteria do not require any change to existing district boundaries. As a resident in District 4, I am totally AGAINST any changes to this district.
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email was 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

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.

Kind regards,
Jan Walters
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email was 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

Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 662825

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2772

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 6:53:08 AM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 6:53:08 AM
From: mjhamilton66@charter.net <mjhamilton66@charter.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:40 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 the Board of Supervisors to retain the current boundaries of our Redistricting Maps, as they fully comply with the law. I echo the opinions expressed in the Tribune by retired police chiefs Gardner and TerBorch. Any choice other than Plan A would look like gerrymandering and would cause the Board to appear partisan. Marilyn Hamilton
For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email was 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: We are strongly opposed to current redistricting proposals & believe present district lines do not need to be changed. Agree with all points presented in the editorial written by former police chiefs Gardiner and TerBorch.
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email was 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 County Board of Supervisors
boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us

November 18, 2021

My husband, daughter, son-in-law, and myself all 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,

Linda and Danny Hampton

Linda and Danny Hampton

District #1 – Paso Robles
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email was 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 voting constituent in SLO County, I urge “all” the Supervisors to “LEAVE THE EXISTING VOTING DISTRICTS IN PLACE” knock off this urge to Gerrymander voting in the county!!!
Cambria, for example, is NOT INTERESTED in becoming part of the “North County” voting district!!! Leave it alone.

Regards,

Geoffrey Brown
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:45 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting maps

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email was 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: Carmela Vignocchi <stellacarmela@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 7:33 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting maps

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

November 18, 2021

I urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt district maps that:

Comply with the criteria stipulated in state law and the Voting Rights Act.

Follow a process that is fair and perceived to be fair and result in fair and balanced districts that do not favor or discriminate against any political party.

Avoid radical changes to district lines that might cause confusion or nurture distrust and/or apathy among voters.

Respect the communities of interest as voiced by those who share common social and economic interests.

Minimize disruption to the election cycle and the number of voters whose ability to vote in an election would be deferred or accelerated.

Place Cal Poly student housing in one supervisorial district, respecting this "community of interest".
Continue to have the City of San Luis Obispo represented by more than one supervisor given its size and importance as a government center, 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, I support selection of Plan A or Plan B.

In addition, I urge the Board to begin the process to establish an independent redistricting commission to manage redistricting going forward.

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

To the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors,

According to the criteria delineated on the Board of Supervisors website for the redistricting in the county:

“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. Areas that meet only at the points of adjoining corners are not contiguous. Areas that are separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not contiguous.”

Although the North Coast may appear on a map to be geographically contiguous to the Paso Robles or inland areas, these areas are separated by a mountain range and completely different climate and economic endeavors.
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 supervisory district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.”

The North Coast shares similar economies with other coastal communities that differ considerably from the inland communities of Paso Robles, Atascadero and even San Luis Obispo. The inland areas strongly rely on agricultural interests while the coastal areas are predominantly oriented toward tourism. Dividing the North Coast from the other coastal communities such as Cayucos and Morro Bay denies our fair representation with the Board of Supervisors. A perfect example of this would be the years long process of enacting a vacation rental ordinance for several of the north coast communities. This was a vital process to preserve the integrity of our local community in Cambria that would have been disregarded had our area been represented by interests in Paso Robles.

3. “To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of a city or census designated place shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.”

4. “Supervisory district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents. To the extent practicable, supervisory districts shall be bounded by natural and artificial barriers, by streets, or by the boundaries of the county.”

It is clear that splitting the North Coast from other coastal areas such as Morro Bay and Cayucos would create division from other similar economic and geographic communities. Places such as Cambria and San Simeon are unincorporated and rely on the county supervisors for their governance. A supervisor representing a populous, agricultural based area such as Paso Robles is not going to be concerned about the issues facing a small coastal area such as Cambria. We will not receive adequate representation in such a situation.

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

Obviously, the population of inland areas would subsume the voice of the North Coast. Not only would sheer numbers drown our voices, but large commercial interests (such as agriculture, wineries, etc.) would hold greater sway with a supervisor’s attention. The North Coast faces very different challenges than are faced by the inland areas, but we face the same challenges as other coastal areas such as Morro Bay and Cayucos.

Please respect the geographic integrity of the communities of interest. We favor Map A or B.

Thank you,

John & Leslie McGarry
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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

Hi, I want to take a moment to express my desire for SLO County district lines to remain as is. There is no reason to combine Cambria and Paso when both are so different and have different needs. I fear next you will want to combine Morro Bay and Atascadero. The current lines are working well. Please leave them as is.

thank you

Sara Darling
Morro Bay Resident
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email was 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

Please vote to use the map submitted by Richard, ID74786.

Please see the attached.

Thanks You,
For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email was 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.

Any redistricting changes from the current district map should be minimized!
Please select Map A to not fracture communities of interest. The City of San Luis Obispo should be maintained in three separate districts for both community of interest and population balance.

Emily Rosten
San Luis Obispo
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email was 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 the Board NOT to make changes to the current voter district lines. They are fully compliant with current election laws and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. Making changes by the majority would be clearly politically motivated and not represent voters wishes.

Don Hightower
Nipomo, CA
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email was 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

SLO County Board of Supervisors:

We urge you to not fall for another politically divisive maneuver by redistricting our County. The system is not broken. Don't try to "fix" it.

Richard and Carol Tickner, SLO
From: Maria G. Brown
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:57 AM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]November 18, 2021 Letter to Board of Supervisors - Redistricting
Attachments: 11-18-21 ltr to Board of Supervisors.pdf

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:51 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]November 18, 2021 Letter to Board of Supervisors - Redistricting

For your review, I was unable to find this constituent in Voter Reg. This email was 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: johncarsellawyer@aol.com <johncarsellawyer@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:28 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: BOS_District 5_Web Contact <district5@co.slo.ca.us>; Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Dawn Ortiz-Legg <dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]November 18, 2021 Letter to Board of Supervisors - Redistricting

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

November 18, 2021

Chairperson Lynn Compton:

Please find attached the following: Letter addressed to you dated 11-18-21

Thank you

patricia
November 18, 2021

Please Reply to:
3285 Shearer Avenue
Cayucos, CA 92430
jcarsel@aol.com

via email to boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us

Chairperson Lynn Compton
San Luis Obispo, County Board of Supervisor

Re: REDISTRICTING
Board of Supervisors Special Meeting 11/19/2021

Dear Chairperson Compton and Supervisors:

On November 3, 2021, the supervisors: Cayucos Citizens’ Advisory Counsel unanimously passed the following resolution:

“We urge the Board of Supervisors to refrain from redistricting and remain with the status quo, Map A. There is no legal mandate nor reason to make changes to the current boundaries - there have not been enough demographic shifts to warrant moving boundaries. The current district boundaries have continuity and support regional communities of interest, including the North Coast. Cayucos is a part of the North Coast and should remain in a North Coast district that includes all coastal communities from the Monterey border to Montana de Oro State Park. Any significant changes at this point, such as breaking apart the North Coast, are clearly for gerrymandering purposes. We call on the Board of Supervisors to reject such changes and approve Map A.”
I cannot stress how seriously Cayucans’ do not want to have our district boundaries changed. We urge you to follow the will of the people and establish a Non-Partisan Commission to conduct the next redistricting and leave the Districts now as they are.

Lead us into healing and not division.

Respectfully,

JOHN M. CARSEL
President, CCAC

JMC:pp
cc: Supervisor Bruce Gibson (bgibson@slo.ca.us)
Supervisor John Peschong (jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us)
Supervisor Dawn Ortiz-Legg (dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us)
Supervisor Debbie Arnold (district5@co.slo.ca.us)
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7Ceb02f41b668a4d19f3b108d9aad234b4%7C84c3c7747df40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728642070552322%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=IbffSGJVNLq7wBMfpXyfbaG%2FPQL8s9MsBh4ysAwm4Rw%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

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

Dear Supervisors,

I would like to add my voice to those encouraging you not to gerrymander the supervisor districts of San Luis Obispo County. Most especially as a resident of Los Osos, I do not wish to be considered part of an artificial district that includes Paso Robles. There have been, unfortunately, far too many incidents up there that tell me a culture of white supremacy and loyalty to the evil of Trump make it a place to shun rather than join. During the pandemic I have been appalled at the high case rates and low vaccination numbers meaning people up there base their health decisions on false politics and disinformation. Arguments in the school board over “critical race theory” is more disinformation meant to pander to white supremacists. Students defecating on LGBTQ Pride flags and waving “F****k Biden” flags on Veterans Day tells me that they are being raised in a climate of hate and intolerance.

It is beyond my comprehension why the Republican party is willing to participate in and encourage lying, violence, and outright cheating by gerrymandering how our votes are counted. Please do not be a part of the current conspiracy of
the Republican party right wing to destroy our great Democracy by eliminating free and fair voting. From what I can see, District Map A is the best choice if you believe in true democracy.

Sincerely,
Sara Kelly
For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email was 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 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,

Richann Robinson
District 1
Paso Robles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RedistrictingID</th>
<th>166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/18/2021 9:54:31 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/18/2021 9:54:31 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Jamie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Maraviglia</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>Arroyo Grande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arroyo Grande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I urge you to retain current supervisorial district boundaries in order to ensure continuity and keep existing Communities of Interest intact. The census data does not justify major changes to our current boundaries, which meet all state requirements for population balance, fairness of representation and compactness. I am extremely concerned that my supervisor is in charge of drawing her own district, particularly when she’s facing a close race in the next six months.
For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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: Redistricting: Districts should align with applicable laws and should be competitive. accordingly, and following the logic of the nonpartisan League of Women Voters, I support keeping Map A (perhaps with minor adjustments as required by law and competitiveness).

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 158786

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2782

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 9:02:13 AM
For your review, this is a District 4 constituent. This email was 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.

San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors,

We are residents of District 4 and have a concern over the potential partisanship in the upcoming redistricting process.

In a recent editorial, the San Luis Obispo Tribune opined on the politicization of the redistricting process and quoted Mike Brown, Executive Director of COLAB, “The biggest threat to conservative and rational values comes from some city of SLO precincts, Cal Poly Precincts, Oceano and some of the large planned golf communities in Nipomo”. Herein lies the heart of the conservative agenda and the reasoning behind the Board of Supervisors decision to take control of the redistricting process rather than trust it to a non-partisan committee. With this usurping of the redistricting responsibility, the Board could turn the process into a political agenda with the goal of ensuring that three current members of the board, who comprise majority of the board's voting power, retain their majority by Gerrymandering the 5 Districts.
Gerrymandering is illegal!

Any major or significant change to the boundaries can only be to gain a political advantage for a political party or an incumbent, both of which purposes are expressly prohibited by the Fair Maps Act.

Over the past 10 years, the overall population of SLO County has not grown precipitously nor are the existing districts so out of balance that redistricting is required by law. San Luis Obispo County's own consultant says that no change in boundaries is justified if the Census data supports "no change." And, the facts are that Census data between 2010 and 2020 does not support change. Of the plans submitted for consideration, only Plan A represents a “no change” position to the current structure. A vote by the Board of Supervisors for anything other than Plan A is a clear attempt at Gerrymandering to ensure the three conservative members of the board can redraw districts in their favor.

Redistricting is supposed to be a non-partisan process. Without facts to support redistricting the non-partisan approach would be to retain the status quo. Therefore, any move other than to support Plan A is pure politics to ensure the current members of the board retain their seats.

We support Plan A, the status quo map. Please keep partisan politics and personal political gain out of the redistricting process.

Your job is to serve the citizens of San Luis Obispo County, not to guarantee your own employment as County Supervisors.

Thank you.

Thomas and Gail Ryan
Nipomo, CA
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:33 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:01 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 was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cbc2b3c6637e24b3e82d908d9aad2a21d%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728643905160481%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzlzLCBTIl6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;data=Mfaq8%2BeYv3Obb%2FH30O1iDCbwkQsN77MqbxwOwpKK4ns%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Paul Fordyce <paulfordyce@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Liz Fordyce <elizabethfordyce@sbcglobal.net>; Jami Fordyce <jamifordyce@gmail.com>; Michelle Chariton <michelle.chariton@yahoo.com>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

Dear SLO County BOS,

I am very concerned about the sanctity of fair elections in our county. I am watching with great interest and working with like-minded community members to demand that our BOS act in a non-partisan and transparent way while redistricting. I ask for the following:

1. Adopt Map A, with only minor changes.

2. Do not remove Oceano from District 4.
3. Commit to using an independent redistricting commission for future redistricting. Remove the temptation for Supervisors to gerrymander.

4. Do the right thing for fair County elections. Uphold the principles of democracy.

Sincerely,

Paul Fordyce
Arroyo Grande
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:02 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 was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7Ca5c84894dbcb442e0e5f08d9aad2a712%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728643977224598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IkpXaWwuMVwiLCJFZCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=l3I4R1YusvSNszSvEvYLZAXnIDKRZOymILXRML8QQA%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathryn Tribbey <kreid@fastmail.fm>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:15 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:

I live in Pismo Beach and I think you should leave the districts as they are. We haven’t had a significant increase in population to necessitate redistricting.

Please do not separate Oceano from Nipomo.

Please do not remove Templeton from Paso and add Cambria to Paso.

Please do not separate Morro Bay from Los Osos.

None of these changes make any sense EXCEPT for gerrymandering purposes. Show us that you are above politics and care about our county.
Thank you,
Kathryn Tribbey

--
Kathryn Reid Tribbey
kreid@fastmail.fm
For your review, this is a District 5 constituent. This email was 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: It is my understanding that the current SLO Co. supervisorial district boundaries are fully compliant with current election law. If this is true, then I strongly urge the SLO Co. Board of Supervisors to cast their votes in favor of retaining the current supervisorial district boundaries. If the current district boundaries are not compliant with election law, then the board must select a knowledgeable, independent and nonpartisan citizens commission to thoroughly evaluate county population data and develop equitable alternative redistricting maps that fully comply with both election law and the intent of election law. Thank you for attention in this very important matter.
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2783

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 9:19:26 AM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 9:19:26 AM
This comment is to advocate for retaining the current district boundaries only with minor modifications. I also want to go on record in support of putting redistricting authority in the hands of independent commissions instead of allowing this process to be overseen directly by elected officials, effectively allowing the presiding Supervisors to choose their own voters.
For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email was 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 Members of the Board

The redistricting decision will impact the future of our County for decades to come. We strongly urge you to adopt Plan A or B with only minor adjustments if any at all. Our reasons are as follows:

Given the slight population change of the last census there is no legal need to change the districts at all. Maps A & B with their minor tweaking of boundaries comply with the law.

The districts of these maps are fair and balanced whereas other of the proposed maps strongly suggest intent to favor one party over another. The law requires balanced districts not partisan alignments.

As residents of the city of San Luis Obispo we strongly oppose the city being placed in a single district. This marginalizes us and renders us unrepresented in decisions that nonetheless impact the city. Further many issues facing all of the districts are intertwined with the city such as employment, education, government services and commercial activities.

Likewise Cal Poly student housing should remain in one district so as not to marginalize this community of interest.
There should be no drastic changes to the existing districts. Such would destroy communities of interest that have long existed.

There are many more reasons why Plan A or B is the right and wise decision but we will stop here.

We live in divisive times. Let San Luis Obispo buck the unfortunate trend we seen in our country. Prove that we are a special, magical place. Redistricting is the most important vote you will make. It is your legacy. Make it a vote for democracy.

Patricia Gomez, Frank Seiple
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:05 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 was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C4e09a77a69cc455f032808d9aad2bded%7C84c3c7747df40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728644360276426%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMziILCJBTiI6Ik1hd3hlclwvLCJveGJvcnRhbCIsImltIjoiVzNhcnFiLWNvbnRlbnQuZ29yeSIsImlkIjoiVzNhcnFiLWNvbnRlbnQuZ29yeSIsImlpZCI6IjFkZTc2ODk1NSIsImltbCI6IjIiLCJ2IjoiaHR0cHM6Ly9hc2UuaW1nLmNvbS93aWR0aD90b3A7c3RydWUlMjIzMDAxNjUxODg4Miwic3RydWUiOiJzZWNyZXQifQ%3D%3D&amp;rap Vampire;__&amp;reserverd=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Sampson <marycdsslo@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:50 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,

“If it isn’t broken don’t fix it”. Please leave the current districts intact. Anyone paying attention, and a lot of us are, knows this is a partisan ploy to wrest further control of SLO County politics.

There will be backlash if this succeeds. It may take a few years, but the pendulum will swing back and the consequences of this underhanded tactic may not be worth losing your integrity over. Your legacy will be characterized by the actions you take today.

Sincerely,

Mary Sampson
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:06 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 2 constituent. This email was 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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cd906588753535416fec3f08d9aad2c479%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728644480360335%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1h
aWwiLCJXViI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;sdata=rWFcafofRqSvf08bTMGko3ekB9YWoL6Himcjlgcbbg%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Toni Edwards <toni6600@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:59 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 live in Los Osos. It is imperative that Los Osos remain with the North Coast District, District 2. To remove Los Osos from its Community of Interest is unnecessary, and will disrupt our watershed along with other coastal needs. We will be alienated from our geographic neighbors. We will also be neglected as Los Osos is not contiguous with District 3.

There is no need to change the districting maps at all. I support Map A. However, if small changes meet the legal requirements, then Map B is appropriate. The other maps are blatant attempts to disenfranchise Democrats.

This is such a transparent political move to gerrymander our county in favor of the minority of voters. This will be remembered at election time.

Toni L. Edwards
Sent from my iPad
-----Original Message-----
From: DAN PREMOLI <tbondpro@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:06 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Public Comment

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

No need for redistricting at this point. Just political and selfish motives.
Keep Cambria within the North Coast. It doesn't belong with Paso Robles.
Respectfully.
Sent from my iPhone
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:07 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]November 19 Redistricting Hearing

For your review, this is a District 3 constituent. This email was 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: Carol Jean <cattoe@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:00 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]November 19 Redistricting Hearing

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

Board of Supervisors,

We have lived in Cambria for 20 years. We have been closely watching the redistricting process and are shocked to find that your Board may be considering splitting up the north coast and placing Cambria and San Simeon in the same district as Paso Robles or other parts of the north county. Our community of interest lies along the highway one corridor. We share the same transportation, recreational, shopping and cultural opportunities with communities to the south of us. We are mostly unincorporated so feel the effects of the decisions your Board makes, whether it is priorities for road repairs or vacation rentals. We are closer to Cayucos and Morro Bay than Paso Robles and have much more in common with them. We urge you to keep Cambria and the north coast unified as one community of interest.

Sincerely,
Carol Jean Attoe
Jean Miller
It cannot happen here. IT CAN AND IT IS. Paradise is turning into a parking lot before our very eyes, with Arnold and Compton wielding the biggest shovels. We must not allow our county to be gerrymandered into nonsensical districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization Represented</th>
<th>Oceano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Oceano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't gerrymander SLO County! Please keep the Districts substantially the same, maps A or B. No packing and cracking to solidify a conservative majority which which would represent a minority of voters, disenfranchising the majority. Voters should choose their supervisors, not the other way around.
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

The 2020 Census did not provide any demonstrable reason for changing the borders of the current supervisorial districts. People develop relationships with their supervisors and to disrupt those relationships without any need to rectify significant demographic changes smacks of political opportunism.

Max Riedlsperger

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Our unique community will greatly benefit by retaining a districting that is close to it’s current configuration and that continues to be represented by Dawn Ortiz-Legg as our supervisor.

Supervisor Ortiz-Legg has achieved a rare understanding of and a meaningful rapport with the commercial business owners and residential homeowners.

Please do not undo the progress that has occurred or disrupt the relationships that have been built or in any way undermine or threaten the beautiful community of Avila Valley.

Supervisor Ortiz-Legg has significant community-wide support.

Carol Hayden

Homeowner in San Luis Bay Estates
Director on two HOA boards in the estates Alternate member on the Avila Valley Advisory Council
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:25 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: COI - ID 36

Your Name*
Karen M. White

Your Email

Which district do you live in? If you’re not sure, use our "Find my Supervisor" tool (opens in new window) to find your district*
District 4

Community Of Interest Name*
Village of Halcyon

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important*
Halcyon was created in 1903 as an Intentionally Formed Community by the theosophical The Temple of the People, who as an entity purchased the land for its village. It continues to this day in the same form. It desires to retaining rural and historic environment and recognition as federally-designated historic district and to protect its agricultural land with nexus to farm land to east and south, rather than the more developed areas of Arroyo Grande to its north and Oceano.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries?*
Village of Halcyon, within Oceano Community Services District, bounded by Halcyon Road to Highway 1 (Cienega), generally Elm Street, then The Pike back to Halcyon Road

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the Board of Supervisor redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the Board of Supervisors has an impact on your community.*
To retain its historic elements and protect farm lands. Halcyon wants to retain its name and identity, which is difficult when the post office identifies it with an Arroyo Grande zip code and the county says it is part of Oceano.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?*
I do not believe Halcyon can be selected as an independent "community of interest" because it is a part of the Oceano sphere of influence and community services district, BUT Halcyon desires in every way to keep itself as a separate enclave within the county.

Form inserted

11/18/2021 10:24:19 AM
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I am asking the Board of Supervisors to approve and adopt a district map that considers all the criteria stipulated in state law and Voting Rights Act, ensures continuity, respects the communities of interest, and minimizes disruptions to the election cycle. Please adopt map A (closely aligned with the current district map) or map B (minimal changes, with Cal Poly campus moved into one district).

Respectfully,

Steffi Ketzler
As a resident of District 1, a SLO high school and Cal Poly graduate, resident of SLO County for 25 years, small business owner and retired college professor, I want Map A (current boundaries) or Map B (Cal Poly intact) selected. All other maps are an attempt to gerrymander Republicans into 10 more years of 3 supervisors, whereas SLO County has more Democratic voters as per our 2020 election. A minority of voters should NOT select a majority of supervisors. Maps A & B meet partisan fairness.
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

From the Ralph M. Brown Act:

“The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created”. Gov’t Code 54950

Please, work FOR the people who have elected you. Maps A & B are the only ones that should be considered. Communities of Interest should be top priority.

Dave & Karen Pearson
Hello, I oppose the redistricting of Cambria with Paso Robles. A case has not been made for this change and only limits our voice into our community. I will try and attend tomorrow's town meeting but am disappointed that a Zoom meeting is not available.

Sincerely

The Borstemanns
As a resident of District 1, a SLO high school and Cal Poly graduate, resident of SLO County for 25 years, small business owner and retired college professor, I want Map A (current boundaries) or Map B (Cal Poly intact) selected. All other maps are an attempt to gerrymander Republicans into 10 more years of 3 supervisors, whereas SLO County has more Democratic than Republican voters, as per our 2020 election and the 2020 census. A minority of voters should NOT select a majority of supervisors. Maps A & B meet partisan fairness.

According to the 2020 census, NONE of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes. This was confirmed by the County's redistricting consultant. Maps A and B ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements. I support robust democracy in which people feel confident that their voices and votes will be heard.

In District 1 where I reside, to include parts of the north coast with inland north county is NOT logical because there are NO existing Communities Of Interest, there is a physical mountain barrier, and there is NO historical shared governing connections, such as CSDs, school districts, etc.

The Board majority must be held accountable for their actions:

- This is the time to call their actions for what they are, a raw political power grab. It's happening everywhere and the GOP is behind it.
- Our current Republican board majority has proved they are highly partisan and will use political maneuvers to stay in power.
- SLO county population has not changed enough to make drastic redistricting changes, maps that greatly alter the current map are most likely illegal under guidelines established in the Elections Code
- Maps A and B meet all the legal criteria and can be adopted without threat of litigation
- Not supporting the approach of minor changes is suspect of Republican partisan gerrymandering
- The Patten-version maps and Map C are illegal, and should not be considered due to numerous violations of redistricting guidelines.

In summary, you must select maps A or B to ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements.

Cynthia Lewis, Ph.D.
President, Lewis Associates Medical Strategies
Hello, I oppose the redistricting of Cambria with Paso Robles. A case has not been made for this change and only limits our voice into our community. I will try and attend tomorrow’s town meeting but am disappointed that a Zoom meeting is not available.

Concerned citizens Rob and Teresa Borstelmann at 2120 Wilcombe Drive, Cambria CA 93428. Can be reached at above email address or mail.
We see you. According to census, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes. This was confirmed by the County's redistricting consultant. Maps A and B ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements. Republican gerrymandering is on the rise - we must remind you. Voters choose their politicians. Politicians don’t choose their voters.
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please consider that there is little need to adjust voting District boundaries. The Fair Maps Act (passed in 1990) states that adapting boundaries for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party

Redistricting Context (from Common Cause California) AB849, passed May 23, 2019
Redistricting is the process by which district boundaries are drawn every 10 years to ensure each district has the same number of people. California voters gave the power to draw congressional and state legislative district maps to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission starting with data from the 2010 census. But today, in most California cities and counties, politicians draw their own districts, which is a conflict of interest that can lead to unfair representation and incumbent protection. AB 849 and SB 139 aim to eliminate that conflict and ensure community responsiveness, López-Calderón said.

The push to radically change these maps is entirely politically-driven towards future campaign goals of one party and does nothing towards supporting fair elections in our state and County.

Please remind me again how the 3-2 vote that increased campaign donations to $25,000 per individual contribution, supported the fair elections process.
Please consider and **support Map A and B update boundaries.** The geographical integrity of our local communities of interest in each District is essential to what makes America Great. Not private party politicians attempting their Party’s dirty work.

Thanks, Linde Owen

31 yr resident of Los Osos
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Honorable SLO County District Supervisors:

As you consider potential changes to our SLO County district maps/boundaries, please know that MANY residents including me feel that the only acceptable change is to use "Map A" but prefer no changes at all presently.

Combining Cambria into the Paso Robles area would be a farce and a mistake. Thanks for doing the right things for local residents rather than making politically motivated changes.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Kantor
Dear Supervisors, According to census, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes, which was confirmed by the County's redistricting consultant. With this in mind, I urge you to adopt map A or B, both of which ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the election cycle, and are fully compliant with state law. Any other action will invite suspicions of gerrymandering. Respectfully, Andrea Chmelik
Mei-Lin Gee
Confidential Secretary
Administrative Office and Office of Emergency Services
1055 Monterey St., Ste. D430 | San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Tel: (805) 781-1334 | Fax: (805) 781-5023
Website  |  Facebook  |  Twitter  |  YouTube  |  LinkedIn

From: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Mei-Lin Gee <mgee@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Public Comment - ID 163

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 5:55 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 163

RedistrictingID 163
Form inserted 11/18/2021 5:54:34 AM
Form updated 11/18/2021 5:54:34 AM
First Name Monica
Last Name Mercer
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization NA
Represented
City Grover Beach
Zip 93433
The Richard Patten Map proves that it is possible to have all Communities of Interest together, whole, and undivided, allowing an even distribution of population throughout the county. I support this map! The Richard Patten Map incorporates the definition of geographical compactness in Communities of Interest that are in proximity with one another. Again, I fully support this map, as it 100% makes sense and follows every rule of redistricting.
Good morning, Mr. Greening. Thank you for your input into the County’s redistricting process. Because the hearing on November 19 is a Special Meeting, notice and the agenda must only be posted 24 hours prior to the meeting under the Brown Act (unlike regular meetings, which must be posted at least 72 hours prior to the meeting). We understand that 24 hours’ notice is not ideal, however, due to our extraordinary time constraints, it was necessary. You may now find our staff report here: https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Home/Meetings-Calendar.aspx?meetingID=46.

We are currently posting daily correspondence on our redistricting webpage (https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Administrative-Office/Countywide-Projects-Programs/Redistricting/Public-Comments-Communities-of-Interest-Input.aspx) and will include your email below in comment posted for 11/17, which should be posted by the end of today or early on November 19.

Please feel free to reach out should you have any further questions.

Regards,

Kristin Eriksson
From: Eric Greening <dancingsilverowl@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:08 PM  
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>; Wade Horton <whorton@co.slo.ca.us>; Rita L. Neal <rneal@co.slo.ca.us>  
Subject: [EXT]Eric Greening comments for the November 19th Special meeting--and Brown Act concern!

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

Hello!

Hoping to scrutinize the staff report for the supposedly planned special meeting coming up this Friday, I visited the appropriate space in the Supervisors' website, and am confronted, not with an agenda for that meeting, with "Item Documents" which would presumably contain a description of the actions expected at the meeting, any staff recommendation as to either process or content, and accumulated correspondence from the public. Instead of finding these things, I find the message that currently there are no upcoming events. While I can visit the County's redistricting website and find the maps you will have before you, it would help, in making written comments, to have the rest of what I presume will be in front of you--that, I would hope you would already have had in front of you since at least 9:00 am Tuesday.

Which brings up the Brown Act concern. Where is the proper notification of this meeting? As I write this, we are approximately 39 hours from the supposed start time of this meeting. The full "Item Documents" with all the elements referenced above should have been available for at least 33 hours. I have no idea what the sentiments of the public are, as I am not able to see their correspondence. I have no idea whether MY correspondence will be visible to you, or to the public.

For the record, I support option B, and was planning to share some reasons I found it preferable to other maps, with analysis of the relative virtues and drawbacks of several of them. But until I have some assurance that these comments are actually going to be READ, actually going to be VISIBLE to those who look for them, I will stop here for now.

I would appreciate a response to the question of whether this special meeting can legitimately be held under these circumstances, or how the missing information is proposed to be remedied.

Many thanks,  
Eric Greening
Hello,

I am writing to express my opinion on redistricting San Luis Obispo County's boundaries. As an informed and active SLO County voter, I am grateful for the opportunity to provide input - thank you for reading!

SLO County does not need redistricting. Any conversation that could lead to redistricting is dangerous and unnecessary to our local democracy. The current districting is valid and there is no need to change things. If changes are enacted, gerrymandering is incredibly likely - and incredibly dangerous.

Fair elections and each voter getting a fair say is both crucial to the integrity of the Central Coast that we all love and the foundation of democracy itself. Please do not entertain the possibility of redistricting in this county - we do not need it and it will lead us down a rabbit hole of political hypocrisy and power.

Thank you,
Hollie West, she/her/hers
To Whom it May Concern,

Please see the attached letter from the Mayor of Morro Bay on behalf of the City Council, for consideration by the Board of Supervisors for the 11/19/2021 public hearing on redistricting.

If you have any questions, please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Scott Collins
City Manager
City of Morro Bay
We see you. According to census, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes. This was confirmed by the County's redistricting consultant. Maps A and B ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements. Republican gerrymandering is on the rise - we must remind you. Voters choose their politicians. Politicians don’t choose their voters.
Comment
No option for Zoom attendance or online voting in the middle of a pandemic? Bad. Changing the map up so much that it may as well be titled “GOP power grab”? Worse. SLO county population has not changed enough to make drastic redistricting changes, maps that greatly alter the current map are most likely illegal under guidelines established in the Elections Code

Public Records Notice
True
-----Original Message-----
From: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:12 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting of North Coast District 2

Public Comment.

- Caleb Mott
Legislative Assistant District 4
San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
(805) 781-4337
(800) 834-4636 ext 4337
District4@co.slo.ca.us
1055 Monterey St D430
San Luis Obispo CA 93408
Visit our Website

-----Original Message-----
From: David Lopez <cambrialopez@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:39 AM
To: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting of North Coast District 2

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

Dear Supervisor Compton,
It is clear that the best redistricting option for north coast residents is Map A. I’m requesting that you choose Map A and keep coastal San Luis Obispo county, coastal. We appreciate your support.
Thank you for your consideration.
David Lopez
Cambria

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

I am writing to strongly urge the board to keep the district boundaries at the status quo.

Tim Bean
San Luis Obispo, CA
I wish to extend my support of Dawn Ortiz-Legg because of her appreciation of the importance of our open spaces, her awareness of the need to balance residents’ needs with commercial needs, and her experience working in the Planning Department. She has expressed an awareness of the concern that we who live here have for safe evacuation routes, as Avila is a one way in/one way out road. She appears to bring a collaborative approach to problem solving, quite rare in today’s political environment. I trust her judgement, particularly as she has demonstrated an ability to involve the community.

Thank you,
Ken Krone

---

Kenneth Krone, MD, FACR

The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. It is intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you receive the email in error, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies. Federal regulation, 42 CFR, Part 2, prohibits further disclosure.
I agree with the non-partisan League of Women Voters that the new district map should remain largely unchanged with only minor revisions. This will ensure continuity, keep existing Communities of Interest intact, and meet all state requirements for population balance and fairness of representation. Due to its importance to the entire county as a hub for jobs and commerce, the city of SLO should NOT be marginalized by being rounded up into one district.
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt Map A to maintain existing districting lines. Since San Luis Obispo County’s current districts meet State requirements, redistricting is an unnecessary waste of government resources. In addition, district representation has an outsize impact on unincorporated areas like Cambria that lack municipal support. Diluting our representation by focusing on towns and cities harms District 2’s community of interest: unincorporated coastal communities impacted by infrastructure, tourism, and water resources.

Respectfully,

Kitty Connolly

Cambria
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:52 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting comments

From: Sean Quigley <squigley707@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting comments

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

Board of Supervisors
I'm writing to express my concern for the proposed redistricting maps that look to isolate the city of SLO into one district. I do not see the benefit to the voter in these proposed maps, with current maps meeting the state requirements for population balance. The process of allowing our district supervisors to draw and choose new maps, after rejecting a non-partisan citizen's commission, does not bolster faith or trust in our elected officials acting in a fair manner. It instead adds to the growing concern around fair elections nationwide.

If the board isn't willing to allow a non-partisan citizen's commission to fairly draw new maps, then the existing maps should be left alone. Preserve some faith in our elected officials not to act out of pure partisan interest. Leave the districting maps as they are.

Sean Quigley
**Redistricting ID** 176  
**Form inserted** 11/18/2021 11:35:51 AM  
**Form updated** 11/18/2021 11:35:51 AM  
**First Name** Kitty  
**Last Name** Connolly  
**Email** [redacted]  
**Phone** [redacted]  
**Name of Organization Represented**  
**City** Cambria  
**Zip** 93428  

I strongly urge adoption of Map A to maintain existing districting lines. Since current districts meet State requirements, redistricting is an unnecessary waste of government resources. In addition, district representation has an outsize impact on unincorporated areas that lack municipal support. Diluting our representation by focusing on towns and cities harms District 2’s community of interest: unincorporated coastal communities impacted by infrastructure, tourism, and water resources.

**Public Records Notice**  
**True**
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&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C38869d0ddfbb4998eb2d08d9aad53b61%7C84c3c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728655066875112%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;sdata=Y%2FKgHepLeB%2FJsRUp6%2FwNaL09PS%2FBE8y4gduT6TEaYdE%3D&amp;amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

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

I would be so proud if you DID THE RIGHT THING.... and you know what that is. We are so proud to have elected our supervisors, so please retain our current district lines. I will be there on November 19 and 30 to watch you do the right thing!!

Please make me proud,
Sherie Tennant
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:52 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

From: cathy ragle <cathy.ragle@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:46 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.

Please retain the current district lines.

Regards,
Cathy Ragle
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 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 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: Garrett Otto <garrettotto@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:23 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, no redistricting for partisan advantage. Even though the current boundaries have resulted in conservative-leaning boards for 11 of the last 15 years, including the last six years. Redistricting designed to lock in partisan advantage and undermine competitive democratic elections is illegal and immoral.

As a SLO resident of District 5 I oppose a blatant partisan push to isolate SLO voters into one marginalized district in order to harden partisan advantage elsewhere. SLO is the largest city by far and is intertwined with all parts of the county through jobs, shopping, and education. Arguing that it should only have one district is clearly a partisan move.

I am in support of keeping the existing district map intact.

Thanks,

Garrett Otto
San Luis Obispo
District 5
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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C10630a53e906469fa58508d9aad549ef%7C84c3c7747df40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728655299088202%7CUnkown%7C7TWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiOMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLiLCJ8Tl6lk1hawWwiLCJXCl6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;sdata=ufBF%2FNElJtU5RVKfTMj8dDAzkNjy6Guq3Kd7jDgfvCE%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

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

After careful review, studying the background, and political desires of the candidates, I would like you to approve of Plan A as being the best option. Please do not yield to powerful groups who want to redistrict for their own gain.
Thank you!
Karen Steves
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

Message: It is so important that our current Board of Supervisors follow the criteria for redistricting and choose to maintain our current districts. There is no legal reason to change our current districts. The way our county is currently districted meets the legal standards of redistricting: compactness, contiguity, equal population, preservation of existing political communities, partisan fairness, and racial fairness. Draft Map A is the most litigation-proof alternative. The County's consultant expert has confirmed that Draft Map A is TOTALLY COMPLIANT with redistricting requirements. Draft A is also the most economical option. Rather than spend money on biased redistricting, we could use the money to help offset our many losses during the pandemic in SLO county. Additionally, if we were to do the unnecessary changes, some of us would lose our opportunity to vote. We don't want to wait additional years to vote. It is obvious in remapping District 4 that partisan fairness would be denied. In the last election Lynn Compton won by only 60 votes. This clearly indicates that District 4 is a balanced, competitive district. Current census data, traditional redistricting
principles, and recently enacted statutory criteria regarding changing California supervisorial districts do not support a need to redraw the 4th District’s current boundaries. Thank you for your time

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 524017

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2784

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 10:36:35 AM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 10:36:35 AM
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

I believe the following points from this article succinctly summarize my opinions on the matter of redistricting.

- 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.

I implore you to leave the district boundaries as they are currently configured.
Thank you for your time,

Tom Shumard
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

First of all, thank you for your public service. You are elected from particular districts, but what you do affects all of us in the county. Your work at its best transcends party or regional differences.

Your decision about redistricting is hugely important. I’m asking you not to make any drastic changes. When I tell people that our Supervisors are allowed to choose their own voters and not the other way around, they are shocked. You have the capacity to make the best decision under that circumstance.

My recommendation to you all is either to make no change, Draft Plan #A, or better yet, Draft Plan B, putting all of Cal Poly into one district, incorporating the new dorms. Either plan would keep regional groups together, such as the north coast, and split the population of San Luis Obispo City up to dilute city representation appropriately. Either plan adheres to the overall rules for redistricting, and would avoid political upheaval and potential lawsuits.

My residence in the County began in 1960, and I have voted in every election since then. My first votes were cast in the old Huasna schoolhouse. We had to drive from Alamo Canyon off highway 166 up through Arroyo Grande and over. If the weather was good we could take a shortcut through neighboring ranches. That only took about an hour each way. No matter how long it took, voting was profound and important, and still is. Please make it as fair as possible for everyone, and choose Plan A or B.
My caregiver duties prevent me from attending your hearing tomorrow, but I will be paying close attention. This may be the most important decision you ever make as Supervisors.

Regards,

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

I urge you to keep the MAP and leave the districts as they are rather than divide up the coastal community and put some of those cities with inland north county Paso Robles. It makes absolutely no sense to me why you would even consider making a change.

Carol Singleton
Paso Robles, CA  93446
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:55 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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:01 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: Mark E Kantor

Your Email: ********

Message: Honorable SLO County District Supervisors: As you consider potential changes to our SLO County district maps/boundaries, please know that MANY residents including me feel that the only acceptable change is to use "Map A" but prefer no changes at all presently. Combining Cambria into the Paso Robles area would be a farce and a mistake. Thanks for doing the right things for local residents rather than making politically motivated changes. Sincerely, Mark E. Kantor 488 Leighton Street Cambria, CA 93428

Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 089807
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2785
From: Maria G. Brown
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:53 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT] Redistricting

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:56 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 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: linda borders <lindaborders@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:03 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; linda borders <lindaborders@hotmail.com>
Subject: [EXT] Redistricting

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

The current map should stay as it is or an impartial commission allowed to make the decision.

The state is blue….the county is blue voting wise, if not leaning blue….our county should not be redistricted to favor red voters.

Leave the districts boundaries alone.

Linda Borders
Vaughn Hasslein
Los Osos
To the County Board of Supervisors:

As a constituent living in Morro Bay, 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.

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

It would be an affront to constituents in all districts to gerrymander district boundaries to serve any one political party over another. We deserve the respect of our County Board of Supervisors and a fair and democratic process.

Respectfully,

Piper Fedrow
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:

It is so important our current Board of Supervisors follow criteria for redistricting and choose to maintain our current districts. There is no reason to change our current districts. The way our county is currently districted meets the legal standards of redistricting: compactness, contiguity, equal population, preservation of existing political communities, partisan fairness, and racial fairness.

Draft A is the most litigation-proof alternative. The County’s consultant expert has confirmed that Draft Map A is TOTALLY COMPLIANT with redistricting requirements. Draft A is also the most economical option. Rather than spend money on biased redistricting, we could use the money to help offset the many losses entailed in SLO county during the pandemic.
Additionally if we were to do the unnecessary changes, some of us would lose our opportunity to vote. We do not want to wait additional years to vote.

It is obvious that in remapping District 4 partisan fairness would be denied. In the last election, Lynn Compton won by only 60 votes. This clearly indicates that District 4 is a balanced, competitive district. Current census data, traditional redistricting principles, and recently enacted statutory criteria regarding changing California supervisorial districts do not support a need to redraw the 4th District’s current boundaries.

Sincerely,
Janet Dalton

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
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmabrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cf77a5f48f6a84c3c7747f9f4e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728656434913090%7CUnkown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWliioMC4wLjAwMjA1MTA4ODA2ODIzOTUwMzIiLCJlIjoiV2luMzIiLCJhIjoiLWwiLCJpIjoiV2luMzIiLCJpYiI6IjEifX0&reserved=0
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:

You are obviously intelligent people, representing all of us. So, surely you can see the wisdom of keeping the present boundaries of Draft Map A. The Census data between 2010 and 2020 Does Not require change.

There has been no successful legal challenge to these district boundaries over the last ten years. After looking at all the alternatives, I am sure you will see the wisdom of continuing to follow Draft Map A!

Thank You!

Mary B. Young
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 Supervisors,
>>
>> Ten years ago while serving as a member of the Solano County Board of Supervisors, we undertook the mandatory redistricting of that county. As you know, at that time the legislature had not set specific priorities for counties to follow nor procedural requirements that now provide for extensive community input into the process. The legislature’s reasoning for the changes is to ensure that redistricting is done in a way that protects maintains contiguous districts that protect communities of interest and do not unnecessarily disenfranchise voters. The ramifications of redistricting are substantial and the creation of districts that are consistent with the law important. Having been part of redistricting efforts in the past, I recognize the ramifications of redistricting and the importance of the creation of maps that are consistent with the law.
>

https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cf61be14bd97546c34ddd08d9aad5e6bd%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728657931047807%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyjWljoimC4wLjAwmDAiLCJQIjoiv2luMziiLCJ8Ti6lk1hawWiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;sdata=WJDkbbbo1Z2QXHLmxvVCKlOzn0zCdsb1EHehVt4Qrc%3D&amp;reserved=0

Direct Line: (805)781-5498
The population growth of SLO County has been relatively small and the current district maps are consistent with Election Code 21500 and the priorities it requires. No changes to the current district maps are required under the statute. Changes to the current maps are not only unnecessary but could lead to disenfranchisement, unreasonable boundaries that divide communities of interest, and are otherwise inconsistent with law.

I believe retaining the current boundaries and the adoption of Map A is in the best interests of the residents of SLO County and I would encourage its adoption.

Thank you,

Linda J. Seifert

Sent from my iPad
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:57 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Retain Current Boundaries

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:01 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Retain Current Boundaries

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: Jacqueline Knowlton <jacquelineknowlton@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:31 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Retain Current Boundaries

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

Dear Board Members,

We urge the Board to uphold our democratic principals and personal integrity by rejecting the redistricting of our county. We strongly urge the Board to resist gerrymandering, and instead to keep our fully-compliant current boundaries as they are. By retaining the current fair and balanced boundaries we will thwart the divisive and violent political aggression that is now plaguing America.

Thank you,
Jacqueline and William Knowlton
Templeton
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsupvs@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:01 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 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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsupvs@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Margaret Meneice

Your Email: [redacted]

Message: RE: Redistricting Meeting of Nov. 19, 2021 No major changes have been identified in the latest census, therefore no major changes to the district boundaries should be made. Additionally, I live in Morro Bay and do not support changes to my district. Thank you for considering my input.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 623921

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2786
Form inserted: 11/18/2021 11:31:27 AM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 11:31:27 AM
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

Cathy Ragle
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:03 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 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: rjhmd@aol.com <rjhmd@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:53 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 SLO County Board of Supervisors,

Please do not alter the present voter district maps. In their current form, they represent a fair distribution of voters.

Thank you for your service,

R. Jeffrey Herten, MD
44-year resident of SLO County
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please register our strong support of Dawn Ortiz-Legg to remain as our supervisor. She is wholly capable, familiar with present issues, and generous in giving her time in our representation.

Our thanks -

Dennis (& Andrea) Burns
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors,

I encourage the rejection of initial Plan A and the adoption of a Plan C-like map for the redistricting of SLO County Supervisor Districts. Plan C meets the objective criteria for drawing areas better than the other initial draft plans, including Plan A. Plan C deals with Plan A’s long term marginal compliance with the currently stated redistricting criteria. Plan A divides SLO City three ways with confusing boundaries. Plan C splits two ways with more clear boundaries. Plan C addresses the geographical compactness issue with District 5.

Plans A and C could equally be construed to violate the caution on drawing lines to favor political interests. Most of the public comments I’ve read supporting Plan A appear to me to be about political interests and not about the objective criteria for redistricting.

Other Plan-C like maps may do a better job at keeping cities/census places together. Coastal SLO Districts (Now Balanced) (District-R Map ID 70648) for example.

I encourage you to use the redistricting criteria objectively and adopt a Plan C-like map as your starting point for the redefinition of the SLO County Supervisor Districts.

Bob Heitzman
SLO City Resident
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:23 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Maps

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%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C4021fe965b3346ea195308d9aad62b30%7C84c3c7747f40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728659079236132%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoimC4wlJAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJ8Il6Ik1hcWwiLCJVCiI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&amp;sdata=JDZ4oNqLt2mUVGz4kmeq%2Fd6DF2av6wkKQdxg6Ilkk%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Debbie Punches <ddpunches@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Maps

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing in support of Richard Patten's redistricting map ID74786, because it meets all the requirements 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 a 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 population.

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

Respectfully,
Debra
District 24
From: Katherine Christensen <alohakate22@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Public Comment Redistricting

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

NO CHANGE is needed. The California Fair Maps Act of 2019 does not require any changes and change IS NOT justified by Census data. Draft Map A complies with all governing criteria. The city of SLO is represented by more than one supervisor because this is NOT about the City of SLO, it is about the County for all of us. Map A is the most economical would NOT CHANGE when people vote for their supervisor. why would an incumbent advocate change now if not for political gain? Leave Dist. 4 as it is.
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>  
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:24 PM  
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting; Adopt Map A

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: Dara Stepanek <dara.stepanek@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:14 PM  
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>  
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting; Adopt Map A

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

At this highly divisive and emotional time, the Board should be uniting us, not dragging residents through a warp speed redistricting process when there is simply no compelling reason to do so. Adopt Map A, with only minor changes.

Please, no redistricting for partisan advantage. Even though the current boundaries have resulted in conservative-leaning boards for 11 of the last 15 years, including the last six years, the conservative board majority appears determined to redraw district lines to cement partisan advantage for the next 10 years. Redistricting designed to lock in partisan advantage and undermine competitive democratic elections is **illegal** and **immoral**.

I live in SLO, own a business in SLO, and my child attends school in SLO. I oppose a blatant partisan push to isolate SLO voters into one marginalized district in order to harden partisan advantage elsewhere. SLO is the largest city by far and is intertwined with all parts of the county through jobs, shopping, and education. Arguing that it should only have one district is hostile and defies common sense; it’s partisan and wrong.

Thank you for your service and your attention to this crucial matter.

Dara Stepanek
**Maria G. Brown**

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:59 PM  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment - ID 177

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:29 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Public Comment - ID 177

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RedistrictingID</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/18/2021 12:28:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/18/2021 12:28:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Christensen</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

NO CHANGE is needed. The California Fair Maps Act of 2019 does not require any changes and change IS NOT justified by Census data. Draft Map A complies with all governing criteria. The city of SLO is represented by more than one supervisor because this is NOT about the City of SLO, it is about the County for all of us. Map A is the most economical would NOT CHANGE when people vote for their supervisor. why would an incumbent advocate change now if not for political gain? Leave Dist. 4 as it is.

**Public Records Notice**

True
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:33 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]re: Redistricting in SLO County

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: Chris Bersbach <chris.bersbach@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:24 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Brittany Coates <brittany.j.coates@gmail.com>
Subject: [EXT]re: Redistricting in SLO County

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

To the County of San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors,

Each decade, following the most recent census the County Board of Supervisors has the opportunity to review our County’s supervisor districts and consider whether changes to the five districts are required. I’ve heard our Supervisors commit to an open and transparent process, but so far every public indication has been that the Board majority favors redrawing districts to cement their partisan advantage for the next 10 years. The supervisors chose to ignore best practice and did not appoint a nonpartisan citizens’ panel to advise on drawing the district boundaries. Based on the minor changes in population, there is no legal requirement to change any district boundaries. The current districts efficiently and fairly balance geography, population, communities of interest, and party registration. If the majority opts for radically new district boundaries simply to secure a partisan advantage for themselves, they will be dishonoring their commitment to faithfully represent the values of our County and their constituents.

In recent years too many Americans have rejected what should be core patriotic values - collaboration, compromise and the rule of law - and replaced them with a win-at-all-costs mentality. Let us in San Luis Obispo County not be among them. To all our County Supervisors: please honor your promises of openness
and transparency by maintaining the existing district boundaries and allowing your constituents to have a meaningful voice in electing their representatives.

Respectfully,

Chris Bersbach
Arroyo Grande, California
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board Members, NO GERRYMANDERING.

Please respect the existing voting district boundaries. There is no legitimate reason for change at this time, as our demographics have remained quite stable. Any change would appear to be, if not in actuality, politically driven and would be divisive at a time when we need more cooperation among the polity, not more hostility. Districts are to be drawn to fairly represent the residents, not for political gain.

Barry Frantz
San Luis Obispo
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.
Please do not combine representation for Paso Robles and Cambria. This is an atrocious idea.

Sincerely, Julia Whitt
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:00 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]BOS Meeting Nov 19th Redistricting

From: Kate Christensen <kchristensen22@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:34 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]BOS Meeting Nov 19th Redistricting

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Thank you for considering my views.

Given that the county’s districts currently conform to the California Fair Maps Act of 2019, **no change to the existing boundaries is justified.** Census data of 2010 to 2020 does not necessitate change. The draft Map A uses existing boundaries with small changes and is therefore the right choice. Draft Map A is consistent with all governing criteria in the California Fair Maps Act and complies with the Federal Voting Rights Act as confirmed by the county’s expert consultant. Draft Map A preserves communities of interest that have been established over decades. It makes no sense to make changes to district 4 because the current boundaries preserve communities of interest in Nipomo, Arroyo Grande and Oceano. The 2020 census deviation was just 3.19% which does not necessitate a change as District 4 complies with all other criteria. Further District 4 is highly competitive and currently campaigning is already underway for the next competitive election. The California Fair Maps Act explicitly prohibits changes for political gain by a party or incumbent. Why would supervisors including an incumbent running for reelection advocate a change if not for political gain? It would be very wrong to change district boundaries that are already completely compliant. There has been no successful legal challenge to the current map over the last ten years. Map A is the right choice because it meets all the criteria, and it does not change when people vote for their supervisor. Map A is the least costly redistricting option. Map A is the most litigation proof option. Map A complies with all criteria as confirmed by the Redistricting Partners and apolitical and impartial consultant under contract by the Board of Supervisors. Map A preserves existing communities of interest. Under Map A, the city of San Luis Obispo would continue to be represented by more than one supervisor. I believe this is the current representation because the County Board of Supervisors is there to make good decisions for the whole county and it is not about making decisions solely for the city. The city has its own city government. If one Supervisor represented all of the city, it would undoubtedly be making decisions that are more about the city than about the entire county. Map A is the right choice for our county. Please vote to keep our map as near as possible to it is now. Vote for the best and fairest map for our county. Map A is the right choice. Please choose Map A.

Thank you,

Katherine Christensen
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:35 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT] Against redistricting of 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

From: Teresa Borstelmann <miscbor1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:28 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Against redistricting of Cambria

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.
From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:47 PM  
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
Subject: Public Comment - ID 178  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RedistrictingID</th>
<th>178</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/18/2021 12:46:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/18/2021 12:46:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Tseng</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I urge the SLO County Board of Supervisors to keep the current districts and adopt Map A with minor changes, which fully complies with state law. Living in San Luis Obispo, I oppose any move to put the largest city in the county in one district, as that would marginalize all of the City of SLO residents, and would be gerrymandering. Thank you for your time.
RedistrictingID 179
Form inserted 11/18/2021 12:49:48 PM
Form updated 11/18/2021 12:49:48 PM
First Name C
Last Name Ellis
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City Templeton, Ca. 93465
Zip 93465
Comment I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt Map A or Map B. There are no significant changes in the census in San Luis Obispo County to justify any changes to the boundaries.
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. While minor updates to the existing boundaries MAY be required, such changes should be MINIMAL. Above all there is NO reason under the statutory requirements to turn the City of SLO into a single district. Thank you.
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Please include the attached letter advising against redistricting.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
To the Board of Supervisors and interested parties:

I urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt map A or map B. According to the 2020 census, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes. This was confirmed by the County’s redistricting consultant. Maps A and B ensure continuity, respect the communities of interest, minimize the disruptions to the election cycle, and meet statutory requirements.

This is a raw political power grab. It’s happening everywhere and the GOP is behind it. Unfortunately, our current Republican majority at the Board has proved they are highly partisan and brazenly will use political maneuvers to stay in power. As one example, I was appalled and I’m deeply saddened that Supervisors Compton and Arnold used the lies of election fraud to force out our county clerk recorder, Mr. Tommy Gong, and then attempt to replace him with Ms. Compton's attorney.

For far too long our current Republican majority has given the message to our community, 'We don't want to hear from you and we'll do what we want with as little input as possible.' SLO county's population has not changed enough to make drastic redistricting changes and those changes are most likely illegal under Elections Code guidelines. Map A meets all legal criteria without threat of litigation. By not supporting the approach of minor changes, our current Republican majority is highly suspect of gerrymandering. The Patten-version maps and Map C are illegal and shouldn't be considered due to numerous violations of redistricting guidelines.

I support a robust democracy in which all people feel confident their voices and votes will be heard. Politicians do not choose their Voters, Voters choose their politicians.
Sincerely,

Patricia Bennett
Dear Mr. Pechong,

As a 31-year resident of the North County, I most strongly urge to only minimally adjust district lines. Plan A is your choice. Legally, no changes are required so keep them as they are. If you need to make a change, then Plan B is your choice. Any significant changes are likely to undermine confidence in our democracy. As an example, Plan C is especially bad as it is made to swing the votes in ways that benefit some residents only.

Do not succumb to politics and do the right thing for our county.

Daniel Mosunich

Sent from my iPad
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:56 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Comments for November 19, Hearing #3

From: Becky Mosgofian <bmosgofian@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:31 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Comments for November 19, Hearing #3

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to express my concern regarding how the redistricting process is being handled and to encourage you to select Draft Map A.

With existing District #4 having a 2020 census deviation of just 3.19% — a change in existing boundaries isn't necessary. According to the California Fair Maps Act of 2019 Census data between 2010 and 2020 does not necessitate a change to boundaries.

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.

The County’s consultant expert has confirmed that Draft Map A is totally compliant with redistricting requirements. It is also the most economically prudent choice. There are significant economic implications when radical boundary changes are made.

What possible legitimate basis do you have for wanting to modify district boundaries? What it appears to me and to many other constituents is that there is some political gain to be made by changing the District #4 boundaries and THAT self-serving reason is not in the interest of our communities.

Please retain District Map A.

Thank you,

Becky Mosgofian
Arroyo Grande, CA
-----Original Message-----
From: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:49 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting proposals

Public Comment for tomorrow.

- Caleb Mott
Legislative Assistant District 4
San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
(805) 781-4337
(800) 834-4636 ext 4337
District4@co.slo.ca.us
1055 Monterey St D430
San Luis Obispo CA 93408
Visit our Website

-----Original Message-----
From: jandgmacd@gmail.com <jandgmacd@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 7:10 AM
To: Lynn Compton <lcompton@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting proposals

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

Dear Ms. Compton:

We are strongly opposed to current redistricting proposals & believe present district lines do not need to be changed. Agree with all points presented in the editorial written by former police chiefs Gardiner and TerBorch.

Jeannie and Greg MacDougall
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:56 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting maps

From: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:49 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting maps

Public Comment for tomorrow.

- Caleb Mott
Legislative Assistant District 4
San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
(805) 781-4337
(800) 834-4636 ext 4337
District4@co.slo.ca.us
1055 Monterey St D430
San Luis Obispo CA 93408
Visit our Website

From: Monica Mercer <monicasm805@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 6:05 AM
To: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting maps

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

Good morning,

I am a resident of Grover Beach and I have supported you in your role as County Supervisor and will continue to support you in your bid for reelection. I am reaching out to you now to implore you to support Richard Patten's Redistricting map, as it is fair and follows every rule of redistricting and the other maps do not. Please help to keep all Communities of Interest together, whole, and undivided, as this allows for evenly distributed population throughout the county. Richard Patten's Map incorporates the definition of geographical compactness in Communities of Interest that are in proximity with one another. The SLO County staff maps A, B, and C divide SLO City into 3 districts; having 3 supervisorial districts in a single Community of Interest is not allowed, as it violates the rules. Thank you for standing up for what is best and legal for the people you represent and thank you for your service!

Respectfully,
Monica Mercer
-----Original Message-----
From: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:57 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistsants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Public Comment for tomorrow.

- Caleb Mott
Legislative Assistant District 4
San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
(805) 781-4337
(800) 834-4636 ext 4337
District4@co.slo.ca.us
1055 Monterey St D430
San Luis Obispo CA 93408
Visit our Website

-----Original Message-----
From: sharon <hillsharh@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:10 PM
To: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Re: [EXT]Redistricting

I would leave it the same or vote for the plan the League of Women Voters is supporting.
Thanks, Sharon Hill

> On Nov 15, 2021, at 3:42 PM, District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us> wrote:
> 
> > Hello Sharon,
> > 
> > Thank you for passing this on. At this point in the process, Lynn is focused on getting public input and maps on the process. She wants to make sure the process is open and transparent and that the community has a chance to have their voice heard. If you have any other questions or concerns, please let me know.
> > 
> > Respectfully,
> > 
> > - Caleb Mott
> > Legislative Assistant District 4
> > San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
From: Sharon Hill <hillsharh@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 2021 4:44 PM
To: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

Hi Lynn, Just attended the LWV redistricting meeting. Just wondering what your opinion is.
Sharon Hill

Sent from my iPhone
Public Comment for tomorrow.

- Caleb Mott
Legislative Assistant District 4
San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
(805) 781-4337
(800) 834-4636 ext 4337
District4@co.slo.ca.us
1055 Monterey St D430
San Luis Obispo CA 93408
Visit our Website

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

Thanks for replying. Yes, I am very concerned about how Supervisor Compton is disregarding her constituents and seems to be more concerned about pleasing the Republican party. She very much needs to listen to those of us that live in her district. We don't want the GOP determining anything we do here on the Central Coast. Please pass on the info that we want her eyes and ears on the needs of this area and not what the "party" wants her to do. Start by leaving the redistricting alone.

Thanks so much,
Jana Hunstad-Sarver

-----Original Message-----
From: Caleb Mott <cmott@co.slo.ca.us>
To: jhunsar@aol.com <jhunsar@aol.com>
Sent: Wed, Nov 17, 2021 2:17 pm
Subject: Follow Up from Supervisor Compton

Hello Jana,

Thank you for passing your comments on redistricting on to Supervisor Compton. I have printed them out for her to review in advance of Friday’s meeting. She takes all constituent input into account before making a decision. If you have any other questions or concerns, please let me know.
Respectfully,

- Caleb Mott

Legislative Assistant District 4
San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
(805) 781-4337
(800) 834-4636 ext 4337
District4@co.slo.ca.us
1055 Monterey St D430
San Luis Obispo CA 93408
Visit our Website
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

My name is Mary Ellen Maldonado and I live in Grover Beach. After reading about the current map proposals, law requirements for redistricting in California counties from news reports and persons/organizations who are knowledgeable about this issue I firmly support keeping our current districts with only slight changes, if necessary. It is clear that major changes to District 4 and District 2 will ignore one of the main requirements of redistricting which is keeping communities of interest in one district. This move portends jerry meandering. Thank you for your request for comments.

Sent from Malena
Thank you for allowing me to comment on proposed re-districting plans. I do not believe that Cambria and coastal communities should be in the same district as Paso Robles. We have different environmental issues that are too important to be overlooked. It seems to me to be an effort by Republican politicians to try and garner more votes because of greed and a disregard for our fragile central coast which belongs to EVERYBODY.
Hello all,

There is no need to redistrict SLO county. The current lines are sufficient and any attempt to change those is a blatant misuse of political power to hold onto control. Representation locally already has a bias even though the majority of constituents seem to lean opposite the board. Any redistricting will have a detrimental effect on local politics in an already strained environment this would be a huge misstep.

Thank you for your time,

Carter McGowan
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

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Judith Cleary

Your Email: [redacted]

U.S. phone number: [redacted]

Message: There is no demographic need to redraw the districts this year. The proposed changes are blatantly political/partisan and are thus, I believe, illegal.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 549070

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2787

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 1:14:43 PM
EXCELLENT LETTER!!
Mike Walsh

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get Outlook for Android

Dear Board of Supervisors:

At its regular monthly meeting last night, November 17th, the North Coast Advisory Council (NCAC) voted to recommend to the San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors (BOS) that they adopt the draft Map A for the 5 supervisorial districts in SLO county, which keeps the boundaries of the districts largely as they now exist.
Cambria is currently in District 2, along with several other North Coast unincorporated areas, including San Simeon, Cayucos, and Los Osos. These communities, along with Morro Bay (which is incorporated), constitute a Community of Interest (COI) because of their similar concerns about coastal resources, including the proposed development of offshore energy and the existing and proposed marine sanctuaries, and our reliance on tourism for a major portion of our economy.

Keeping COI’s together is an important principle in redistricting; therefore, it is fitting that Cambria remain in this COI and not be grouped with other, more urban, areas that do not share our particular concerns, which draft Map C would specifically do.

In addition, because the county’s population since the last census in 2010 did not change sufficiently to warrant that district boundaries be redrawn, Map A is legally sufficient. This choice also preserves the compactness of the district.

The NCAC urges the Board of Supervisors to be mindful of these considerations during its redistricting deliberations and adopt Map A.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Glusovich
Chair, North Coast Advisory Council
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:39 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, 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
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Steve Poteete-Marshall <steve@atascaderoumc.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:16 PM
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.

As a resident of Atascadero, I am writing to appeal to the board to retain the current borders and not make new district lines.
This is one way we can continue to insure that the public is served with just governing.
Thank you,
Steve Poteete-Marshall
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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:22 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: Mark Stetz

Your Email: [redacted]

U.S. phone number: [redacted]

Message: I write this with a profoundly spiritual concern. Although I am a Catholic priest in this county and the bishop’s representative to all the Catholic communities here, I am not writing this from a religious perspective — this is exclusively spiritual. The areas being considered in the new districts would dangerously alter the spiritual balance of our region and county. I have led spiritual communities and interacted with other spiritual leaders in this area for more than 17 years. We often celebrate the very spirit of San Luis Obispo. What you are considering would change that from one that recognizes the value and spirituality of our coast line and our environment. This is a particularly precarious step, at this time with the world environment. You are considering a motion that word subsume our environmental concerns with those of more developed areas, who would overpower the delicate balance and the urgent need of our environment and spirit. I beg you to please consider this important step within the spiritual heritage of San Luis Obispo County. Please do not let us lose this balance.
Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 559330

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2789

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 1:21:35 PM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 1:21:35 PM
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 writing to remind the Board that the recent census data confirms that there is NO NEED to make any changes to the current supervisorial district maps. In the event you feel any changes are necessary, they should be limited to those contained in map A.

Map C, which cuts Cambria off from its neighboring coastal communities and ties it to Paso Robles, is a blatant attempt by political partisans to game the system (I think it's called "gerrymandering") in favor of one political party over another. Given that the Board is supposed to be nonpartisan, this is to be avoided.

Thank you,

Jim Townsend
Cambria, CA
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:44 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]NO to 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
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Barbara Howard <barbarahoward321@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:31 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]NO to Redistricting

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

Dear Sups,
That you retain the current district lines would be my first choice. I feel the current districts are fair and balanced and any major redrawing would smack of gerrymandering. Enough precious time and tax-payer money has gone into this process, when none of the SLO County districts changed enough to necessitate boundary changes. Seems like another waste, when so many other county matters desperately need your time and attention.

- Please keep the lines the same.
- If smallish change must be had, I'd say Plan B would get my grudging "go-ahead"

Thank you,
Barbara Howard
Grover Beach
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:47 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
[link]
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Josephine Laing <josephine@stepintomagic.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:50 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 Members of the Board of Supervisors of San Luis Obispo County,

I'm writing again to urge you to retain the current district lines. These are currently fairly divided with respect to: population, geography, party registration and community interest. They are also fully in compliance with election laws. No more tricks, please.

Thank you,
Josephine
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

----- Forwarded Message ----- 
From: "scanner@cbstar.com" <scanner@cbstar.com>
To: Darla Stephenson <darlahomes@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021, 12:52:40 PM PST
Subject: Message from "RNP5838791DFF66"

This E-mail was sent from "RNP5838791DFF66" (IM C3000).
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,

[Signature]

11/18/21
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

Message:
Regarding the redistricting plans: I urge you to retain the current district lines. The current districts are balanced and to change them would be seen as a partisan gerrymandering scheme. Please retain the current district boundaries.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 836815

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2795

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 1:56:16 PM
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
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Message: I strongly oppose draft plan 3 which would separate our coastal communities of interest and imbed us in the largely rural, conservative and economically different part of the county and dilute our voices representing our home coast region. Please retain our current district areas of common interest representation. Sincerely, James Smith Cambria

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 078439

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2796

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 1:58:16 PM
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:54 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Richard Patton Map

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%7C7C1166587ea955416c119808d9aae8f53f%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728739792569025%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8eyjWjoiMC4wLjAwMDAnLCJ8Il8%7C0%7C637728739792569025%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8eyjWjoiMC4wLjAwMDAnLCJ8Il8%7C0%7C637728739792569025%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8eyjWjoiMC4wLjAwMDAnLCJ8Il8%7C0%7C637728739792569025%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8eyjWjoiMC4wLjAwMDAnLCJ8Il8%7C0%7C637728739792569025%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8eyjWjoiMC4wLjAwMDAnLCJ8Il8%7C0%7C637728739792569025%7CUnknown%7CTWfpbGZsb3d8eyjWjoiMC4wLjAwMDAnLCJ8Il8%7C3000&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Cynthia Reynolds <thearoo@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Richard Patton Map

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

In favor the Richard Patton map as it must evenly distributed the population. I do not want SLO and CalPoly broken up

Cindy Reynolds

Sent from my iPhone
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:54 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&amp;data=04%7C01%7C7magbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C7C7b320d4a2d114e2a469008d9aee8f5ae%7C84c3c7747df40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728739792150864%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1hdGhvZCI6Nn0%3D%3D&amp;sdata=%2Bi50VfmvqWP2VAauZ%2FwqixXx1C%2B9s5nXHwdfUdlfz6oo%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Judy Salamacha <judysalamacha@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:22 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.

Keep current districts whole....especially Estero Bay with Los Osos, Morro Bay, Cayucos and even Cambria together...no need to change the political county lines during this redistricting decade.

Judy Salamacha
Freelance Journalist: Salamacha PR Strategies
Author: COLONEL BAKER’S FIELD: An American Pioneer Story (Bear State Books, 2013) Program Chair: Morro Bay Rotary
GAC Committee: MB Chamber of Commerce Board Member: Garden House of MB

President Abraham Lincoln: A good man/women must take the world as he/she finds it. Then he/she must do what little he/she can to make it a bit better.
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

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,

Christie Youngdale
District 1

Sent from my iPad
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:55 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Fwd: 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: Todd Youngdale <tyoungdale@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Fwd: Redistricting map

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

ITo the Board of 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.
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,

Todd Youngdale
District 1

Sent from my iPad
From: Maria G. Brown
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:55 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 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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:37 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: Lenora Gentry
Your Email: *************
U.S. phone number: *************
Message: Please do not split SLO County in half and keep us with Santa Barbara. Districts should be geographically contiguous. Thank you.

Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 812337
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2797
Form inserted: 11/18/2021 2:36:28 PM
Form updated: 11/18/2021 2:36:28 PM
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
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

Message: Supervisors: Because of the COVID-19 Pandemic, I will not attend the Board of Supervisors Meeting November 19. I’m well past 60 and do not feel safe attending large gathering. Efforts should have been made to continued the use of telephone comments from the public. This would have allowed Senior Citizens and people with comprise immune systems to make public comments. Written comments do not have the same effect as in person or phoning in during the meeting. Carrie Pardo Given the seriousness of choosing County Supervisory Districts for the coming decade, all residents of the County should have the same opportunity to attend and speak at Board of Supervisors Meeting.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 354936

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2798
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:57 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redrawing County 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
www.slocounty.ca.gov
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

From: Carole Toerge <caroletoerge1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:46 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redrawing County District Lines

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

I support the Richard Patton map ID74786. I do not wish to have San Luis Obispo city split up.

Sincerely,

Carole Toerge
From: Maria G. Brown
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Public Comment - ID 182

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:58 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 182

RedistrictingID 182
Form inserted 11/18/2021 2:56:54 PM
Form updated 11/18/2021 2:56:54 PM
First Name Ossana
Last Name Terterian
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented Cambria Community Services District
City Cambria
Zip 93428
Comment 11/19/21 Redistricting Hearing #3 - Agenda item not yet assigned - Please see attached letter from the Board of Directors of the Cambria Community Services District
Public Records Notice True
Good afternoon,

This letter is an attachment to the Public Comment Form already submitted via the General Public Comment Submission page. Please include in the Hearing set for tomorrow 11/19/21.

Thank you,

Ossana Terterian
November 18, 2021

San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors  

Re: Current Redistricting Evaluation

Dear Board of Supervisors:

This letter is submitted by the Cambria Community Services District (CCSD) Board of Directors regarding the current redistricting evaluation being conducted by the SLO County Board of Supervisors (BOS). The CCSD is in strong support of maintaining the existing Districting Lines (Map A) relative to current Supervisorial Districts. Specifically, our letter addresses the unincorporated community of Cambria within its current District 2 designation. Cambria is located within an historic Community of Interest (COI) coastal footprint. The remaining coastal corridor of District 2 communities (San Simeon, Cayucos, Morro Bay and Los Osos) are also unincorporated, except for Morro Bay. We have many areas of shared concern that affect our sustainability, including sea level rise, dependence on a tourist economy, environmental commitment, fire risk, and access to fresh water sources.

Being unincorporated, we are significantly impacted by BOS decisions such as land use, road paving priorities, garbage rates, and vacation rental growth. It is essential that this coastal corridor COI remain in its current District 2 designation and not be redistricted to communities without shared commonalities. Realignment into any urban based inland district would, in effect, suppress the voice and needs of the coastal unincorporated communities, while damaging an historically defined COI. Specifically, Map C presents serious dilution of coastal interests and creates a lack of compactness (ignoring two of the five criteria established in Community of Interest guidelines).

In a broader sense, the current BOS's desire to redraw all district lines in the County appears redundant. Current district definitions meet all State requirements for population balance (less than 10% deviation), and fairness of representation (minority representation, communities of interest and compactness).

The BOS's considerable discussion and focus on the effects of districting on city-based communities is a predictable concern for the unincorporated regions of San Luis Obispo County. Special district coastal populations do not have a back-drop of city government, with its infrastructures, to hear and meet the needs of our community members. The County is our governance in many areas and we advocate that you not lose sight of these special district needs.
The Cambria Community Services District urges the San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors to be circumspect in their consideration of redistricting and recognize the diverse needs of communities within the County they serve.

Cindy Steidel, President
Board of Directors

Donn Howell, Vice-President
Board of Directors
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
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 include the attached letter advising against redistricting.
November 18, 2021

To: The County Board of Supervisors, San Luis Obispo, CA Date: 11/19/21
From: Greenspace-the Cambria Land Trust
Re: Opposition to Proposed Redistricting in SLO County

Dear Honorable Board Members,

Current census data, redistricting principles, and recently enacted statutory criteria governing rebalancing or redrawing of California Supervisorial districts does not support a need for any significant changes to District 2’s current boundary.

Greenspace-the Cambria Land Trust has advocated and worked for the protection and preservation of natural resources in North SLO County for over 30 years. As such, we believe the proposed redistricting will be harmful to our local coastal communities and to SLO County at large and join with the many other organizations and voices opposing redistricting.

Research has shown that the facts support this position against redistricting. The county’s minimal population growth does not mandate change. Communities of interest, a defined criteria for districting, currently in District 2 have common social and economic interests, including coastal tourism, and corresponding economic interest in protecting the coastal environment.

The Santa Lucia Mountain Range separates Cambria and rural North County SLO, which does not meet the “contiguous or compactness” criteria for redistricting. Additionally, coastal communities will face distinctively different challenges of climate change needing to be addressed in the future.

We ask the Board of Supervisors to respect the geographic and demographic integrity of Communities of Interest, as stipulated in redistricting criteria. District changes are simply not justified.
The Board must remain a transparent, fact-driven entity acting in a non-partisan fashion benefiting our coastal communities. Greenspace joins with many others here in Cambria and Coastal San Luis Obispo County to urge your action against unnecessary redistricting, and its related disruption and cost.

Sincerely,

John Seed
President, The Cambria Land Trust
From: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:11 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]NO on Redistricting from Cambria! Please read at BOS meeting.

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

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.
To: The County Board of Supervisors, San Luis Obispo, CA

Submitted 11/9/21 for meeting on 11/19/21

From: Cambrians for Preserving District 2

Re: Redistricting in SLO County District 2, and Preventing Gerrymandering

OUR SHARED POSITION

Current census data, traditional redistricting principles, and recently enacted statutory criteria governing decisions about the rebalancing or redrawing of California Supervisorial districts do not support a need for any significant changes to District 2 current boundary.

DISCUSSION

The county’s population growth has been minimal. No reason for change.

The communities of interest that are currently in District 2 have the following common social and economical interests:

* We are all communities with economies that have heavy coastal tourism components. Our communities have a strong interest in protecting the coastal environment, while still promoting accessibility and enjoyment of those who want to enjoy the coast.

** The balance of ecological preservation and economic activity require a different set of considerations than communities that are more agriculturally oriented. Both of these types of communities deserve effective and fair representation. It is not appropriate to have the voice of small coastal communities dampened or muted by larger population interests. We need our own voice related to planning. We have the Santa Lucia Mountain Range separating Cambria and rural North County, which does not meet the contiguous or compactness criteria.

**The coastal communities may face distinct challenges should water levels continue to rise as a result of climate change. These challenges are distinct from the climate-related challenges that might face inland communities.

**the coastal communities have priorities around water access (& preservation of access for residents) that are necessarily different than those of agriculturally-driven communities.
**For these reasons, the coastal communities also need to have a strong dominant voice on the Coastal Commission. We would note that Map C and others would have four of five districts reach the coast. This softens the voice of the people who are actually living and working on the coast daily, as these communities are currently represented by only two districts. There was discussion at the last BOS meeting that there needs to be more supervisors represented on the coast to have more impact on the Coastal Commission. YOU know this is not true! The Coastal Commission is here to protect the coast.

* Several of the communities currently in District 2 are unincorporated, and we therefore have a single voice determining the rules that govern the places we call home...that voice being the rules and regulations of San Luis Obispo County. We do not have city governments that could protect the interests of the residents of this community if the county were to adopt rules that would otherwise be harmful to the interests of our community.

Please respect the geographic integrity of Communities of Interest. Radical change is not justified by the census data. We favor Map A or B.

Lastly, the Board shall not adopt supervisorial district boundaries for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party. Section 21500 (d)

Please, let the Board be transparent, fact-based, and fact-driven. Let it be non-partisan, and protect and preserve the diversity of all communities of interest, and let us be proud of our governmental representatives.

Thank you.

Cambrians for Preserving District 2

David & Karen Pearson       Mike & Sharon Evans       Gerry & Marty Main
Teresa Pilot               Frank Widmann                 Barb Buchanan
Tina & John Dickason        David & Tish Breda           Pat Moreno
Tom & Barbara Thompson      Dan & Carolyn Golowka         Janet Cooper
Sharkey & Nancy Warrick    Allan MacKinnon               Mary & Jim Webb
Elaine & Payam Zamani      Ann Glaser                   David & Judy Skartvedt
Marshall & Ilme Hamilton    John & Glenda Hoskins        Mary & Jim Webb
Kent & Lisa Delgadillo     Cheryl McDowell               Evaan & Roland Portillo
Marcia & John Rhoades      Joan Cehn                     Joseph Sorensen
Ricki Jones                Jim & Michelle Razor           Greg & Karen Whitney
Jeff Bloom                 Marilyn Staats               Tess Syrjanen
Mahala Burton              Steve & Rita Burton           Bill & Carol Gerlach
Margaret Mic               Curt & Karen Snow            Brenda Gale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richard &amp; Susan Burchiel</th>
<th>Victoria &amp; Serge Krassensky</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Bookout</td>
<td>John &amp; Diane Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claud &amp; Cheryl Corvino</td>
<td>Amy &amp; Adrian Taron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Cindy Harbeson</td>
<td>Tom Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Parsons</td>
<td>Sue Kersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Stone</td>
<td>Eugene Blanck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pitton</td>
<td>Mark Bronson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collen Juarez</td>
<td>Linda &amp; Terry Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Barnes</td>
<td>Darrell Bronson-Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Barnes</td>
<td>Stevan &amp; Lori Rosenlind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Farmer</td>
<td>William and Suzanne Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Farmer</td>
<td>Joseph Crowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Baldwin</td>
<td>Ellen Finnerty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kennedy</td>
<td>Barbara &amp; Don Dallman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zale Shuster</td>
<td>Harry Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Baldwin</td>
<td>Mel McCulloch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Linn</td>
<td>Mike &amp; Jenny Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Chapman</td>
<td>Dawn Stephey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Clevenger</td>
<td>Loretta &amp; Ken Butterfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Aitkens</td>
<td>Mike &amp; Jenny Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Michel</td>
<td>Terry &amp; Thelma Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fitzrandolph</td>
<td>Eunice Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Spiderman</td>
<td>Marylyn Villeneuve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Maxted</td>
<td>Delphine Vega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Peck</td>
<td>Christine Heinrichs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlotta McDonald</td>
<td>Richard Beekman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Rodgers</td>
<td>Tony &amp; Penny Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Pezzoli-Kennedy</td>
<td>Lisa Tanzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Brauer</td>
<td>Marcelle Bakula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lacey</td>
<td>Anthony Tripi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Covello</td>
<td>Barbara Crowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Covello</td>
<td>Gail Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Tambeaux</td>
<td>Jim Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Walters</td>
<td>Robert Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Connor</td>
<td>Robert Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Ziol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Berghoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Berghoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lawton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Peck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Himsworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Rich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Goddard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joost Teunissen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mcmillen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Langwassers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is made up of actual Cambria residents, and if you want emails or addresses, please let me know. Karen Pearson konatika@gmail.com

Thankyou.
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:00 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Special meeting of November 19th public comment

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&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7Cf32aeeeea1084260422608d9aae8fe6a%7C84c3c7747fd40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637728739932446006%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=RqPCFHf%2BaCA41Mod2Y9yCcGsswRLG7OQZaKvyFKNASs%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Harry Farmer <harry@hfastrologer.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:58 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Special meeting of November 19th public comment

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

My name is Harry Farmer, 35 year resident of Cambria, as well as having moved to San Luis Obispo County in 1979. And while I am a twice elected member of the Cambria Community Services District Board of Directors, I am making this comment as a private citizen.

While the premise of Redistricting to allow for balanced representation among all the citizenry in various communities and County Districts is an admirable goal to achieve, removing Cambria from District 2 is not in the best interest of our town. As described in the criteria to be used in drawing District lines, “communities of interest” with common social, economic and environmental identities should be included in any decision making, in fact perhaps the major criteria. Obviously San Simeon and Cambria, Cayucos, Morro Bay, and Los Osos/Baywood Park share being adjacent to the Pacific Ocean, and are therefore defined as “beach towns” reliant on tourism for our economic well being. Plus we are mostly intersected by Highway One, a road traveled by locals and tourists alike known for decades by folks from all over the world for its visual beauty. In addition, the communities named above are in some fashion all under the auspices of the
California Coastal Commission, thereby sharing a common connection regarding water and land use issues and regulations, as well as wonderful beaches.

Also, with regard to encouraging geographical compactness, another criteria in drawing Board of Supervisor’s District boundaries, there is a connectedness among the coastal communities regarding relative closeness. Placing Cambria in District 1, where we are 30 miles from Paso Robles, a large inland incorporated city with which we have essentially no common identity, and with no population of consequence in between, makes no sense. No one I’ve spoken with in our town favors being removed from District 2.

In conclusion, I urge the County Board of Supervisors to make no changes of consequence regarding the essential makeup of any of the 5 Districts of San Luis Obispo County.

Thank you very much.
In regards to the proposed redistricting, I am writing you to request that communities of common interest be preserved. Please keep north coast communities together. We share mutual interests in the environment, labor issues, and transportation needs. Please do not tear apart the strong bonds that have developed over the years. Thank you for your dedicated service to San Luis Obispo County.
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:13 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: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:00 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: Colleen Runyen

Your Email: [REDACTED]

U.S. phone number: [REDACTED]

Message: Please do not move forward on redistricting. It is unnecessary and divisive. You have so much serious business to attend to, such as water conservation and addressing the continuing development of dry farmed land into irrigated crops. This is political and inappropriate at this point in time. Sincerely, Colleen P. Runyen

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 052143

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2799

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 2:59:06 PM
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 Members,

When going through the process of redrawing the county lines, I believe the Richard Pattern,s citizens map should be followed as his map complies best with intent of the guidelines of AB849.

Thank you!

HaeJa Crisman
im understanding that an independent body that california worked hard on achieving to redraw lines is not to be utilized in this redraw, that is very disappointing. I would like the lines to be redrawn by a non partisan committee, not officials who have a bias. And from the data observed doesn't seem like the population changed enough to even warrant a change. I will be at the meeting to see if these questions are answered. Thank you
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:15 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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:09 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: barbara j wright

Your Email: 

U.S. phone number: 

Message: I strongly favor the RICHARD PATTON MAP.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 902217

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2800

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 3:08:00 PM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 3:08:00 PM
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

There have been minimal demographic, population, or communities of interest (COI) changes in SLO county since the last census was taken. Our district maps should reflect these minimal changes with minimal district line changes such as map A.

Do not split the coastal communities and lump them into the areas to the east.

Thanks,

Janet Leonard and Brent Nolan
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:31 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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:20 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: Anne Marie Kirkpatrick

Your Email: 

U.S. phone number: 

Message: Re: Redistricting. I am against Plan C. I am for retaining present boundaries as the demographics shifts are negligible.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 154103

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2801

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 3:20:07 PM
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: RE: County Redistricting Honorable Board of Supervisors, The purpose of my letter is to urge you to make no adjustments to the current county district boundaries as you consider the question of redistricting San Luis Obispo county. The most current census data demonstrates moving district boundaries is unnecessary and not supported by legal mandate because demographic shifts have been minimal. The current districts’ configuration reflects a wisdom in its support for communities of interest and demonstrate regional continuity. The only other option that would be appropriate is Map A. It reflects minor adjustments to the current districts and the only option for redistricting that meets federal mandates. Sincerely, Linda Chipping

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 511578
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2802

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 3:21:18 PM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 3:21:18 PM
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:33 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 input

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: Seona Lampman <seona@charter.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:25 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Meeting input

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

To the SLO County Board of Supervisors:

I understand that there is a proposal to split up representation of the City of San Luis Obispo into 3 parts with three different Supervisors. This does not make sense to me and affects the representation of other parts of the County. I favor the Richard Patton citizen’s map because the City of SLO is then represented by one Supervisor. His map follows the guidelines of AB849 the best, so that the population of SLO County is more evenly distributed.

Please support the Richard Patton map.

Respectfully,

Seona Lampman
Morro Bay, CA 93442
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

Your Name: Sharon K. Roberts
Your Email: ************
U.S. phone number: ************

Message: I cannot attend the November 19th meeting, but would like to weigh in on your decision about redrawing our district maps. I support Plan B. I do not wish to see large changes in the current coastal districts, but I do believe Cal Poly housing should all be in one district. The other change I would like to see is a Board that does not play politics, or a member or group of members that need to hog the spotlight. The spotlight should be on doing what is best for the entire county, not partisan politics. In the future I believe this redistricting should be done the way Santa Barbara County is doing theirs with a non-partisan committee working fairly to meet the legal requirements.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 235131
BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2803

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 3:30:01 PM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 3:30:01 PM
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: In regard to the BOS meeting tomorrow at 9:00 AM on the topic of redistricting. I hope to be there but do wish to express my opinion in writing that there is no logical or rational reason to change our current District boundaries; there is no demographic shift to justify it. I am in favor of Map A or perhaps Map B as favored by the League of Women Voters. I live in Los Osos and any proposal that divides District Two is completely unwarranted and illegal in my opinion. We are a north coast Community of Interest; in particular in regard to our coastal community, the gateway to Big Sur and all the recreational and commercial activities reliant on coastal access. Tourism is our number 1 economic interest and any attempt to disrupt the introspection of the District 2 coastal communities may result in a detriment to the livelihood of hundreds of our residents. Please retain our current 5 Districts; they serve the needs of the entire county just fine.

Public Records Notice: True
Security Check: 449951

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2804

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 3:31:19 PM

Form updated: 11/18/2021 3:31:19 PM
First Name: Sharon
Last Name: Smith
Email: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
City: Cambria
Zip: 93428

Comment: I wish to express my opposition to Draft Plan C. Our coastal area should not be included with the interior areas of the county. Please retain the current supervisorial districts. Thank you.
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:40 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting in SLO County
Attachments: Redistricting SLO County --2021.doc

From: Lee McFarland <leemcfarl@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:35 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting in SLO County

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

Please read and consider the comments in the attached letter. Thank you,
Marshall L. McFarland
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 believe that there is any compelling reason to redraw district lines at this time. The effort comes across as a partisan effort to gerrymander in favor of one political party over another.

Norman Baxter
Janet Baxter
Arroyo Grande
Dear Board of Supervisors,
There have been minimal demographic, population, or communities of interest (COI) changes in SLO county since the last census was taken. Our district maps should reflect that information, with minimal district line changes. Do not split the common coastal communities and lump them into the areas to the east.
Thank for your consideration,
Katy Budge
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County’s network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

November 18, 2021

Ron krassensky
6905 Jordan Rd
Cambria Ca 93428

San Luis Obispo County
Board of Directors

As a long term resident of the North Coast community, I strongly oppose the map that disassembles an identity and traditional association. This demolition plan makes no sense, if you take in the concept of community interest. And there has been no explanation of a real need for change from proponents. In fact there is no reason to make such drastic change. This is political, gerrymandering has long been a staple of Republican voting tactics. And that’s the only reason that makes sense behind this move.

Best said, in a letter to the editor of the Nov 8th to the Paso Robles Daily by Cindy Marie Absey, the President of the Women’s League of Voters SLO. In keeping a strong democratic theme the WLV IS “committed to ensuring that this process results fairly determined districts where election outcomes reflect the will of the electorate”

(let my intention was to be present to deliver this msg but did not work out and I’m sending this email)

Let’s keep Democracy strong

Ron krassensky
VICKI JANSEN, Legislative Assistant
First District Supervisor John Peschong
1055 Monterey St., D430
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-4491/Fax (805) 781-1350
vjansen@co.slo.ca.us

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

From: Karen Pearson <konatika@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:07 PM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT] Redistricting.

From: Karen Pearson <konatika@gmail.com>
Subject: Public Comment for 11/19/21
Date: November 18, 2021 at 10:33:15 AM PST
To: redistricting@co.slo.ca.us, district4@co.slo.ca.us, district5@co.slo.ca.us, Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us, dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us

From the Ralph M. Brown Act:

“The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is
not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created”. Gov’t Code 54950

Please, work FOR the people who have elected you. Maps A & B are the only ones that should be considered. Communities of Interest should be top priority.

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

Good Afternoon,

Please find attached a letter to the County Board of Supervisors regarding the County Redistricting process sent by Mayor Erica A Stewart on behalf of the City of San Luis Obispo City Council.

Thank you,

Teresa Purrington
pronouns she/her/hers
City Clerk

CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

City Administration
990 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3218

Stay connected with the City by signing up for e-notifications

e-notifications
November 18, 2021

Chair Lynn Compton
County Government Center
1055 Monterey Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

RE: County Redistricting

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for accepting this letter from the City of San Luis Obispo representing its nearly 48,000 residents and nearly 50,000 workers that are employed in or directly adjacent to the city. The decisions on County redistricting are critical for the continued trust and well-being of the relationship between the entire County’s population and your Board, our regionally elected representatives.

This letter is intended to support the Board’s stated objective of making a legally supported decision, as well as educating the general public about foundational principles for good governance. California is quite unique in the United States for having specific laws regarding the redistricting process, which specifically prohibit districting decisions based on political objectives. Instead, California law requires district maps to be based on the demographic and population data revealed by the latest census, while also placing the concept of “community of interest”, as defined in the Elections Code (Fair Maps Act) at the center of this public policy framework. That being said, the City of San Luis Obispo sees virtually no change in the U.S. census data and thus sees no statutory or legal foundation for changing the voting district lines significantly. We note that Map A, as well as the County’s expert consultant, reflects this observation.

We believe that the law and essential governance principles also support this conclusion, as discussed briefly below:

1. Supervisorial Districts must comply with applicable Federal, State and County codes. Any proposed boundary changes must be supported by changes in census data, which are very minimal. Any proposed boundary changes must address potential dilution concerns under and otherwise demonstrate compliance with the federal Voting Rights Act (VRA) and consider impacts in other jurisdictions under the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA). Any boundary changes effecting changes within the City must also mitigate against a domino effect on the other four districts and their populations, which could implicate state and federally protected legal interests for marginalized voters. For instance, any changes contemplated must be evaluated for adverse impacts on the representation and influence of Latinx or Latino populations in Oceano and Nipomo, and the geographic and coastal jurisdictional interests shared by northern coastal cities, distinct from other adjacent communities such as Templeton and Paso Robles.

2. Supervisorial Districts should provide geographic boundaries that recognize that the City of San Luis Obispo and its neighborhoods are comprised of widely diverse “communities of interests” extending beyond municipal boundaries that compels a broader and more diverse representation; the city is not, and should not be treated as, a monolithic community. The law requires the Board
of Supervisors to take these communities of interest into account and their effective representation even before consideration of municipal boundaries. As an example, the neighborhoods to the south of the city are more broadly connected to the Edna Valley via commerce, transportation, water, etc. The Foothill Neighborhood is more economically, socially, and culturally connected to the coast. The western portion of the city and neighborhoods along Los Osos Valley Road and South Higuera are more connected to southern coastal areas of Avila and Pismo Beaches. The northern part of the city is connected to the communities above the Cuesta Grade as the wildland urban interface and grazing areas of ranches that directly abut the city. These communities of interest are currently effectively represented in supervisorial districts recognizing these historic connections. Disrupting these connections is antithetical to the goals of the Fair Maps Act, under which the municipal boundaries of the City are secondary to established communities of interest.

3. The Board must also recognize and take into account that the City of San Luis is the County seat, center for government services of all types, the major employment hub, deeply interconnected with, but jurisdictionally distinct from, a nationally recognized state university, and the site of many other key County-wide interests. It is crucial that a majority of the Board, at least three Supervisors, represent the breadth of interests shared by the County (including the unincorporated area, as well as within each city), that are singularly contained within the City’s boundaries—regional transportation, government, commerce, water, agriculture, housing, homelessness, emergency services, to name a few.

4. Supervisorial Districts should recognize that Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo share multiple common interests ranging from classic “Town-Gown” issues to many shared services, such as law enforcement partnerships, fire, and transportation. Having multiple Supervisors familiar with the diverse, but interrelated interests and policy issues between the City and the university is crucial for the tens of thousands of people who live and work in this uniquely situated economic and cultural flagship of the County.

5. Supervisorial Districts should include and reflect diversity, equity, and inclusion. As stated above, any potential changes must not dilute the current influence and power of any interests legally protected and guaranteed by the CVRA and federal voting rights laws. As important, it is incumbent on the Board to acknowledge the simple ethical imperative not to harm traditionally underrepresented populations when making this decision, and in fact to promote representational equity.

As outlined above and as understood by the City, we assert that there is no legal reason or imperative to make sweeping changes to district lines based on the need for “balance”, “compromise” or other reasons not part of the Fair Maps Act that we understand as being promoted or discussed at the Board’s initial hearings on this topic. Based on the census data, and the law, minimal if any changes are supported, beyond (possibly) a few minor adjustments in alignment with minor population or census boundary shifts.

The Fair Maps Act compels significant public transparency and opportunity for public review and comment prior to the Board’s adoption of a districting map. Accordingly, the Board should select from among the published and publicly reviewed and analyzed maps on which the public has had the opportunity to
engage and comment. Any significant last-minute revisions are ill-advised and risk legal challenge for defects resulting from unintended and unstudied consequences of late revisions and lack of public transparency and compliance with public review, comment, and hearing provisions of the Fair Maps Act, which is intended to stop the practice of redistricting “bait & switch”.

Attempts to suggest that the City of San Luis Obispo is a monolith of communities of interest, such that jurisdictional boundary considerations should supersede all other legally required considerations, while ignoring the significant adverse ripple effects of such action throughout the County, are improper and legally suspect and are undermining of public trust. It is clear that placing the City of San Luis Obispo into a single district would drive other mapping changes that adversely divide and affect long-established and logically connected communities of interest throughout the County and would raise serious concerns regarding compliance with the Fair Maps Act and representational equity of racial and ethnic minority groups throughout the County. Such action cannot be justified by the data or the law and should not be pursued by your Board.

We look forward to the Board’s considered deliberations and publicly transparent decision regarding this foundational democratic process. Please feel free to contact me, the City Manager or City Attorney for any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Erica A. Stewart
Mayor

CC: City Council, San Luis Obispo
    City Council, Arroyo Grande
    City Council, Atascadero
    City Council, Grover Beach
    City Council, Morro Bay
    City Council, Paso Robles
    City Council, Pismo Beach
    Derek Johnson, City Manager
    Wade Horton, CAO
RedistrictingID 186
Form inserted 11/18/2021 3:55:31 PM
Form updated 11/18/2021 3:55:31 PM
First Name Janice
Last Name Kline
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented (none)
City Arroyo Grande
Zip 93420
Comment I’d like to express my support for retaining the County Supervisor districts as they are currently. Changing them risks breaking up communities of interest and unfairly advantaging partisan interests.
Public Records Notice True
Per the census & County’s consultant, district growth does NOT require changes. Based on criteria in State law & Voting Rights Act I strongly urge the Board to adopt Map A or Map B. Both reflect existing boundaries. The Board did not authorize an independent commission; I can only deduce that the other plans reflect partisan goals of majority members. If current/future demographics are not represented by final map, distrust & division will grow in our community.
-----Original Message-----
From: Christine Parker-Kennedy <cparkerkennedy@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:07 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Chris Parker-Kennedy <cparkerkennedy@gmail.com>
Subject: [EXT]Public Comment

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

After much study, I support Map B as the best one for Supervisors to support. I agree that Cal Poly students should be in the same district. Other than that, our existing map is adequate and functional for our county needs; we would save significant cost and time before the upcoming June election by keeping the boundaries mostly as they are. I live in Paso Robles, and I do not think that our common interests coincide with Cambria or the coastal communities. I therefore urge you to support Map B. Thank you.

Christine Parker-Kennedy
Paso Robles 93446
-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:07 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistsants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistsants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]I support the Richard Patten map ID74786

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&amp;data=04%7C01%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C37c87adcc3524fa0bdf08d9af0964d%7C84c3c7747df40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C637728772546915279%7CUUnKnown%7CtWFpbGZsb3d8eyjWljioiMC4wLjAwMDAiLC1zrjoiV2luMzlilCJBTi1i+Ik1haWwiLCJXVC16Mi93D%7C3000&amp;sdata=TEHClgr%2B%2Bz27%2Bwuey4LMkJ3IDrtV0xaK%2B1g4OzDBTU%3D&amp;reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: molly pasutti <zootymoon333@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:43 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]I support the Richard Patten map ID74786

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

I support the Richard Patten map ID74786 thank you Molly Pasutti
From: Maria G. Brown
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:08 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:08 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 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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:47 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: Barbara Akle

Your Email: [REDACTED]

U.S. phone number:

Message: Myself and my husband urge all the SLO county supervisors to vote to maintain the current district lines. Any change is not in the best interests of our county.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 381625

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2805

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 3:46:11 PM
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

Hello,

We live in Cambria and are strongly on the side of keeping current district guidelines in effect. We feel we are aligned with other coastal communities rather than larger inland cities for so many reasons.

Thank you,

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

To the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors:

We have been active members of the Paso Robles Community for the past 37 years. We have observed that the North County has operated as a “Community of Interest”, sharing common service and land use issues. Although we enjoy visiting the coastal communities between Montana de Oro and San Simeon, we recognize that they share a different set of common interests and issues than we do in North County.

Option “C” would combine Paso Robles and Cambria and divide the coastal communities, weakening their abilities to tend to their own priorities. The result would be two separate Communities of Interest competing for limited resources and differing visions.

We strongly protest adoption of Option “C” for redistricting.

Ed and Madeleine Gallagher
Paso Robles
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 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 love my district and I love San Luis Obispo County!!
November 18, 2021

San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors

Re: Redistricting

Dear Honorable Board Members,

You have a difficult choice ahead of you, similar to Solomon cutting the baby in half perhaps, or in this case fifths. Your choice is made more difficult because of various environmental issues, areas of expertise required and politics.

Like all the Districts within the County, the Coast, especially the North Coast, has very specific needs and requires experience and expertise to deal with the myriad of issues that are unique.

I encourage you to keep ALL OF THE NORTH COAST communities intact. We have many areas of shared interests and inner connected needs that do not impact any other District. Because our District is made up of mostly unincorporated towns we need a champion who will understand and respond to the Coast’s needs, like: coastal development issues;
rising sea levels and erosion; off-shore power generation; watershed concerns; bay pollution; Highway 1 corridor concerns and the Highway 1 bike lane, etc.

Just the physical barrier alone between Cambria and North County, and between Los Osos and Avila Beach seem to make combining these areas completely antithetical.

Making Los Osos a "political island" — when what we need is a strong, connected cohesive approach to our region with our neighboring north coastal communities — would not serve us well.

The redistricting proposals seem to be flawed (some worse then others) in that they do not meet the contiguous or compactness mapping criteria.

Please reject the proposed maps.

Thank you,

Pandora Nash-Karner
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:10 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Contact Form Topic: District 5 Supervisor Debbie Arnold Question/Issue

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:10 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: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:00 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: Brenda Mack

Your Email: [REDACTED]

U.S. phone number: [REDACTED]

Message: Proposed redistricting I feel it should stay the same there is no valid reason for change which may result in costly ligation for the county

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 609438

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2806

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 3:58:43 PM
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 SLO County Supervisors,

Please support the Richard Patten map ID74786 since it is the fairest and most equitable districting map being considered.

Thank you,

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

Please keep our coastal communities in District 2. We live in Los Osos and want to remain in a district with the north coast communities. Map A is the only acceptable map of those proposed if the districts need to be changed.

Marcia Lamkin
Los Osos

Sent from my iPad
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:13 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

From: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:13 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Public Comment for tomorrow.

- Caleb Mott
  Legislative Assistant District 4
  San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Lynn Compton
  (805) 781-4337
  (800) 834-4636 ext 4337
  District4@co.slo.ca.us
  1055 Monterey St D430
  San Luis Obispo CA 93408
  Visit our Website

From: Pandora Nash-Karner <Pandora@PandoraAndCompany.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:02 PM
To: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

November 18, 2021

San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors

Re: Redistricting

Dear Supervisor Compton:

You have a difficult choice ahead of you, similar to Solomon cutting the baby in half perhaps, or in this case fifths. Your choice is made more difficult because of various environmental issues, areas of expertise required and politics.

Like all the Districts within the County, the Coast, especially the North Coast, has very specific needs and requires experience and expertise to deal with the myriad of issues that are unique.

I encourage you to keep ALL OF THE NORTH COAST communities intact. We have many areas of shared interests and inner connected needs that do not impact any other District. Because our District is made up of mostly unincorporated
towns we need a champion who will understand and respond to the Coast’s needs, like: coastal development issues; rising sea levels and erosion; off-shore power generation; watershed concerns; bay pollution; Highway 1 corridor concerns and the Highway 1 bike lane, etc.

Just the physical barrier alone between Cambria and North County, and between Los Osos and Avila Beach seem to make combining these areas completely antithetical.

Making Los Osos a “political island” — when what we need is a strong, connected cohesive approach to our region with our neighboring north coastal communities — would not serve us well.

The redistricting proposals seem to be flawed (some worse then others) in that they do not meet the contiguous or compactness mapping criteria.

Please reject the proposed maps.

Thank you,

Pandora Nash-Karner

Pandora & Company
www.PandoraArts.com
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

For the Public Record of Redistricting in SLO county 2021:

The Patten Map group are misguided and are forgetting the priority order of the mapping guidelines and State Laws to prevent Gerrymandering.
It is illegal to break up so many Communities of Interest (COI) in all the Districts to achieve a lower priority guideline of keeping Cities in one district. A City, by itself, is not necessarily a COI. COIs exist more strongly in the regional context. For example, at least 30% of District 5 residents travel to SLO daily for work, services, education, etc.

I support the efforts of the SLO Chamber to maintain the division of San Luis Obispo city into three districts. This maintains the strong COIs that exist in the different regions of our county. I prepared a similar Map- Keep D5 in SLO city, for the same purpose of fair representation and keeping CalPoly in District 5. Either one could be acceptable.

In the end, we will likely not to agree on what’s “the best Map.” Ethically and honestly, Map A is the best choice given the short timeline and the limited public access provided in the process. Map A will stand before any potential legal challenge and would be seen as the least disruptive with a Primary election coming in 6 mos.

Please consider these points.

Sincerely,
Ellen Beraud
District 5 voter
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

1. As a 14 year resident of Cambria, I am writing today to urge you to keep the Plan A district map, which is the status quo. There are no good reason to place Cambria in the same district with either Paso Robles or Atascadero, or other inland communities. The county must maintain “communities of interest” or those that share common interests and characteristics within districts. Each of these towns (Paso Robles, Atascadero) are vastly different than the makeup of Cambria and San Simeon. Our current district (District 2), that includes Los Osos, Morro Bay, Cayucos, Cambria, San Simeon and others, do reflect communities of interest and a common concern and appreciation for our north coastal communities.

Please respect the voice of your constituents, and keep District 2 as is, with Cambria, San Simeon and north along the coast to the Monterey County boundary within District 2.
2.
3. Respectfully,

   Robert Fountain

4.
5.
6.
1. As a 14 year resident of Cambria, I am writing today to urge you to keep the Plan A district map, which is the status quo. There are no good reason to place Cambria in the same district with either Paso Robles or Atascadero, or other inland communities. *The county must maintain “communities of interest” or those that share common interests and characteristics within districts.* Each of these towns (Paso Robles, Atascadero) are vastly different than the makeup of Cambria and San Simeon. Our current district (District 2), that includes Los Osos, Morro Bay, Cayucos, Cambria, San Simeon and others, do reflect communities of interest and a common concern and appreciation for our north coastal communities.

   Please respect the voice of your constituents, and keep District 2 as is, with Cambria, San Simeon and north along the coast to the Monterey County boundary within District 2.

2.

3. Respectfully,

   Robert Fountain

4.

5.

6.
From: Alison Denlinger <outlook_38D8C890FC7019D5@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:21 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 of Supervisors, I strongly encourage each board member to support Plan B for redistricting since none of the districts has grown enough to justify changing the established boundaries.

Thank you,
Alison Denlinger
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:21 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Letters to NCAC redistricting
Attachments: Emails to NCAC re SLO County Redistricting.pdf

From: Brian Glusovich <glus@charter.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:20 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Karen Chrisman <karenchrisman@sbcglobal.net>; Don Sather <landuse@ncacsllo.org>; Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Blake Fixler <bfixler@co.slo.ca.us>; Brian Glusovich <glus@charter.net>; Iggy Fedoroff <chezfed@att.net>; Jamie MacLeod <jamie_macleod@sbcglobal.net>; Karen Dean <KADean2018@outlook.com>
Subject: [EXT]Letters to NCAC redistricting

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

The North Coast Advisory Council is forwarding these emails, which we have received from residents of Cambria and San Simeon regarding the current redistricting study. As you can see from the content, these should be considered as “community of interest” comments, rather than general public comments. Thank you for your consideration, and your efforts in this critical project.

Brian Glusovich
Chair, North Coast Advisory Council

[Image]
| From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us> | Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:35 PM |
| To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us> | Subject: Public Comment - ID 188 |

| RedistrictingID | 188 |
| Form inserted | 11/18/2021 4:34:20 PM |
| Form updated | 11/18/2021 4:34:20 PM |
| First Name | William |
| Last Name | Bianchi |
| Email | [Redacted] |
| Phone | [Redacted] |
| Name of Organization Represented | |
| City | Cambria |
| Zip | 93428 |
| Comment | I oppose the proposed redistricting Plan D which would combine coastal and inland areas. I support Plan B. |
| Public Records Notice | True |
After much study, I support Map B as the best one for Supervisors to support. I agree that Cal Poly students should be in the same district. Other than that, our existing map is adequate and functional for our county needs; we would save significant cost and time before the upcoming June election by keeping the boundaries mostly as they are. I live in Paso Robles, and I do not think that our common interests coincide with Cambria or the coastal communities. I therefore urge you to support Map B. Thank you.

Christine Parker-Kennedy  
Paso Robles 93446
No to redistricting there is no reason to change. Changes may result in costly litigation for the county.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RedistrictingID</th>
<th>190</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form inserted</td>
<td>11/18/2021 4:37:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form updated</td>
<td>11/18/2021 4:37:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Bianchi</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>Atascadero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Atascadero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>93422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

I oppose redistricting Plan D, and support Plan B which combines all student housing at Cal Poly into one district with minimal additional changes.
Dear Supervisor Peschong:

You have a difficult choice ahead of you, similar to Solomon cutting the baby in half perhaps, or in this case fifths. Your choice is made more difficult because of various environmental issues, areas of expertise required and politics.
Like all the Districts within the County, the Coast, especially the North Coast, has very specific needs and requires experience and expertise to deal with the myriad of issues that are unique.

I encourage you to keep ALL OF THE NORTH COAST communities intact. We have many areas of shared interests and inner connected needs that do not impact any other District. Because our District is made up of mostly unincorporated towns we need a champion who will understand and respond to the Coast’s needs, like: coastal development issues; rising sea levels and erosion; off-shore power generation; watershed concerns; bay pollution; Highway 1 corridor concerns and the Highway 1 bike lane, etc.

Just the physical barrier alone between Cambria and North County, and between Los Osos and Avila Beach seem to make combining these areas completely antithetical.

Making Los Osos a “political island” — when what we need is a strong, connected cohesive approach to our region with our neighboring north coastal communities — would not serve us well.

The redistricting proposals seem to be flawed (some worse then others) in that they do not meet the contiguous or compactness mapping criteria.

Please reject the proposed maps.

Thank you,

Pandora Nash-Karner

Pandora Nash-Karner
Pandora@PandoraAndCompany.com

Pandora & Company

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

Keep current district guidelines in effect.
Thank you
Leslie Manning
Resident of Cambria
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:45 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: Fwd: [EXT]Redistricting SLO County

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:51 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only; Redistricting
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting SLO County

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email was 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 Supervisors,

I would like to add my voice to those encouraging you not to gerrymander the supervisor districts of San Luis Obispo County. Most especially as a resident of Los Osos, I do not wish to be considered part of an artificial district that includes Paso Robles. There have been, unfortunately, far too many incidents up there that tell me a culture of white supremacy and loyalty to the evil of Trump make it a place to shun rather than join. During the pandemic I have been appalled at the high case rates and low vaccination numbers meaning people up there base their health decisions on false politics and disinformation. Arguments in the school board over “critical race theory” is more disinformation meant to pander to white supremacists. Students defecating on LGBTQ Pride flags and waving “F****k Biden” flags on Veterans Day tells me that they are being raised in a climate of hate and intolerance.

It is beyond my comprehension why the Republican party is willing to participate in and encourage lying, violence, and outright cheating by gerrymandering how our votes are counted. Please do not be a part of the current conspiracy of
the Republican party right wing to destroy our great Democracy by eliminating free and fair voting. From what I can see, District Map A is the best choice if you believe in true democracy.

Sincerely,
Sara Kelly
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

Message: The Richard Patten map proves that if County Administrative recommendations are followed, it is possible to have all "Communities of Interest" together, whole, undivided and evenly distributed population throughout the county. I like his map".

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 068507

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2807

Form inserted: 11/18/2021 4:41:37 PM
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:48 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: merril lynn <merril@finestplanet.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:45 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.

SLO County Board of Supervisors,

Regarding redistricting, I would like to refer to a quote “If it ain't broke, don't fix it!”
There is nothing wrong with the current districts map; it meets all the criteria based on California law for districts & there have not been enough demographic changes in SLO County to necessitate moving boundaries.
If for some reason the board decides there must be a change, I urge the Board to select Plan B which keeps the “community of interest” criteria intact whereas the other plans do not.

Thank you, Merril Lynn, Nipomo
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

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

Dear Supervisor Peschong,
I am deeply disturbed by the possibility of Map C of the upcoming Supervisory District redistricting options becoming a reality. The North County and North Coast demographic make-up and related interests of their constituencies are incredibly different in so many ways. The Map C option would terribly skew negatively against the North Coast residents. If you truly are an elected official that seeks to fairly, justly and effectively represent the communities of SLO county, I respectfully request that you do not vote for Map C and support Map A as the best option for all the citizens of SLO county. Map C just does not make any sense for the residents of the North Coast and I and many of my fellow Cambrians are strongly against it.
Thank you for your time.
David Lopez
Cambria

Sent from my iPhone
Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:49 PM
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Public Comment - Redistricting Plans

From: Blake Fixler <bfixler@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:48 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: BOS_Legislative Assistants <BOS_Legislative-Assistants@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Public Comment - Redistricting Plans

For your review.

These are District 2 constituents.

Blake Fixler
Legislative Assistant - District Two
San Luis Obispo County
805-781-4338
bfixler@co.slo.ca.us

From: Mary Bianchi <mary.lee.bianchi@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:34 PM
To: Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Blake Fixler <bfixler@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Bill Bianchi <biabill@hughes.net>
Subject: [EXT]Public Comment - Redistricting Plans

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

Good afternoon to you both:

My father, William Bianchi, and I both oppose redistricting Plan D. Briefly, and channeling Mom/Shirley, it's just ridiculous.

We believe that Plan B is the most effective of the currently proposed plans, placing all student housing at Cal Poly in one district while minimizing unnecessary changes.

Thanks!

Mary Bianchi and William C. Bianchi
Cambria, CA
ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Supervisor Arnold,

It is clear that the best redistricting option for north coast residents is Map A. I’m requesting that you choose Map A and keep coastal San Luis Obispo county, coastal. We appreciate your support.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Lopez
Cambria

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Members of the Board,

I respectfully request that you adopt Map A or Map B, which is similar to the current map. According to the 2020 census and the County’s redistricting consultant, none of the districts in SLO County grew enough to necessitate substantial boundary changes. Maps A and B will ensure continuity, meet statutory requirements, and result in less disruption to the election cycle.

As Board Members, you were elected to represent all of you constituents and create an environment where everyone feels confident that their voices and votes are heard. Voters should choose their politicians; politicians should not choose their voters.

Thank you,

Kathy and Larry Stone
Paso Robles, CA
Dear Supervisors,

SLO county population has not changed enough to warrant drastic redistricting changes, and significant changes will be suspect of partisan gerrymandering.

On one hand, significantly changing the maps will create winner and losers. It will fundamentally violate the public trust by realigning the makeup of the districts.

On the other hand, adopting the current map or map A has the priceless benefit of promoting PUBLIC TRUST and protecting integrity in the system.

Keeping the existing map or adopting Map A has the following benefits:

- Meets statutory requirements of the Elections Code
- Ensures continuity
- Respects communities of interest
- Minimizes disruptions to the election cycle
- Meets all the legal criteria and can be adopted without threat of litigation

You stand in a unique position to be politically neutral in this process. Adopting the current map or Map A does this.
You have a DUTY to promote the public trust and protect the integrity of district maps for the entire county, for every voter.

Imagine a situation where all 5 of you, stand together, united at a press conference, announcing your 5-0 vote to adopt the map that does not create winners and losers, but rather creates a fair and legal map that creates fair representation for every SLO county resident.

This is your moment to be brave and show such courage.

--

Kris Beal
Atascadero Resident, SLO County resident since 1976
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:55 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: mustang4della@aol.com <mustang4della@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:53 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.

Supervisors,

Regarding redistricting: as you consider whether to redraw the district boundaries, please avoid the urge to create a partisan advantage. Leave the boundaries as they are now -- don't change them.

Respectfully,
Della Barrett, South Atascadero
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
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:

As a resident of SLO County, I want to express my concern regarding redrawing district lines to enable partisan advantage. My understanding is that there have been minor changes in population in our county and therefore there's no legal requirement to change district boundaries.

Please retain the current district lines which are compliant with election laws. As you know, there is a movement in our country to manipulate boundaries in order to "win at all cost." Please don't let our county be a part of this inappropriate behavior and decision-making. Vote to keep boundaries as they currently exist.

Sincerely,
Donn Baker
Nipomo, CA 93444
Dear San Luis Obispo County Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to maintain the current Supervisor district boundaries. The population changes in our county do not justify major changes to the districts. Also, the current configuration meets the state requirement that district define areas of common interest and have historically resulted in election results that fairly represent our diverse population.

Sincerely yours,

Elizabeth Helgerson
Atascadero, CA
Please please keep Cambria in a district with shared values and needs. Please choose Map A.

Thu 11/18/2021 8:50 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>

To whom it may concern,

I strongly request that any action on proposed redistricting keep Cambria and its coastal neighbors together. Population alone is a poor determinant of boundaries. I strongly agree with the writings of local leaders that Cambria and its coastal neighbors like Cayucos are communities of shared interest and must remain in its current District 2 designation. Redistricting as proposed in Map C breaks up and dilutes communities of shared interest and needs. Please choose Map A to prevent linking Cambria to communities without shared commonalities. I believe Map A is indeed the best, even only, option to keep the North Coast communities together. Map C is deliberate gerrymandering and must be quashed. I am a voter with a memory and will take note of the Board of Supervisors actions.

Again, please choose Map A.

Respectfully,
Loris Mills
Cambria, CA 93428
Cambria will be more accurately represented if we keep current district guidelines in effect.

Thank you,
Craig Penner
Cambria
I think we should leave the districts the way they are. They best define the areas by interest and climate.

Thank you,

Lucia McMillan Cleveland

San Luis Obispo, Ca 93401
To all involved in this decision:
I want to speak to you in favor of choosing Plan A - maintaining the current Board of Supervisor districts

I have lived in Cambria for 16 years, moving here from Los Angeles. Given that background I have been able to observe first hand the differences between a city and small county-governed towns. Their interests, problems and concerns are very different.

The current district 2 which covers several coastal communities is far more appropriate governance than clumping them together with the city Paso Robles.

Dealings with a city or a county are never perfect for everyone, but I have found the decisions made by the county in my district have supported the common good. And that is what we need so much now.

Thank you for your consideration,

Leslie Clarke Gray

Leslie Clarke Gray
Deer Run Art & Artifacts
Cambria, CA

New email address!
Keep current districting guidelines in place.

Gail and Russ Kolander

Sent from my iPad
Gerrymandering may be good for political power and ambitions, but destroys fair representation. Playing dirty, and tribal, hurts our country and our democracy. It would be nice if our "non-partisan" supervisors that want to change our districts would put fair representation above their partisan goals. Democracy should be placed above personal power grabs.