

[REDACTED]

From: Sheila Dallas [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 1:53 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Citizen Richard Patten's Rev 1 Map

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

This is the only map that keeps communities of interest together. Unites SLO with Cal Poly and is put in one supervisors district instead of splitting SLO into 3 districts. it also allows Oceano and Grover Beach who share a sewer a fire department and a school district to be together Question? Why should SLO have the benefit of three supervisors ?

~Sheila Dallas

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 4:35 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Comment re November19 Hearing 3: Redistricting

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

The fundamental questions facing county voters are whether significant redistricting is necessary, and whether it is desirable. The answer to both questions is no. The burden of proof is on the proponents of boundary change, and thus far they have made no compelling arguments.

I strongly recommend approving Draft Map A, and I vote.

Sincerely,

Howard S. Miller

[REDACTED]
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

[REDACTED]

From: Irwin Joseph [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 8:09 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Comments for November 19

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

I support Draft Map A.
Substantial changes are not justified.

Irwin Joseph

[REDACTED]
Nipomo, CA

www.MediateYourDisputeOnline.com

From: Cheryl Storton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:22 AM
To: Redistricting
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.

I would encourage the Board to pick **Map A or a similar map** that does not make major changes to the districts. The population of SLO County has not increased greatly and the current Districts are in compliance with the law and supported by the county's own consultant expert. Supervisors—especially those up for election in 2022—need to make it clear that they will not make changes based on personal political gain. Arroyo Grande, Oceano, and Nipomo—all presently in District 4—should remain together. Oceano was more firmly attached to District 4 and its supervisor when a new advisory commission was authorized and funded.

I live in Arroyo Grande. The closest grocery store, the closest beach, the closest gas station and the closest restaurant is in Oceano. Nipomo is a quick trip. Our area has a lot in common. We need to stay together. Choosing map A is also the most fiscally conservative and will save money that can be better used in the county.

Respectfully submitted

Cheryl Storton, Arroyo Grande

[REDACTED]

From: Arlene Versaw <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 3:20 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Comments for November 19

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

Three of the supervisors are willing to undermine the tenets of justice and fair play with their redistricting ploy. Their supported proposals smack of self-interest at the very least as they tear at the fabric of our institutions.

I support Draft Map A, which preserves the existing communities, complies with federal voting rights and measures up to the criteria of the California Fair Maps Act.

Nothing in the census data requires a change to present boundaries. There is no justification for a wholesale change. Support no change - support Draft Map A.

Arlene Versaw

"Only truth and transparency can guarantee freedom." - John McCain

"Freedom of the press ensures that the abuse of every other freedom can be known, can be challenged and even defeated". Kofi Annan

[REDACTED]

From: Lois Garney <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 1:13 PM
To: Redistricting; Bruce Gibson
Subject: [EXT]District 2 Cambria

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

Redistricting Committee,

We are residents of Cambria, District 2, and don't want Cambria moved to District 1, Paso Robles. We have very different issues than Paso Robles and need to be represented with other coastal communities.

Sincerely,

Lois & Fox Garney

[REDACTED]

From: Catherine Petty <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 7:44 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Maps

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

Dear Redistricting,

I see no reason to alter the current district maps except to honor population changes. There is no logical reason to make changes except to give "upset the apple cart" and open "pandora's box." The districts as they are current as I drawn have worked well for the citizens of the county for many years. AS far as I can tell the only reason for any drastic changes is called "gerrymandering."

Sincerely,
Catherine Petty

[REDACTED]

From: Laura DeHaven <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:33 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]No changes to the SLO county district lines

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.

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

Thanks,

Laura DeHaven

[REDACTED]

From: Lee Osterloh <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:12 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]No redistricting

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

There is no reasonable reason to change the redistricting that is in place. I am against any changes that are meant to enable a particular political group to benefit from this action. All citizens should be represented equally and be able to vote equally as well.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:43 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]opposition to Plan C

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

I live in Cambria and this town is very unique. We are a community that is a bit cut off from other towns of SLO. We are a town that is made up of a majority of retired persons and are only industry is Tourism. The rest of our counties towns has more them one industry to keep their economy going. We need a Supervisor that understand the need of this village. We need our Supervisor to have knowledge and understanding of what an isolated coastal town needs. I don't believe that we will be serve well by being redistricted with Paso Roble and other inland towns.

Paulla Ufferheide
Cambria resident

From: Craig Ufferheide <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 8:26 AM
To: Redistricting
Cc: 'Craig Ufferheide'
Subject: [EXT]Opposition to Plan 'C'

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

I adamantly and totally oppose the adoption of Plan-C or any redistricting that ignores the difference between the coastal and the inland regions of our part of SLO County. This difference in geography & demographics represent a 'micro-demographic community of interest' that requires protection. Twenty+ miles of two lane, undivided highway, with a sparse population and a radical climatic change does not represent a reasonable connection between two areas. Plan-C type redistricting would essentially split and disenfranchise the common interests of the communities of San Simeon, Cambria, Harmony, Cayucos, Morro Bay, Baywood and Los Osos. I fully understand that the redistricting must consider a balance in population, but there are ways to do that without disenfranchising our voters. Thank you for your consideration.

Craig Ufferheide
Cambria Resident



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

[REDACTED]

From: Tracy Priestley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:31 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Please keep Cambria in District 2

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

The sense of community in Cambria is strong, with a like-minded approach to environmental conservation. The current District 2 aligns with the needs of our coastal community.

Paso Robles is in a growth spurt that does not align with our limited expansion, and a District 5 supervisor not living in a coastal town will not be in a position to address our concerns with the same regard.

It is my sincere hope that we can continue to be a thriving part of District 2.

Thank you.

Tracy Priestley
Cambria, CA

[REDACTED]

From: Anneka Scranton <a [REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 4:14 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Public Administration Ph.D. and Professor supports Plan A

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Holding a Ph.D. from the U.S.C. Graduate School of Public Administration and speaking as a retired Clinical Professor of Policy at the U.S.C. School of Social Work, I strongly support Plan A. Many years ago, the federal civil rights lawsuit against the districting plan of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors was successful because the plan arbitrarily divided communities to insure the ongoing power of the long term Board members. Plan A is consistent with all governing criteria under the California Fair Maps Act and is consistent with census data. There appears to be no valid reason to significantly alter existing boundaries. Any attempt to dramatically change existing boundaries to promote a political agenda would be subject to ongoing expensive and time consuming litigation —litigation with significant chances of success.

Anneka Scranton M.S.W. Ph.D.
Clinical Associate Professor U.S.C. School of Social Work (ret)
[REDACTED] /
Los Osos
93402

[REDACTED]

From: RAY SMITH <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 4:45 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Public Comment

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

Please do not split District 2 in half. We suggest keeping it as it is.

Ray & Julie Smith
Los Osos

[REDACTED]

From: Ginger Lordus <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:35 AM
To: Board of Supervisors; Redistricting; Lynn Compton
Subject: [EXT]Public Comment for the Redistricting meeting scheduled for Nov 19

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

Subject: Public Comment for the Redistricting meeting scheduled for Nov 19

I am Ginger Lordus have lived in Rural Arroyo Grande since 1996. I have also been a homeowner and lived in Los Osos and San Luis Obispo cities. Being a 30+ year resident of SLO County I have many friends throughout SLO County cities and rural areas. I taught at Cal Poly for over 15 years and worked as the Director of Education for Community Health Centers of the Central Coast where I was a dietitian for all of their clinics. I also worked as a dietitian in SLO County hospitals, clinics, prisons, skilled nursing facilities, and worked for home health and hospice. Therefore, I am VERY familiar with the geographical, socioeconomic, political, and environmental issues of San Luis Obispo County's Communities.

After reviewing the current SLO County District map and the County funded "Staff" District Draft maps (A,B,C) I was bewildered. These are all variations of the same map and are ALL WRONG. I sketched my own common sense, in your face obvious draft map to be: North County (1,2); SLO City/Cal Poly (3); South County (4); Coast (5). Then I found Richard Patton's CITIZEN MAP. THIS IS IT!! After further education it is apparent that the CITIZEN MAP is just that a CITIZEN MAP and NOT a political self-interest map because it:

- places "Communities of interest" together; whole, undivided, and evenly distributed population throughout the county.
- keeps Cal Poly and the City of SLO together BECAUSE THEY ARE Communities of Interest. Look at Santa Barbara's 2021 Redistricting map (Plan 407), it has the City and College TOGETHER.
- allocates ONE Supervisor for each of the Communities of Interest. The SLO County Staff Maps A, B, & C divide SLO City into 3 districts; having 3 supervisorial districts in a single "Community of Interest" is not allowed, it violates the rules.

I urge you to DO THE RIGHT THING and choose the Richard Patton's CITIZEN MAP.

Ginger Lordus

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Arroyo Grande CA 93420

:

[REDACTED]

From: Michael W. Stebbins [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 8:29 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistributing

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

It is not our interest to combine Cambria with Paso Robles. Our populations, culture, and conservation agendas are completely different. We vote against gerrymandering.

Margaret and Michel Stebbins.

Michael W. Stebbins, PhD
Professor Emeritus,
Organization Design
Management Area
Orfalea College of Business
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

[REDACTED]

From: Rosemary Wrenn <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 6:29 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

As a property owner and resident of San Luis Obispo County since 1993, I urge you to retain the current supervisorial district boundaries, which ensure continuity, maintain existing Communities of Interest, and meet all statutory requirements. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted.

The County Board of Supervisors has a fiduciary responsibility to all of us who live and pay taxes in SLO County. Retaining current boundaries ensures ongoing representation of voice in decisions that deeply affect our way of life.

Rosemary Wrenn
Shell Beach

From: Jo Gustely <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting comment

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

From: Jo Gustely <freeallorcas@icloud.com>
Date: November 15, 2021 at 10:41:10 PST
To: Gustely Jo <freeallorcas@icloud.com>
Subject: **COMMENTS FOR 11/19 hearing**

Greeting Supervisors, Lynn Compton:

I write to ask you to vote against gerrymandering, for Map A. With a total county population increase between 2010-2020 of 5.67%, no valid criteria exists to justify distortion of any district boundary. Map A conforms to all redistricting criteria: complies both with the Federal Voting Rights Act & the 2019 Fair Maps Act, while it retains existing communities of interest. Map A incurs the least financial cost of redistricting.

Yet if you vote to forthe Patten map, this is an overt conflict of interest to control the mechanism of representation choosing your very own GOP voters. All 5 supervisor seats are still nonpartisan.

Please vote to leave well enough alone, for redistricting map A to avoid electile dysfunction.

Jo Gustely
Nipomo, CA 93444

[REDACTED]

From: Dorothy Modafferi <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 5:24 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting in San Luis Obispo County

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

As a concerned resident and voter in Nipomo, CA, my recommendation for redistricting in our county is that NO CHANGE IS NEEDED!

There is NO CHANGE justified by Census data. The County's own consultant agrees with this. DRAFT MAP A PRESERVES ALL THE CRITERIA FOUND IN CALIFORNIA'S FAIR MAPS ACT.

I live in District 4 and am especially concerned about any changes to our current district. THERE ARE NO REASONS TO CHANGE DISTRICT 4!!

Sincerely,

Dorothy Modafferi
Nipomo, CA

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: ccorvino71_gmail.com [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 5:26 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Letter
Attachments: Redistricting Letter-11.11.21.docx

Importance: High

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

November 11, 2021

Sent via E-mail: boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us
redistricting@co.slo.ca.us

Re: Current Redistricting Proposals

Dear Board of Supervisors;

We are writing this letter to provide our comments regarding the various plans put forth for the ongoing redistricting efforts. My wife and I are residents of Cambria (685 Evelyn Court) and are very concerned about the proposed Plan B & C, which would realign Cambria and San Simeon from North County coastal communities to those of Paso Robles. Such a plan would dilute our coastal voice and mute Cambria's input into county legislative and other efforts by pairing us up with a community which is much larger in population (Paso Robles) and which have interests and issues quite dissimilar to those of coastal communities.

Upon review of the criteria for appropriate redistricting efforts, they clearly state that ***“the geographic integrity of any 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 and economic interests that would be included within a single supervisorial district for purposes of its effective and fair representation”***.

The current communities within District 2 have the following common social and economic interests:

- Our communities have a strong interest in protecting the coastal environment, while promoting accessibility and enjoyment for all.
- The balance of ecological preservation and economic activity require different set of considerations than agriculturally oriented communities (Paso Robles). Both of these types of communities deserve effective and fair representation
- Our coastal communities face distinct water issues, ranging from climate related challenges, to water access for residents that are necessarily different than those of agriculturally driven communities

- Our coastal communities need to have a strong dominant voice on the coastal commission. The majority of communities in District 2 are unincorporated and therefore have a single voice in determining the rules and regulations in the places we call home.

We respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt a district plan that does not divide the North County coastal communities. As such we urge the board to adopt Plan A.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to San Luis Obispo County.

Claude & Cheryl Corvino

[REDACTED]

From: Allyson Dallmann <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 11:41 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting SLO County

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

As a coastal community, we highly value our unique environment, wildlife and preserves. We appreciate the fact that we are one of the few remaining California regions where we can enjoy peaceful ocean walks, view wildlife and connect with nature. Along with Cayucos, San Simeon, Los Oso, and Morro Bay, we form a historical unit. As a coastal unit, we are committed to protecting our delicate environment and unique species.

Together, we need to remain in District 2. We understand our fire risk, need for fresh water, tourism economies, and that being absorbed into incorporated, larger communities would destroy our ability to protect our shared concerns and interests. We have a right to protect our culture, needs, values and history.

Since there was less than a 10% population deviation, you don't NEED to redistrict this County. We deserve to maintain our current designation in District 2 for accurate representation and Map A maintains our integrity.

Thank you,

Dr. Allyson Dallmann

Cambria, CA

[REDACTED]

From: Teri Ninelives <m [REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 6:56 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

Board of Supervisors

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.

Teri Ninelives
Concerned Citizen of SLO County

[REDACTED]

From: Rachael Drake <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 7:08 PM
To: Redistricting
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,
I live in the City of SLO and support its division into three supervisorial districts. The City has ties to all parts of the county, providing jobs, shopping, and education for folks who live in other areas and are connected through our central location and major transportation systems. Those who assert otherwise generally don't live in the City. Don't marginalize us into a single district. Thank you for your consideration.
Respectfully,
Rachael Drake

[REDACTED]

From: Denise Larsen & Carl Nelson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 7:20 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

We urge the Board of Supervisors to make minimal or no changes to the current district boundaries. The current districts provide reasonable balance in population and communities of interest. It is important to have the city of SLO represented by multiple Supervisors given its importance as the most populous city and a central economic and cultural entity. Minor updates may be necessary for balance, but the citizen presented "Patten Map" is a blatant and shameful gerrymandering attempt.

Sincerely
Carl Nelson and Denise Larsen - SLO City residents

[REDACTED]

From: Joyce Tseng <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 7:37 PM
To: Redistricting
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 keep the current supervisorial district boundaries, as it will keep existing Communities of Interest intact and ensure continuity. The new census data does not justify major changes to current supervisor district boundaries. Current districts meet all state requirements for population balance and fairness of representation.

As a resident of the City of San Luis Obispo, I support the City's division into three supervisorial districts. The City of SLO is centrally located and provides jobs, shopping, food, education for those who live in all parts of SLO County. While minor updates to the existing boundaries may be required, such changes should be minimal. Please reject the proposed "Patten map" and others that kettle the City of SLO into a single district.

Thanks for your consideration,
-Joyce Tseng

[REDACTED]

From: Lisa Chadwick <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 7:40 PM
To: Redistricting
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 have happily lived in District 4 for over 40 years. I see no reason to change our district boundaries at this point in time. It is well balanced with urban, rural, young, old, poor, and rich.

Please leave District 4 just as it is.

Thank you,
Lisa Chaddwick
[REDACTED] Lane
Arroyo Grande

[REDACTED]

From: Jill ZamEk [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 8:29 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]redistricting

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

To the Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to maintain the existing supervisorial district boundaries. They already meet the State standards for fairness of representation and for population balance.

Jill ZamEk
Arroyo Grande

[REDACTED]

From: Laura DeHaven [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 8:35 PM
To: Redistricting
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,

As a voter in SLO County, 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.

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

As a voter in SLO County, I am watching this process carefully, speaking with my fellow voters, and noting how the Board handles this important decision.

Thank you,

Laura DeHaven
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Dori McInerney <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:33 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

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

Dorine McInerney
Cambria

[REDACTED]

From: Nancy Crane [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 11:22 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to retain current supervisorial district boundaries which will ensure continuity, keep existing Communities of Interest intact, and meet all statutory requirements.

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. No drastic changes to district boundaries are warranted. While minor updates to the existing boundaries maybe required, such changes should be minimal.

Please reject the proposed "Patten map" and others that kettle the City of SLO into a single district.

Yours sincerely,

Nancy Crane

From: Web Notifications <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:50 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: COI - ID 35

Your Name* Allyson Dallmann
Your Email Allysonrdallmann@outlook.com
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 2
Community Of Interest Name* Historical Coastal Community
What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important* Historical Coastal Community, delicate environment and unique species, rural, peaceful community. We respect and appreciate our delicate balance and choose to live here because of them.
Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries?* Coastal
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.* We are unincorporated and if the Board wrongfully annexed us into cities, as some maps do, it would not allow us to represent ourselves or maintain our ability to protect our unique interests. Our voices must be heard together because we share and understand fire risk, fresh water needs, tourism economies, infrastructure needs and our amazing and fragile environment and wildlife.
What else would you like to tell us about your community?* remain in District 2, Map A is best. coastal community; value our unique environment, wildlife and preserves; one of few remaining CA regions to enjoy peaceful ocean walks and wildlife. Along with Cayucos, San Simeon, Los Oso, and Morro Bay, we form a historical unit; We understand our fire risk, need for fresh water, tourism economies, and being absorbed into larger communities would destroy our ability to represent and protect our shared concerns and interests.
Security Check* 728056
Form inserted 11/15/2021 12:49:33 PM

From: Morgan Torell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:20 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: FW: [EXT]Keep the existing supervisorial districts as is

From: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:43 AM
To: Kristin Eriksson <keriksson@co.slo.ca.us>; Morgan Torell <mtorell@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: [EXT]Keep the existing supervisorial districts as is

Redistricting Correspondence

Sincerely,
Clerk of the Board Team
Administrative Office, County of San Luis Obispo
1055 Monterey St., Ste. D430 | San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Tel: (805) 781-1045 | Fax: (805) 781-5023

From: John Peschong <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 09:37 AM
To: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Keep the existing supervisorial districts as is

Redistricting- November 19

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



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Jim <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, November 14, 2021 11:47 AM
To: John Peschong <[REDACTED]>
Subject: [EXT]Keep the existing supervisorial districts as is

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

Mr. Peschong'

Please vote to keep all the districts in our county as is. Do not allow partisanship dictate any divisions. Districts should be assigned by population geography and common needs of the district not political leanings.

Jim Berg

[REDACTED]

From: Blake Fixler <bfixler@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 1:55 PM
To: Redistricting
Cc: BOS_Legislative Assistants; AD-Board-Clerk
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Good afternoon.

Please see the below correspondence regarding redistricting.

Thank you.

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Whalen [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:19 PM
To: Bruce Gibson [REDACTED]
Cc: Blake Fixler <bfixler@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

Bruce—

I live in Los Osos, and I'm interested in the redistricting process you're working on. I have a few comments for you to consider:

The process you're using is undemocratic. You, the politicians will be choosing your voters. I believe you voted to have the boundaries drawn by an independent commission, but you were not successful. Thanks for trying.

Changing the district map is not required. None of the county supervisorial districts changed in population enough.

Because of the ideological, partisan makeup of the current board majority, I'm concerned that they will solidify their power for the next decade by diluting the power of minority communities, resulting in increased voter apathy and cynicism at the local level.

At this point, I do NOT support significant changes to the district map.

I know you are at a political disadvantage in this process, and I support your hard work and patience. Please try to be transparent and explain the reasons for any changes to the district map.

Thanks for your hard work
—Joe Whalen

From: Morgan Torell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:14 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Maps

From: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 8:49 AM
To: Morgan Torell <mtorell@co.slo.ca.us>; Kristin Eriksson <keriksson@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: [EXT]Redistricting Maps

Redistricting Correspondence

Sincerely,
Clerk of the Board Team
Administrative Office, County of San Luis Obispo
1055 Monterey St., Ste. D430 | San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Tel: (805) 781-1045 | Fax: (805) 781-5023

From: John Peschong [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 07:56 AM
To: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Maps

For November 19th redistricting 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



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 13, 2021 10:09 PM
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Maps

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

Supervisor,

I urge you to vote for the Richard Patten citizen's map for redistricting our County.

I believe the rules issued by the Redistricting Commission are all satisfied with

this map, and ONLY this map. All of the others split the city of San Luis Obispo, which is completely unnecessary.

Mr. Patten's map keeps all communities of interest together and evenly distributes the population. Additionally, maps A, B and C all split Cal Poly, which makes no sense at all.

Keeping the districts in their current boundaries does not follow the rules of the Commission, as splitting the cities of San Luis Obispo and Templeton goes against this.

Terri Stricklin
Nipomo

[REDACTED]

From: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Fw: [EXT]Redistricting

Sincerely,

Clerk of the Board Team

Administrative Office, County of San Luis Obispo
1055 Monterey St., Ste. D430 | San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Tel: (805) 781-1045 | Fax: (805) 781-5023

From: Blake Fixler <bfixler@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 01:55 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: BOS_Legislative Assistants <BOS_Legislative-Assistants@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting
Good afternoon.

Please see the below correspondence regarding redistricting.

Thank you.

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Whalen [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:19 PM
To: Bruce Gibson [REDACTED]
Cc: Blake Fixler <bfixler@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

Bruce—

I live in Los Osos, and I'm interested in the redistricting process you're working on. I have a few comments for you to consider:

The process you're using is undemocratic. You, the politicians will be choosing your voters. I believe you voted to have the boundaries drawn by an independent commission, but you were not successful. Thanks for trying.

Changing the district map is not required. None of of the county supervisorial districts changed in population enough.

Because of the ideological, partisan makeup of the current board majority, I'm concerned that they will solidify their power for the next decade by diluting the power of minority communities, resulting in increased voter apathy and cynicism at the local level.

At this point, I do NOT support significant changes to the district map.

I know you are at a political disadvantage in this process, and I support your hard work and patience. Please try to be transparent and explain the reasons for any changes to the district map.

Thanks for your hard work
—Joe Whalen

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:20 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: FW: [EXT]Restructuring

From: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:43 AM
To: Kristin Eriksson <keriksson@co.slo.ca.us>; Morgan Torell <mtorell@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: [EXT]Restructuring

Redistricting Correspondence

Sincerely,
Clerk of the Board Team
Administrative Office, County of San Luis Obispo
1055 Monterey St., Ste. D430 | San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Tel: (805) 781-1045 | Fax: (805) 781-5023

Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 09:35 AM
To: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Restructuring

Redistricting- November 19

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



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: William Phillips [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 14, 2021 9:03 PM
[REDACTED]
Subject: [EXT]Restructuring

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

The best map is the one submitted by Richard Patten Nov 3, 2021. It adheres to the rules and does the best job of keeping San Luis Obispo city as whole as possible. It keeps like aspects of San Luis Obispo City together like no other map ever.

Oceano and Grover Beach together is smart as they share fire protection, school district and most important that famous sewer.

Do the right thing and vote in Richard Patten Rev_1 map.

Bill Phillips
Arroyo Grande

Sent from my iPhone

From: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 5:06 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: FW: Public Comment on Redistricting
Attachments: [EXT]Redistricting (4.85 KB); [EXT]Supervisor district boundaries (5.97 KB); [EXT]Keep our current districts (6.86 KB); [EXT]Redistricting (10.5 KB); [EXT]Fird (4.90 KB)

From: Caleb Mott <cmott@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 3:51 PM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment on Redistricting

Public Comment on Redistricting.

- **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](#)

[REDACTED]

From: Jim [REDACTED] >
Sent: Sunday, November 14, 2021 11:49 AM
To: District 4
Subject: [EXT]Keep our current districts

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

Ms. Compton

Please vote to keep all the districts in our county as is. Do not allow partisanship dictate any divisions. Districts should be assigned by population geography and common needs of the district not political leanings.

Jim Berg

[REDACTED]

From: Sharon Hill <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 2021 4:44 PM
To: District 4
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

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

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Elisandro Yorba [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:36 AM
To: Lynn Compton
Cc: District 4
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

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

Lynn,

Please vote to not split the City of San Luis Obispo for the upcoming Redistricting vote.

Eli Yorba
Direct: 8 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This message may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the addressee or authorized to receive this for the addressee, you must not use, copy, disclose, or take action based on this message or any information herein. If you receive this message in error, please advise Eli Yorba immediately by reply email and delete this message. Thank you for your cooperation

[REDACTED]

From: andy wallace [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Bruce Gibson; Dawn Ortiz-Legg; District 4; BOS_District 5_Web Contact; jpeshong@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: [EXT]Supervisor district boundaries

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

Dear Supervisors;

We don't believe that there is any reason to significantly change the Supervisor Districts 1-5 as they are now.

We believe that it would be an unnecessary waste of time and money and would only further exacerbate the already fractious political climate.

Please do not schedule these wasteful changes.

Best regards,

Andy and Debbie Wallace
San Luis Obispo county residents

Andy Wallace
National Property Inspections
[REDACTED]

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:22 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 100

RedistrictingID 100
Form inserted 11/15/2021 9:21:20 AM
Form updated 11/15/2021 9:21:20 AM
First Name ROY
Last Name BARBA
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City Creston
Zip 93432

Comment After reviewing the redistricting maps posted on the SLO County website it seems the only map that conforms to the California redistricting regulations is the Richard Patten map. I would recommend that the SLO County Board of Supervisors adopt the Richard Patten Rev. 11-3-2021 map for 2021 redistricting.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 799227

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:24 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 101

RedistrictingID 101
Form inserted 11/15/2021 9:23:28 AM
Form updated 11/15/2021 9:23:28 AM
First Name Marianne
Last Name Culver
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93401
Comment I would like to express my support for redistricting plan "B"
Public Records Notice True
Security Check 709584

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:32 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 102

RedistrictingID 102
Form inserted 11/15/2021 9:31:25 AM
Form updated 11/15/2021 9:31:25 AM
First Name Sandra
Last Name Lee
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93401

Comment · NO CHANGE IS NEEDED AND THE COUNTY'S OWN CONSULTANT SAYS THE SAME THING: The California Fair Maps Act of 2019 does not require any change in existing boundaries if change isn't justified by Census data. Census data between 2010 and 2020 DOES NOT necessitate change • THE "NO CHANGE" OPTION IS DRAFT MAP A • DRAFT MAP A COMPLIES WITH THE FAIR MAPS ACT. • DRAFT MAP A COMPLIES WITH THE FEDERAL VOTING RIGHTS ACT.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 969873

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:33 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 103

RedistrictingID 103
Form inserted 11/15/2021 10:32:01 AM
Form updated 11/15/2021 10:32:01 AM
First Name Terence
Last Name Young
Email [REDACTED]m
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization self
Represented
City Cambria
Zip 93428

Comment I support Redistricting Plan A because populations have shifted very little since 2010. The district boundaries should remain the same. Doing so will facilitate everyone's ability to contact the correct supervisor's office. Moreover, keeping the status quo will maintain supervisors' knowledge of the issues, concerns, and contacts of importance in her or his district. Many of us have worked with our current representatives in the past. Changing that relationship should have a good reason.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 904886

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:32 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 104

RedistrictingID 104
Form inserted 11/15/2021 12:31:36 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 12:31:36 PM
First Name Claire
Last Name Mamakos
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City Paso Robles
Zip 93446
Comment As you select a redistricting map, please chose one that makes and keeps cities whole.
Thank you for your consideration.
Public Records Notice True
Security Check 429621

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:37 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 105

RedistrictingID 105
Form inserted 11/15/2021 12:36:04 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 12:36:04 PM

First Name Joe
Last Name Whalen

Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]

Name of Organization Represented

City Los Osos
Zip 93402

Comment The redistricting process you are using is undemocratic. You, the politicians are selecting your voters. According to the Fair Maps Act no changes are required because population changes were not big enough. Please bring back trust in government. Don't change the map!

Public Records Notice True

Security Check 959554

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 1:43 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 106

RedistrictingID 106
Form inserted 11/15/2021 1:43:24 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 1:43:24 PM
First Name Sheila
Last Name Dallas
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City Arroyo Grande
Zip 93420
Comment Citizen Richard Patten Rev 1 Should be implemented as it follows all the rules and keeps neighborhood of interest together no longer splitting SLO into 3 supervisory districts
Public Records Notice True
Security Check 972842

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 2:48 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 107

RedistrictingID 107
Form inserted 11/15/2021 2:47:22 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 2:47:22 PM
First Name Carol
Last Name Collins
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented none/self
City Templeton
Zip 93465
Comment I would prefer the board of supervisors retain the status quo and adopt Draft Plan A. This map will retain community of interest continuity.
Public Records Notice True
Security Check 630758

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 2:49 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 108

RedistrictingID 108
Form inserted 11/15/2021 2:48:00 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 2:48:00 PM
First Name Laurance
Last Name Shinderman
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Self
Represented
City Nipomo
Zip 93444

Comment There's no compelling reason for redistricting other than the conservative troika of the current supervisor want to "game the system" where the supervisors pick the "voters" rather than the voters select their representatives. Census data suggests minor changes but there's a hypocrisy on the part of the conservatives who speak about "election integrity" yet want to sculpt our entire segments to assure their hegemony in the board of supervisors.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 217477

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 3:12 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 109

RedistrictingID 109
Form inserted 11/15/2021 3:11:25 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 3:11:25 PM

First Name Ronda
Last Name McKible

Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]

Name of Organization Represented

City Nipomo
Zip 93444

Comment Please listen to the consultants who say that the current census does not warrant any major changes. Why in the world would we want to create absolute chaos by following any other map than draft Map A? The map is fair, legal, financially prudent and doesn't upset the upcoming elections. Keeping San Luis Obispo in one precinct does nothing but cause a domino effect of problems. Please vote for draft Map A.

Public Records Notice True

Security Check 603146

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 3:12 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 109

RedistrictingID 109
Form inserted 11/15/2021 3:11:25 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 3:11:25 PM

First Name Ronda
Last Name McKible

Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]

Name of
Organization
Represented

City Nipomo
Zip 93444

Comment Please listen to the consultants who say that the current census does not warrant any major changes. Why in the world would we want to create absolute chaos by following any other map than draft Map A? The map is fair, legal, financially prudent and doesn't upset the upcoming elections. Keeping San Luis Obispo in one precinct does nothing but cause a domino effect of problems. Please vote for draft Map A.

Public Records
Notice True

Security Check 603146

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 4:14 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 110

RedistrictingID 110
Form inserted 11/15/2021 4:13:09 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 4:13:09 PM
First Name Joanne Beale
Last Name Ruggles
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93405

Comment
Supervisors, I ask that you kindly do not remap our SLO County's supervisorial districts. There is no data to support the need for any significant changes to the county's supervisorial districts. We are particularly aware of what will or will not be happening in District 4. There is NO need for gerrymandering in our county. It's citizens are watching what you will do and we will remember those who act to prevent fair and free elections.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 365876

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 5:08 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 111

RedistrictingID 111
Form inserted 11/15/2021 5:07:32 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 5:07:32 PM
First Name Michael
Last Name Mullen
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented County Resident
City Paso Robles
Zip 93446

Comment I first had to look at the requirements from the state. After reading them and then looking at the various maps, it's obvious that the one complying most closely is the one by Richard Patten. Please adopt his final plan.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 428219

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 5:53 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 112

RedistrictingID 112
Form inserted 11/15/2021 5:52:40 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 5:52:40 PM
First Name David
Last Name Gray
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93401

Comment I like the citizen, Richard Patten's map Rev_1. For one thing, it keeps Templeton all in one district, rather than being split up into two. Also I like that Cal poly is and the same district with San Luis Obispo. I don't like our present situation where San Luis Obispo is split into three supervisor districts. Richard Pattons map keeps San Luis Obispo in one district.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 422576

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 6:59 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 113

RedistrictingID 113
Form inserted 11/15/2021 6:58:21 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 6:58:21 PM
First Name Dianna
Last Name Beck
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Individual/citizen
Represented
City San Luis Obispo
Zip 93401

Comment I am a resident of the City of San Luis Obispo and I am writing to urge you to keep the boundaries of the current supervisorial districts. Especially the City of SLO, it is important to keep representation of the City balanced across multiple districts. I appreciate your consideration.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 468384

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 7:19 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: Public Comment - ID 114

RedistrictingID 114
Form inserted 11/15/2021 7:18:44 PM
Form updated 11/15/2021 7:18:44 PM
First Name Marguerite
Last Name VanDsmr
Email [REDACTED]
Phone [REDACTED]
Name of Organization Represented No Party
City Paso Robles
Zip 93446

Comment The outcome of the census did not require any redistricting of SLO county. There is no significant change in population distribution. Taking a step to change district lines is only a partisan endeavor. We don't want partisanship to guide our county. Let's just be real. Representative government is the basis of our democracy.

Public Records Notice True
Security Check 679062

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Julie Rodewald
Cc: Redistricting
Subject: RE: [EXT]question about presentation on 10-26
Attachments: San Luis Obispo Draft Plan D with Current Lines_2020_Cover.pdf; San Luis Obispo Draft Plan D with Cities_2020_Cover.pdf

Hi, Julie. Good catch! It looks like our consultant made an error on slide 35. I've attached the final overview maps of Map D with City and Current Line overlays. We'll make sure he fixes that error going forward.

Let me know if you have any further questions.

Thanks,

Kristin

From: Julie rodewald [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 10:39 AM
To: Kristin Eriksson <keriksson@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]question about presentation on 10-26

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

Kristin - I was looking back over the presentation on 10-26 and am confused about the difference in slides 34 and 35 (Plan D), 34 shows the north coast as a whole but 35 which shows the existing districts seems to split the north coast into 3 districts. Can you clarify?

Thanks as always for your help. Julie


Julie Rodewald
[REDACTED]




**REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS**

San Luis Obispo County

Plan D with Cities





November 15, 2021

Dear SLO County Supervisors,

We advocate for basically retaining our current Supervisory Districts, whose broad outlines have been in place since we moved to this County on December 26, 1985. Over the years, we have lived in unincorporated areas within three supervisory districts, as follows: 1985 to 1993, in Cambria and on San Simeon Creek Road (District 2); 1993 to 1998 in the Templeton School District on Highway 46W (District 1); since 1998 in Squire Canyon, east of Avila Beach (District 3). In addition, both my husband (optometrist) and I (psychologist) have had professional offices in Cambria, Templeton and San Luis Obispo. Our son attended the public schools in Cambria, Templeton and San Luis Obispo. With this lived experience, we wish to comment on the "community of interest" issues related to redistricting.

When people live on the North Coast, going "over the grade," either by way of Highway 46 or 41, looms as a large undertaking. Although distance traveled from Cambria to Paso, Templeton or Atascadero is either slightly shorter or equal to the distance from Cambria to SLO, it is experienced quite differently. The Coastal Range between the two areas is a barrier that is seldom crossed and only then when it cannot be avoided. The North Coast and North County geographic areas do not share the same population demographics, the same weather patterns, the same school districts, the same economic bases, or the same environmental concerns or challenges. In short, there is few, if any, shared "communities of interest" between the North Coast and North County. However, within each of these two geographic areas, there are many shared areas of concern and interest.

North Coast people, tend to live, shop, recreate and work within the confines of the North Coast (current District 2) and drop down into San Luis Obispo occasionally, and especially for, medical services. On the other hand, North County people, whether living in current District 1 or District 5, tend to live, shop, recreate and receive medical care within the North County corridor and some people, especially residents of District 5, come into San Luis Obispo primarily for work. Clearly the North Coast and the North County are geographically and practically divided by the Coastal Range. Clearly, the boundaries of our Supervisory Districts need to continue to reflect this geographic and social reality.

The City of San Luis Obispo provides services and employment to those who live throughout our County. Therefore, it is reasonable that the City of San Luis Obispo should not be exclusively in one District. Rather, this important hub has been well served by having multiple supervisors (Districts 2, 3 and 5) representing the parts of the city adjacent to their districts. While there are smaller neighborhoods within San Luis Obispo City, these do not seem to provide significantly distinct identities within the City. Rather, Supervisory District boundary lines determined by major roadways or school district boundaries are clear and appropriate.

While we have not lived in South County, it appears that the boundaries for District 4, especially as drawn in Plan B, provide for cohesive communities of interest which lie within the City of Arroyo Grande and the County's most southern beach communities. While the dividing line between Districts 4 and 5 as drawn in Plan B certainly make sense in terms of community cohesiveness since all communities along our coastline share common interests and concerns while the same is true of more inland areas.

We sincerely hope you will maintain Plan A (basically the current Supervisors District Map for San Luis Obispo County) or implement Plan B. Both are fair to voters and to our communities. Thank you.

Sharon and Thomas Rippner, 6448 Squire Court, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401.

NOV 15 '21 PM2:49

