Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Gerry. Mander.

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 12:08 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Gerry. Mander.

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

SLO Board of Supervisors.. I hope we find the Courage to do the right thing. Unlike Nov.30th..this December..What the county People want..minimal change for the minimal growth. As we said at the last BOS meeting and Prior, the Communities overwhelmingly choose the Chamber map over The Richard Patten(who?) map.

Maybe let's not use this scheme to
disadvantage opposite party's.. That would be pretty pety. And I'm sure voters will remember.

Thanks...
Ronald Ross
District 5

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
[redacted] Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]I support a lawsuit in order to defend democracy

From: Lisa Hutfluss [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 3:14 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]I support a lawsuit in order to defend democracy

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Patton map, is an attempt to prevent the North Coast area of San Luis Obispo County, from having fair representation on the Board of Supervisors. Clearly the North Coast is a Community of Interest. Clearly Cambria, San Simeon and Cayucos, have no common interest with Atascadero. By removing Cambria, Cayucos and San Simeon from their Community of Interest, you are usurping the power of the voters, for your own purposes. This is a violation of the principles of a democratic society. If you continue forward with the Patton map, I, along with many others will donate funds for the sake of a lawsuit, to defend the rights of citizens, in a democratic society. Based on the recent census, there is no justification for any significant changes to the district map. Continueing down this path, is a waste of county resouces, when there are so many important problems, that need to be resolved. Please think about this, do what is right, and reject the Patton map.

Thank you,
Lisa Hutfluss
[redacted]

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Support map ID #74786

-----Original Message-----
From: Vicky Morse <vicky@tcsn.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:44 AM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; Lynn Compton <lcompton@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Support map ID #74786

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

Please support this map.

Thank you,

Vicky Morse

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]district map

From: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 7:10 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]district map

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: Luther Johnson <lutherj35@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:27 AM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]district map

Dear Supervisors, I ask for your continual support of district map 74786 that is based on population, and also helps keep like communities together such as Templeton, and Atascadero. Luther Johnson

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Fwd: Letter in Support of Redistricting Map ID 74786

From: Linelle Soxman [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 7:57 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; Lynn Compton <lcompton@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Fwd: Letter in Support of Redistricting Map ID 74786

Couldn't get the original to send, trying again.

Linelle Soxman

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Linelle Soxman [redacted]
> **Date:** December 6, 2021 at 9:40:16 PM PST
> **Subject: Letter in Support of Redistricting Map ID 74786**
>
> Dear Board of Supervisors,
>
> We fully support the approved Redistricting Map ID 74786. The map does exactly what it is supposed to do - keep communities together, not split them apart. Templeton and Atascadero need to to be kept whole, and finally, it makes complete sense to have Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo city together. This should have always been the case. The map is fair and impartial, follows the rules, shows inordinate common sense, and provides balance. Thank you for voting for a Redistricting Map that works to fairly represent ALL citizens of San Luis Obispo County. We appreciate your due diligence and hard work regarding this matter.
>
> Sincerely,
> Linelle Soxman and James McPherson
> [redacted]
> Paso Robles, CA
> 93446
>
> Sent from my iPad

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Map 74786

From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:24 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Map 74786

Correspondence on redistricting.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Goble
Legislative Assistant
5th District Supervisor Debbie Arnold
(p) 805-781-4339
(f) 805-781-1350
kgoble@co.slo.ca.us

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Frank Triggs [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 10:08 PM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; Lynn Compton <lcompton@co.slo.ca.us>; Dawn Ortiz-Legg <dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Map 74786

This map keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and also brings Cal Poly and SLO city together. I am in favor of this map. Thank you Board of Supervisors for your choice of Map 74786.

W. Frank Triggs

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]SLO County Redistricting Map

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:26 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]SLO County Redistricting Map

Correspondence on redistricting.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Goble
Legislative Assistant
5th District Supervisor Debbie Arnold
(p) 805-781-4339
(f) 805-781-1350
kgoble@co.slo.ca.us

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

-----Original Message-----
From: Becky Hallett [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 6:11 PM
To: Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]SLO County Redistricting Map

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

As a long time resident of this county, I am writing to the Board of Supervisors in full support of the approved redistricting map ID 74786. This map keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and also brings Cal Poly and SLO City together.

Thank you for finally making sense of our districts and preserving the integrity of our votes. The Gerrymandering is finally halted for at least a decade.

Becky Hallett

Sent from my iPhone

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:28 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

Correspondence on redistricting.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Goble
Legislative Assistant
5th District Supervisor Debbie Arnold
(p) 805-781-4339
(f) 805-781-1350
kgoble@co.slo.ca.us

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Donna Jordan [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 6:09 PM
To: Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

December 06, 2021

To SLO County Board of Supervisors, Debbie Arnold.

I am in support of the approved map ID 74786

Donna Jordan

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]district map

From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:32 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]district map

Correspondence on redistricting.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Goble
Legislative Assistant
5th District Supervisor Debbie Arnold
(p) 805-781-4339
(f) 805-781-1350
kgoble@co.slo.ca.us

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Luther Johnson [redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:27 AM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]district map

Dear Supervisors, I ask for your continual support of district map 74786 that is based on population, and also helps keep like communities together such as Templeton, and Atascadero. Luther Johnson

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Thank You

From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:39 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Thank You

Correspondence on redistricting.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Goble
Legislative Assistant
5th District Supervisor Debbie Arnold
(p) 805-781-4339
(f) 805-781-1350
kgoble@co.slo.ca.us

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: John Texeira [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:22 AM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Lynn Compton <lcompton@co.slo.ca.us>; Dawn Ortiz-Legg <dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Thank You

Dear Supervisors,

America is a nation of laws. The Patten map #74786 conforms to the criteria set forth in Assembly Bill 849 and the California Elections Code. I want to thank the Supervisors who voted to adopt the Patten map and end the 20 years of Gerrymandering San Luis Obispo County.

John Texeira

San Luis Obispo County

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Item #39 FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

---

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:49 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Item #39 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, the Board-Clerk 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: Monday, December 6, 2021 10:13 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: Linelle Soxman

Your Email: [redacted]

U.S. phone number [redacted]

Message: RE: Redistricting Map ID 74786 Dear Board of Supervisors, We fully support the approved Redistricting Map ID 74786. The app does exactly what it is designed to do - keep communities together, not split them apart. Templeton and Atascadero need to be kept whole and it makes complete sense to have Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo city together. This should always be the case. The map is fair and impartial, follows the rules, shows common sense and provides balance. Thank you for voting for Redistricting that works to fairly represent ALL citizens of San Luis Obispo County. We appreciate your due diligence and hard work regarding this matter. Sincerely, Linelle Soxman and James McPherson 28 Hilltop Drive Paso Robles, CA 93446

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 135222

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2942

Form inserted: 12/6/2021 10:11:59 PM

Form updated: 12/6/2021 10:11:59 PM

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]I support a lawsuit in order to defend democracy

---

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:50 AM
To: BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]I support a lawsuit in order to defend democracy

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors, the Board-Clerk 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: Lisa Hutfluss [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 3:14 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]I support a lawsuit in order to defend democracy

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Patton map, is an attempt to prevent the North Coast area of San Luis Obispo County, from having fair representation on the Board of Supervisors. Clearly the North Coast is a Community of Interest. Clearly Cambria, San Simeon and Cayucos, have no common interest with Atascadero. By removing Cambria, Cayucos and San Simeon from their Community of Interest, you are usurping the power of the voters, for your own purposes. This is a violation of the principles of a democratic society. If you continue forward with the Patton map, I, along with many others will donate funds for the sake of a lawsuit, to defend the rights of citizens, in a democratic society. Based on the recent census, there is no justification for any significant changes to the district map. Continueing down this path, is a waste of county resouces, when there are so many important problems, that need to be resolved. Please think about this, do what is right, and reject the Patton map.

Thank you,
Lisa Hutfluss

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]74786

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:53 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]74786

-----Original Message-----
From: Lorraine Cagliero [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:06 AM
To: John Peschong <john@johnpeschong.com>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]74786

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

I support 74786. I cannot understand when liberals don't get their way they just threaten law suits and everything gets held up just like they want.
Please do the right thing. Lorraine Cagliero

Sent from my iPad

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Item #39 FW: [EXT]Redistricting

From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:53 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Item #39 FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors, the Board-Clerk 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: Debbie Punches [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 8:47 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

Dear Board of Supervisors
First, I would like to thank you for selecting the best redistricting map, ID74786. It best fits the legal requirements.
I encourage the Board to unanimously vote yes on agenda/consent #39.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Debbie

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
[redacted] Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]The Patten map

From: Bonnie Thompson [redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 10:07 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]The Patten map

Dear Wade Horton,

I was shocked to learn that the clearly gerrymandered Patten map was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. It has no advantages for county residents and has many disastrous disadvantages. For instance:

--The new districts have been devised to give Republicans—who are a minority by population in the county—almost perpetual rule.

--A perfect illustration of the fancy footwork required to attain that Republican advantage is the skinny dog-bone-shaped version of District 3, which connects SLO to Morro Bay via a long, mostly empty span of highway.

--San Miguel is separated from Paso Robles—its closest neighbor and strongest community of interest.

--The whole point of the Patten map was—patently—to keep cities whole. Yes SLO is still divided. So, clearly, that was not the real point at all.

--As the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has pointed out, the Patten map also accelerates some 48,000 Republican voters and defers 48,000 Democrats. Again, this is no coincidence but is part of the Republican power grab.

--State law states that communities of interest should be kept together. But not only is San Miguel split from Paso Robles but Los Osos and Morro Bay—about as close, in terms of interests, as two towns can get—are separated.

--And not only *that*, but Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. Ignoring the fact that residents of Cayucos are in Morro Bay constantly for shopping, that their children attend school there.

--Splitting up Los Osos and Morro Bay is literal insanity; the two towns have so much in common that "local" to a resident of either one can mean either town.

--And grouping Los Osos with Avila Beach is also ludicrous--it takes forty minutes even to get from one to the other. You might as well group Los Osos with San Miguel, for all the use this would do. (But hold on: that's already happened for Cambria.)

The map the board selected is clearly intended to engineer and cement minority rule for the next ten years. That is not democracy.

Is it not absurd to give the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries? This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel.

The Patten map spits in the face of the ideals that are America.

Sincerely yours,
Bonnie Thompson
[redacted]

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Gerrymandering

From: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 10:28 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Gerrymandering

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

From: Mary Van Ryn [redacted]>
Sent: Sunday, December 5, 2021 7:39 AM
To: District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Gerrymandering

Good morning from Nipomo,

As a long time resident, I am extremely frustrated and angry with the management of district 4.

Now you voted to change the district boundaries to make it more conservative.
As an independent voter, I'm beyond disappointed and can tell you, that I will voice my concerns about Lynn Compton. She doesn't represent the south counties best interest.

Every opportunity I have, I will discuss District 4, and how Nipomo is and will be negatively affected by the board of supervisors. Our town is a mess, with congestion and lack of code enforcement. Now you're moving to allow another huge development. Terrible management - sold out to rich developers.

Regards,

Mary van Ryn

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]New districting map

-----Original Message-----
From: Pamela Hostetter [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 10:53 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]New districting map

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

Please use the non-partisan chamber map for our new representative distribution. Breaking up the coastal cities does not keep areas of interest together. Morro Bay and Los Osos are combined in our interests, area type and we share upper level schools.
I also do not like that my town will miss out in the next election.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter

Pamela S Hostetter

Sent from my iPad

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Public Comment - ID 321

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 12:54 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 321

RedistrictingID	321
Form inserted	12/7/2021 12:53:33 PM
Form updated	12/7/2021 12:53:33 PM
First Name	Christie
Last Name	Cutter
Email	[redacted]
Phone	[redacted]
Name of Organization Represented	
City	San Luis Obispo
Zip	93401
Comment	I strongly oppose adopting the Patten map which I see as radical redrawing of districts for the purpose of partisan advantage. The 3/2 "conservative" board majority has railroaded this through ignoring their own staff recommendations and the clear majority of public comment. This flies in the face of democracy, communities of interest have been divide, not united! this is SO wrong, may their shame be PUBLIC and judgement severe. Sincerely, Christie Cutter
Public Records Notice	True

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Thank YOu!

From: janlynch1@charter.net [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:20 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Thank YOu!

Thank you for supporting the redistricting plan #74786! Great job!

Patrick & Jan Lynch

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
[redacted] Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting the county

-----Original Message-----
From: Linda Robertson [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:43 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting the county

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

I just read today's Tribune article about this morning's Board of Supervisors' meeting, and the tenor of the comments quoted convinced me even more that the Patten map is not only a Republican power grab, but an intensely partisan one. Calls for the prosecution of the Democratic supervisors for exercising their legal right to demand data about the partisan makeup of the districts are more and more typical of the authoritarian right in this country, and now this county. They have already tried voter suppression; and I fear for what will become of this county when they have the upper hand for the next ten years. I have no wish to live in a place run by such people. We need an independent redistricting commission, and until that can happen I fully support any lawsuit against the gerrymandered Patten map.

Linda Robertson

San Luis Obispo

--

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Patton redistricting map

-----Original Message-----
From: Peggy [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:49 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Patton redistricting map

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

It is very clear to me that this map is gerrymandered specifically to favor the Republican Party. There is no need to so radically alter the current map that has been in place for decades. The census did not change equally as radically.

Margaret Ladue
Templeton

Sent from my iPhone

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Comments - Identification of revised Supervisor District defined areas.

From: Wade Horton <whorton@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:52 PM
To: Morgan Torell <mtorell@co.slo.ca.us>; Kristin Eriksson <keriksson@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Comments - Identification of revised Supervisor District defined areas.

FYI

Wade Horton
County Administrative Officer
County of San Luis Obispo
805.781.5018
whorton@co.slo.ca.us

From: Murray J. Powell [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 12:48 PM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; Vicki Janssen <vjanssen@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: bnj13536@gmail.com; Erik Gorham <Erik@madronelandscapes.com>; Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>; Trevor Keith <tkeith@co.slo.ca.us>; Wade Horton <whorton@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Comments - Identification of revised Supervisor District defined areas.

Vicky,

Thanks for your response. One question that we need help with is how to determine which Districts voters will be residing in with the adoption of the Patten map. Today's December 7th BOS hearing agenda item #39 regarding redistricting issues includes agenda item documents 2 and 3 that represent the revisions of County code Section 2.60 that will define the new precise identification of the areas to be included in each of the County's 5 Supervisorial Districts.

As I indicated in my email below, the proposed revised County code ordinance 2.60 specifies hundreds or thousands of "Whole Census Tracts", "Whole Block Groups" and "Individual Block" numbers that apparently define actual areas contained in each District. How is this information accessed within County websites to allow voters to determine their new Supervisorial Districts? Hopefully, the County will provide some sort of website search program where residents can enter their registered voting addresses and be advised of their new Supervisor Districts. This sort of search program should be immediately established on a County website.

Murray Powell

From: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 5:21 PM
To: Murray J. Powell [redacted]>; John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: bnj13536@gmail.com; Erik Gorham <Erik@madronelandscapes.com>; Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: RE: [EXT]Redistricting Comments for tomorrow's BOS meeting.

Hello Murray,
Here is some information to answer your questions about the effective date of new boundaries:

- The ordinance amendment will be effective 30 days after the December 14, 2021 hearing
- For Districts in which the current supervisorial term ends in 2022 (District 2 and District 4) the new boundaries will be effective at the beginning of the new term beginning January 2023 and those district elections in 2022 will be based on the new boundaries
- For Districts in which the current supervisorial term ends in 2024 (District 1, District 3 and District 5) current supervisors will preside over their current district boundaries for the remainder of their term. New district boundaries will be effective at the beginning of the next term beginning January 2025 and those district elections will be based on new boundaries.
    - Note: Although there will be a Special Election for District 3 in the next general election, whomever wins that election will serve the existing District 3 term through 2024.
    - Note: After the new boundaries go into effect, there will be some overlap where there may be two or more supervisors for some portions of the districts until District 1 and 5 new boundaries go into effect in January 2025.

I have forwarded your comments to the Clerk for the public record.

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: Murray J. Powell [redacted]>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 3:30 PM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: bnj13536@gmail.com; Erik Gorham <Erik@madronelandscapes.com>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Comments for tomorrow's BOS meeting.

John and Debbie,

We have been receiving questions regarding issues concerning the effects of the new 2021 – 2030 redistricting map.

Actual District Boundary Line locations

- The revised approved 2021-2030 map that is posted as an attachment to tomorrow's Board hearing Consent Item # 39 as a hearing item document on the County's Meeting Calendar website is very unclear as to the actual proposed Supervisorial District boundary line locations. Tomorrow's hearing item attachments 2 and 3 - Ordinance to amend Chapter 2.60 of County Code specify hundreds or thousands of "Whole Census Tracts:, "Whole Block Groups" and "Individual Block" numbers that apparently define actual boundary locations. No information is provided with tomorrow's hearing documentation that provides this information by tract, block or individual black numbers that would allow for the identification of precise District boundary locations. Of particular concern are residents and property owners who are located in close proximity to the proposed boundary lines of the approved map.

- A second question is in regard to the various Supervisorial Districts that the Templeton Area Advisory Group (TAAG) will influence. Currently TAAG defines its boundaries as the Templeton Unified School District boundaries that cover portions of District 1 and 5. The 2021-2030 approved map will move the eastern boundary of District 2 into the westerly portion of the Templeton School District boundary. Does this mean that TAAG will immediately begin dealing with the District 2 Supervisor?

- The third question is whether TAAG will continue to deal with the District 5 Supervisor since District 5 will be moved to the westerly side of San Luis Obispo and obviously will no longer be located within the Templeton School District boundaries? Or will TAAG continue to deal with Supervisor Arnold until her term expires on January 1, 2025?

- Last question. Will the Creston Advisory Board (CAB) and the Santa Margarita Advisory Council (SMAC) who are presently located in existing District 5 continue to deal with Supervisor Arnold until her term expires on January 1, 2025 or will these two Advisory Councils begin dealing with the District 1 and possibly District 2 Supervisors?

Representation of Existing Supervisors in Their Currently Existing Defined District 1 and 5 Supervisorial Districts.

- It is our understanding that both Peschong and Arnold, whose current terms do not expire until January 1, 2025, will continue to represent District 1 and 5 registered voters and residents who are located in the present District Boundaries without regard to the new redistricting map the substantially changes these District boundaries and adjacent District boundaries. For example, The Boundaries of District 2 whose Supervisor's term expires on January 1, 2023 is up for election in 2022. The revised District 2 boundaries moved easterly and take over a considerable portion of the District 1. Questions include the following;

    - Do former District 1 voters who are moved to District 2 vote for a District 2 Supervisor during the 2022 election?
    - Which Supervisor District (1 or 2) do former District 1 voters relay on and contact until John Peschong's term expires on January 1, 2025?
    - If Peschong continues to oversee the present designated District 1 boundaries until his term expires on January 1, 2025, how do the new approved map District 2 boundaries affect the present District 1 boundaries prior to January 1, 2025?

Obviously, these questions and others also relate for the most part to Debbie Arnold's representation of District 5 until her term expires on January 1, 2025.

Violation of California Election Code and the Fair Maps Act regarding protecting Communities of Interest with respect to the recognized unincorporated Templeton Community area

- The County BOS redistricting hearings have clearly recognized and agree that the split of a substantial portion of a recognized "Community Interest" is a violation of the Californian Election Codes and the state's Fair Maps Act provisions. The approved proposed 2021-2030 map obviously violates the split of the unincorporated Templeton Community. The approved redistricting map has moved the existing District 2 easterly boundary line a substantial number of miles to the east to absorb a considerable portion of District 1's western area that has been recognized as the western portion of the Templeton Community area for many years. Although the proposed map boundaries are not well defined in attachment 1 of tomorrow's hearing, it appears that the proposed District 1 – 2 boundary line will run generally north and south in line more or less with the Hiway 46 West-Vineyard roundabout intersection. The present existing District 1 westerly boundary line runs North and South along Santa Rosa Creek Road. Many miles to the west of the proposed approved map's District 1 -2 line. The 2021-2030 approved map essentially cuts a large western portion (extending north into the Adelaide area) of the generally recognized Templeton community out of District 1 and combines the area with the coastal community areas of Cambria and Cayucos whose interests do not align with the District 1's rural, ag, vineyard, winery, crop production and livestock raising interests whatsoever.

- The proposed 2021-2030 map goes further in violating the Election Codes "Communities of Interest" provision by combining the unincorporated inland communities of of Atascadero, Oak Shores, Lake Nacimiento, San Miguel and Garden Farms within District 2 with the coastal communities of San Simeon, Cambria, and Cayucos.

Murray Powell
Templeton Resident
December 6, 2021

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Public Comment

-----Original Message-----
From: Karen Pearson [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 3:07 PM
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.

I don't possibly see how you can say that you followed all the mandates for redistricting, then say that the Patten Map is not Partisan. But, you won't allow anyone on the board to look at &/or disclose how many democrats/republicans have been displaced by the Patten Map. It has been studied by the League of Women Voters, and very much favors Republicans. IT IS PARTISAN. I suppose if you go this way, you will all be put out of a job, hopefully. What you have done is very blatant and illegal.
Dave & Karen Pearson
Cambria

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting map SLO County

-----Original Message-----
From: Jan DUFFY [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 3:52 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting map SLO County

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

I do NOT support the selection of the Patten map for SLO redistricting. I believe it is being chosen by the conservative Board of supervisor members to provide an unfair and partisan advantage to the Republican Membership of our county. I sincerely hope that a legal challenge to this decision is made before implementation in 2022. I suggest that this decision be placed on the ballot for SLO citizens to determine rather than the current SLO Board of Supervisors.

Janice Duffy
[redacted]
Pismo Beach, Ca

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Please reconsider

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanne Miller [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 4:10 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Please reconsider

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

I live in Atascadero - our closest “relatives” are Templeton and Paso Robles. It is with them that we share similar issues and concerns. The same cannot be said for Atascadero and Cal Poly or Cambria or Cayucos. This new map is ridiculous and I feel deprives me of appropriate representation.

Jeanne Miller
[redacted]
Atascadero

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting Comments - Identification of revised Supervisor District defined areas.

From: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 4:40 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: [EXT]Redistricting Comments - Identification of revised Supervisor District defined areas.

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: Murray J. Powell [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 12:48 PM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; Vicki Janssen <vjanssen@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: bnj13536@gmail.com <bnj13536@gmail.com>; Erik Gorham <Erik@madronelandscapes.com>; Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>; Trevor Keith <tkeith@co.slo.ca.us>; Wade Horton <whorton@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Comments - Identification of revised Supervisor District defined areas.

Vicky,

Thanks for your response. One question that we need help with is how to determine which Districts voters will be residing in with the adoption of the Patten map. Today's December 7th BOS hearing agenda item #39 regarding redistricting issues includes agenda item documents 2 and 3 that represent the revisions of County code Section 2.60 that will define the new precise identification of the areas to be included in each of the County's 5 Supervisorial Districts.

As I indicated in my email below, the proposed revised County code ordinance 2.60 specifies hundreds or thousands of "Whole Census Tracts", "Whole Block Groups" and "Individual Block" numbers that apparently define actual areas contained in each District. How is this information accessed within County websites to allow voters to determine their new Supervisorial Districts? Hopefully, the County will provide some sort of website search program where residents can enter their registered voting addresses and be advised of their new Supervisor Districts. This sort of search program should be immediately established on a County website.

Murray Powell

From: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 5:21 PM
To: Murray J. Powell [redacted]; John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: bnj13536@gmail.com; Erik Gorham <Erik@madronelandscapes.com>; Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: RE: [EXT]Redistricting Comments for tomorrow's BOS meeting.

Hello Murray,
Here is some information to answer your questions about the effective date of new boundaries:

- The ordinance amendment will be effective 30 days after the December 14, 2021 hearing
- For Districts in which the current supervisorial term ends in 2022 (District 2 and District 4) the new boundaries will be effective at the beginning of the new term beginning January 2023 and those district elections in 2022 will be based on the new boundaries
- For Districts in which the current supervisorial term ends in 2024 (District 1, District 3 and District 5) current supervisors will preside over their current district boundaries for the remainder of their term. New district boundaries will be effective at the beginning of the next term beginning January 2025 and those district elections will be based on new boundaries.
    - Note: Although there will be a Special Election for District 3 in the next general election, whomever wins that election will serve the existing District 3 term through 2024.
    - Note: After the new boundaries go into effect, there will be some overlap where there may be two or more supervisors for some portions of the districts until District 1 and 5 new boundaries go into effect in January 2025.

I have forwarded your comments to the Clerk for the public record.

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: Murray J. Powell <murray@dfrios.com>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 3:30 PM
To: John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: bnj13536@gmail.com; Erik Gorham <Erik@madronelandscapes.com>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting Comments for tomorrow's BOS meeting.

John and Debbie,

We have been receiving questions regarding issues concerning the effects of the new 2021 – 2030 redistricting map.

Actual District Boundary Line locations

- The revised approved 2021-2030 map that is posted as an attachment to tomorrow's Board hearing Consent Item # 39 as a hearing item document on the County's Meeting Calendar website is very unclear as to the actual proposed Supervisorial District boundary line locations. Tomorrow's hearing item attachments 2 and 3 - Ordinance to amend Chapter 2.60 of County Code specify hundreds or thousands of "Whole Census Tracts:, "Whole Block Groups" and "Individual Block" numbers that apparently define actual boundary locations. No information is provided with tomorrow's hearing documentation that provides this information by tract, block or individual black numbers that would allow for the identification of precise District boundary locations. Of particular concern are residents and property owners who are located in close proximity to the proposed boundary lines of the approved map.

- A second question is in regard to the various Supervisorial Districts that the Templeton Area Advisory Group (TAAG) will influence. Currently TAAG defines its boundaries as the Templeton Unified School District boundaries that cover portions of District 1 and 5. The 2021-2030 approved map will move the eastern boundary of District 2 into the westerly portion of the Templeton School District boundary. Does this mean that TAAG will immediately begin dealing with the District 2 Supervisor?

- The third question is whether TAAG will continue to deal with the District 5 Supervisor since District 5 will be moved to the westerly side of San Luis Obispo and obviously will no longer be located within the Templeton School District boundaries? Or will TAAG continue to deal with Supervisor Arnold until her term expires on January 1, 2025?

- Last question. Will the Creston Advisory Board (CAB) and the Santa Margarita Advisory Council (SMAC) who are presently located in existing District 5 continue to deal with Supervisor Arnold until her term expires on January 1, 2025 or will these two Advisory Councils begin dealing with the District 1 and possibly District 2 Supervisors?

Representation of Existing Supervisors in Their Currently Existing Defined District 1 and 5 Supervisorial Districts.

- It is our understanding that both Peschong and Arnold, whose current terms do not expire until January 1, 2025, will continue to represent District 1 and 5 registered voters and residents who are located in the present District Boundaries without regard to the new redistricting map the substantially changes these District boundaries and adjacent District boundaries. For example, The Boundaries of District 2 whose Supervisor's term expires on January 1, 2023 is up for election in 2022. The revised District 2 boundaries moved easterly and take over a considerable portion of the District 1. Questions include the following;

    - Do former District 1 voters who are moved to District 2 vote for a District 2 Supervisor during the 2022 election?
    - Which Supervisor District (1 or 2) do former District 1 voters relay on and contact until John Peschong's term expires on January 1, 2025?
    - If Peschong continues to oversee the present designated District 1 boundaries until his term expires on January 1, 2025, how do the new approved map District 2 boundaries affect the present District 1 boundaries prior to January 1, 2025?

Obviously, these questions and others also relate for the most part to Debbie Arnold's representation of District 5 until her term expires on January 1, 2025.

Violation of California Election Code and the Fair Maps Act regarding protecting Communities of Interest with respect to the recognized unincorporated Templeton Community area

- The County BOS redistricting hearings have clearly recognized and agree that the split of a substantial portion of a recognized "Community Interest" is a violation of the Californian Election Codes and the state's Fair Maps Act provisions. The approved proposed 2021-2030 map obviously violates the split of the unincorporated Templeton Community. The approved redistricting map has moved the existing District 2 easterly boundary line a substantial number of miles to the east to absorb a considerable portion of District 1's western area that has been recognized as the western portion of the Templeton Community area for many years. Although the proposed map boundaries are not well defined in attachment 1 of tomorrow's hearing, it appears that the proposed District 1 – 2 boundary line will run generally north and south in line more or less with the Hiway 46 West-Vineyard roundabout intersection. The present existing District 1 westerly boundary line runs North and South along Santa Rosa Creek Road. Many miles to the west of the proposed approved map's District 1 -2 line. The 2021-2030 approved map essentially cuts a large western portion (extending north into the Adelaide area) of the generally recognized Templeton community out of District 1 and combines the area with the coastal community areas of Cambria and Cayucos whose interests do not align with the District 1's rural, ag, vineyard, winery, crop production and livestock raising interests whatsoever.

- The proposed 2021-2030 map goes further in violating the Election Codes "Communities of Interest" provision by combining the unincorporated inland communities of of Atascadero, Oak Shores, Lake Nacimiento, San Miguel and Garden Farms within District 2 with the coastal communities of San Simeon, Cambria, and Cayucos.

Murray Powell
Templeton Resident
December 6, 2021

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
[redacted] Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Item #39 FW: [EXT]Redistricting

From: AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 4:40 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: Item #39 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: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 09:53 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Item #39 FW: [EXT]Redistricting

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors, the Board-Clerk 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: Debbie Punches [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 8:47 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting

Dear Board of Supervisors
First, I would like to thank you for selecting the best redistricting map, ID74786. It best fits the legal requirements.
I encourage the Board to unanimously vote yes on agenda/consent #39.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Debbie

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Public Comment - ID 322

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 5:21 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 322

RedistrictingID	322
Form inserted	12/7/2021 5:20:53 PM
Form updated	12/7/2021 5:20:53 PM
First Name	Tim
Last Name	Rich
Email	[redacted]
Phone	[redacted]
Name of Organization Represented	
City	Los Osos
Zip	93402
Comment	My concern with the Patten map is that it was developed with the intent of favoring one party over the other, a clear violation of the line drawing criteria. Bruce Gibson and Dawn Ortiz-Legg asked to make these data transparent, but was voted down. I insist that these data are made public. My other concern is that criteria #2, "communities of interest" was violated. Splitting up Los Osos, Morro Bay and Cambria into three separate districts for no good reason makes no sense whatsoever.
Public Records Notice	True

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Fwd: County District Plans

From: bill Smith [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:15 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Fwd: County District Plans

Subject: County District Plans

Dear Board,
Please do not approve the Patten map for redistricting. There really isn't any necessity to vote in a new map at all. County demographics and population has not significantly changed since the last census. Please leave well enough alone.
I'm a long time resident of South County.
Thank you,
Bill Bonama

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Public Comment - ID 323

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:42 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 323

RedistrictingID	323
Form inserted	12/7/2021 6:40:59 PM
Form updated	12/7/2021 6:40:59 PM
First Name	Gregory
Last Name	Ross
Email	[redacted]
Phone	
Name of Organization Represented	Self
City	Arroyo Grande
Zip	93420
Comment	The 3/2 board majority should be ashamed of the undemocratic nature of their action regarding redistricting. These actions will not be tolerated!
Public Records Notice	True

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]SLO County Redistricting Map

From: Thomas Dowell [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:43 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Jenny Beck <jennybeck11@hotmail.com>
Subject: [EXT]SLO County Redistricting Map

Good evening - I'm writing to comment on the proposed map written by AG resident Patten and supported by the local republican party.

It is clearly no accident that the GOP has endorsed this map as the nature of its partisan influences are obvious. While the right wing supervisors claim ignorance that any knowledge of demographic data went into the creation of this map, it's fairly trivial to see how flaccid that claim is.

When the map is overlayed with population and racial data, it is self evident that this map has been created with the same anti democracy gerrymandering methods employed in many other republican controlled counties across the country where changing demographics are shifting the political priorities of the electorate. Rather than evolving their platform to accommodate the voters, republicans are employing dirty tricks to confuse the public and distract from their corruption. SLO County is not immune to this corruption of the democratic process.

The GOP would have you believe that this map was created to "keep communities together". This is a lie and a lame attempt to dog whistle the racial insecurities of republican voters. If it were at all true, the map would show the same respect for municipal borders of more left leaning communities as it does for the right. It does not, in fact cleaving the southern third of San Luis Obispo completely in a desperate attempt to salvage power in the face of a shifting electorate by disenfranchising voters (primarily low income and POC).

Adopting this map is an egregious and flagrant violation of the Fair Map Act and a painful reminder that a certain group of people in this country are willing to destroy democracy rather than cede power to the will of the people.

Please do not adopt this map.

Tom Dowell
Resident of Morro Bay

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: Public Comment - ID 324

From: Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:56 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment - ID 324

RedistrictingID	324
Form inserted	12/7/2021 6:55:20 PM
Form updated	12/7/2021 6:55:20 PM
First Name	Kathleen
Last Name	Fisher
Email	[redacted]
Phone	[redacted]
Name of Organization Represented	
City	Arroyo Grande
Zip	93420
Comment	I am in despair for our country and for the county of SLO. How can the wishes of the majority be ignored by a power hungry minority? I strongly oppose the recent redistricting map approved by Compton and her cohorts much to the chagrin of most of us who live here. I support any action that would render this ill conceived decision null and void. The Chamber of Commerce map proposal is a fair and sane approach to this current gerrymandered fiasco.
Public Records Notice	True

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Patten Map

From: Shelley Lawrence [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:14 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Patten Map

Dear Wade Horton,

Why the heck did the board of supervisors even decide to change the districting? The census indicated that we had changed very little. And why does the board of supervisors even get to vote on the districts? Why is this not a vote of the people? Who votes for whom? Seems backwards if not unethical…and it should be illegal!

The map that was adopted makes no sense for the people of this county. Communities of interest were separated such as San Miguel and Paso robles and Cayucos and Morro Bay and Morro Bay and Los Osos. They share a high school for heaven's sake! This reeks of a partisan power grab! The board's vote was self-serving and keeps the minority voters in the driver's seat for the next 10 years!

SHAME ON THEM. They should be voted OUT of office but I guess that can't happen now, can it?

And to borrow from Bonnie Thompson's letter, "Is it not absurd to give the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries? This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel."

Take back this decision! Sincerely yours,

Shelley Lawrence
San Luis Obispo (she/her/hers)
[redacted]

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]unreal redistricting map

From: Ed Rush [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 11:54 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]unreal redistricting map

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

How can anyone justify separating Morro Bay from its neighbors in Cayucos and Los Osos, while connecting it to Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo? That makes no sense at all. One look shows that this is clearly a textbook case of gerrymandering.
-*"*-.,,.-*"*-.,,.-*"*-.,,.-*"*-.,,.-*"*-.,,.-*"*-.,,.-*"*—
Ed Rush, Atascadero, Calif.
ed@edrene.us
(This email system won't let me show ed@edrene.us in the From line, but please reply to it anyway.)

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting

-----Original Message-----
From: william smith [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:14 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.

Subject: Redistricting

Dear Board Members,

I am a resident of Avila Valley. I am absolutely opposed to the Patten redistricting map and urge you to either vote for the other map or leave districts as they are. There really wasn't enough population shift to even require redistricting.

Yours,
William Smith

Sent from my iPad

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
[redacted] Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Fwd: Redistricting of Supervisorial Districts

-----Original Message-----
From: william smith [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:13 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Fwd: Redistricting of Supervisorial Districts

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

Subject: Redistricting of Supervisorial Districts

Greetings Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to leave supervisors' district as they have been for the last ten years. The county has not seen enough population change to justify redistricting.

If you must vote on a new plan, DO NOT APPROVE the Patten map plan.

Thank you,

William Jerome

Maria G. Brown

From: Redistricting
Sent: [redacted]
To: Maria G. Brown
Subject: FW: [EXT]Republican Gamesmanship

From: Laurance Shinderman [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 3:53 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Republican Gamesmanship

The Trumpian Troika of Peschong, Arnold and Compton who vote in lock step; refuse to establish a non partisan citizen's advisory committee to provide formal insight and direction on redistricting the County Supervisory districts or heed the comments of the SLO chamber of commerce or the league of women voters.

Essentially, their collective position is to have the politicians pick the voters rather than the voters selecting their representatives.

Lynn Compton won her 2018 election by a razor thin margin of 60 votes; and more than likely would face a more formidable and experienced candidate in 2024 for the 4th supervisory district.

So what to do? Redraw the district lines to pack the traditionally blue voters in Oceano, currently in the 4th district, into the already blue 5th district. In essence this would slice off voters that trend blue and would not support her and then redraw her district to include the traditionally red voters of Edna Valley into the 4th Supervisory District.

The result; a political shell game of lopping off a large segment of contiguous voters who may not support her; for a more receptive segment of Edna Valley voters. Simply stated; gerrymander the districts to establish an unfair political advantage by manipulating the boundaries of electoral districts.

With a current 3 to 2 majority on the Board of Supervisors on the line; rather than making their case to the voters; their game plan is to change the boundaries. What would the alternative be? Calling up Tommy Gong's replacement , a respected public servant who maintained election integrity and say…come on…find me 60 more votes.

Lynn is fond of saying that she does her homework…but again it seems that her homework was done by the Republican cabal that drew a map that she well knows favored her by lopping off voters that were fed up with her shenanigans.

Of course; Peschong and Arnold were like bobble heads nodding in agreement.

"**Those who can make you believe absurdities, can make you commit atrocities."...Voltaire**