## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:14 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]DO NOT VOTE YES FOR THE PATTEN MAP

**From:** jj johnson [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 8:40 AM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]DO NOT VOTE YES FOR THE PATTEN MAP



The Patten redistricting map is blatantly partisan and not legal. DO NOT VOTE FOR IT. Vote YES for the SLO County 2030 map.

Doug Scheel
[redacted]
Los Osos,CA

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:15 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 8:58 AM
**To:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

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

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

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Friday, December 3, 2021 7:52 PM
**To:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Tom Martin

Your [redacted]

U.S. phone number: [redacted]

Message: To Bruce Gibson and Dawn Ortiz-Legg - THANK YOU for being on the correct side of the fence. To the three others who shall not be named, no thanks at all for your stance on the far right side of the fence. The redistricting map chosen by the three of you for San Luis Obispo County is clearly NOT in the interests of anyone except Republicans and Trump supporters. You ought to be ashamed, but in politics today shame just doesn't carry any weight. You just wait! One day this will all come back to haunt you.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 594486

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2931

Form inserted: 12/3/2021 7:51:52 PM

Form updated: 12/3/2021 7:51:52 PM

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:16 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Enough of this autocratic vote grab

-----Original Message-----
From: Victor Hyde [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 9:06 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Enough of this autocratic vote grab

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

I have lived in this county for 29 years and cannot believe just how corrupt the 3 county supervisors are. Arnold, Peschong, and most of all, Compton. Have you no shame? The only thing you care about is your money and power. Thus, no surprise, with Compton only losing to Paulding by 60 votes…the despicable trio sets out to gerrymander the district to uphold their power. This is the only way they can keep their seats…not by honest and good representation of their constituents. Wow…how truly sad. OH, and I am sure that they are all "good Christians" too.

Disgusted constituent of (sadly) Lynn Corrupt Compton

Leave the districts alone!!!!

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:16 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting San Luis Obispo County

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 9:14 AM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting San Luis Obispo County

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

Sincerely,
Lisa Marie Estrada
Administrative Assistant III-Confidential Board of Supervisors
https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.slocounty.ca.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmagbrown%40co.slo.ca.us%7C54738ca2927644a4f3a808d9b9277bb0%7C84c3c7747fdf40e2a59027b2e70f8126%7C0%7C0%7C637744401484037938%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=7XMWPh0EpZivBTi9BlvHYCK7B92fdIo%2BSduSKvYHaAw%3D&reserved=0
Direct Line: (805)781-5498

-----Original Message-----
From: Dorothy Modafferi [redacted]>
Sent: Sunday, December 5, 2021 10:38 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting San Luis Obispo County

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

As a voting citizen of San Luis Obispo County, I am appalled at the recent decision of the majority on the SLO Board of Supervisors to select the Patten map for the unnecessary redistricting of our County.

The blatant party politics of Compton, Peshong, and Arnold in voting for redistricting of our county, in spite of all the evidence shown that only minor adjustments, if any, needed to made, is abhorrent. Instead, communities of interest, geography, common sense have been ignored.

The best thing for our county would be for further DISCUSSION to take place on the board, listening to the experts, and another informed vote to take place. Party politics have no place on the SLO Board of Supervisors. This is a non-partisan office.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Modafferi
Nipomo, CA

Sent from my iPad

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:16 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Opposition to the Patten Redistricting Map

**From:** JAMIE HUGHSON [redacted]>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 9:20 AM
**Cc:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]Opposition to the Patten Redistricting Map



I would like to register my opposition to the Board of Supervisors adopting the Patten map for redistricting. This map is very obviously drawn to gerrymander the districts in favor of election of conservative supervisors. I support adoption of either the Chamber of Commerce proposed map or leaving the districts as they currently exist. These two options yield districts that are more closely matched to communities that have common interests, keep neighborhoods together, and economic interests consistent within the districts.

Regards,

Jamie Hughson
Pismo Beach

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:16 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 11:29 AM
**To:** BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

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

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

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 11:26 AM
**To:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

Your Name: Nancy Graves

Your Email [redacted]

U.S. phone number: [redacted]

Message: Dear Board, I am a resident of the County for the last 25 years, and I am very concerned about the current Redistricting issue. I was told you would be voting on this at your 12/7/21 meeting, but cannot find it on the item agenda so I am commenting in a general way. Redistricting needs to be put to the people to decide. Unfortunately the redistricting map put forward last week can only be viewed as gerrymandering and will not be let stand. You will be sued, it will take up an enormous amount of time and cause the voters of the County to lose faith in our form of government. The current districts may need some slight tweaking to even out population differences shown in the census but the current proposed map will totally change SLO county's make up. Please reconsider this ill advised action. I would also propose that Ms. Compton recuse herself from voting on this measure as it directly effects her election this coming year.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 629715

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2940

Form inserted: 12/6/2021 11:25:01 AM

Form updated: 12/6/2021 11:25:01 AM

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:17 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting ...Thank you for the courage to stand up to the mob!

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 11:49 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]Redistricting ...Thank you for the courage to stand up to the mob!

-----Original Message-----
From: Barry Branin [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, December 5, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Lynn Compton <lcompton@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting ...Thank you for the courage to stand up to the mob!

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

Dear Supervisors.
I was not able to attend the public meetings on the Redistricting. I had to work.
You have taken the first step toward the balance needed in the County.
Please continue to finalize the map you have chosen.
I remember when the last redistricting was done and they cut up the City of SLO so they could dominate the Board of Supervisors.
That stunk and now you are correcting the previous gerrymandering.

Thank you for your courage.
I am with all three of you.

Sincerely,
Barry Branin
Morro Bay

Sent from my iPad

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:17 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]November 30th meeting

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 11:51 AM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: FW: [EXT]November 30th meeting

-----Original Message-----
From: Sande ADKINS [redacted]
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>; Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]November 30th meeting

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

I was at the BOS meeting on November 30th. I didn't speak but I sure got an ear full. I just now listened again to the last hour or so to make sure I heard correctly.

It would appear as though Supervisor Bruce Gibson is channeling Adam Hill. I was stunned at his rudeness and lack of civility, not just to other board members, but to the public, his constituents. It all seemed very calculated, not just spur of the moment anger. At any rate if he doesn't apologize I would hope there would be some form of censure available. We don't need to encourage another supervisor continually 'going off the rails' when he doesn't get his way.

Thank you for your time,
Sande Adkins Triggs
Sent from my iPad

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:18 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Shameful

-----Original Message-----
From: Theresa Kaiser [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 12:15 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Shameful

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

This new redistricting map is not reflective of the people who live in them. To consider a map drawn up by a Republican citizen is against the non-partisanship role of the Board of Supervisor. The vote by conservative members of this board does not reflect the wishes of the majority of the citizens of SLO county. It's just wrong!
Theresa Kaiser
Atascadero

Sent from my iPad

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:18 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting December meeting

-----Original Message-----
From: l caulfield [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 1:04 PM
To: Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: [EXT]Redistricting December meeting

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

To the board of supervisors:
I strongly oppose the boards decision to adopt the Patten map, it has been shown to be a politically motivated gerrymandered map to ensure the election of a Republican majority on the board.
There will be legal action and the three conservatives have shown themselves to be Corrupt and anti-Democratic.
I ask that you reconsider and adopt map A.

Thank you,

Lee Andrea Caulfield
Los Osos, Ca.

Sent from my iPhone

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:18 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]redistricting

---

**From:** Sharon Rich [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 1:09 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]redistricting



Very disheartened that 3 people who represent the minority can make a decision that will impact all of us for the next decade. This should be put to the voters.

Be well.

sharon
**sharon rich | ceo**
thinkbusinessgrowth, inc.
[redacted]




**Author of *Your Hidden Game:Ten Invisible Agreements that Can Make or Break Your Business.***
**Check it out on Amazon: https://tinyurl.com/YourHiddenGame**

The strength of the team is each individual member.
The strength of each member is the team.
Phil Jackson

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:19 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Thank you for your Vote YES on Map ID 74786:)

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 1:21 PM
**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]Thank you for your Vote YES on Map ID 74786:)

For your review, this is a District 1 constituent. This email has been sent 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:** Lois Trompeter [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 12:15 PM
**To:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; District 4 <district4@co.slo.ca.us>; Dawn Ortiz-Legg <dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us>; District 3 <district3@co.slo.ca.us>; BOS_District 5_Web Contact <district5@co.slo.ca.us>; Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]Thank you for your Vote YES on Map ID 74786:)



**Board of Supervisors, San Luis Obispo County,**

**I would like to thank the Board for selecting the best map for San Luis Obispo County communities and residents:)**

**The resolution is well stated and I encourage you to unanimously vote YES on consent item #39.**

**I continue to support map ID 74786.**

**Thank you all for your support and amazing courage to stand for our citizens!**

**Sincerely,**
**Lois Trompeter/Paso Robles**

**Lois Trompeter** */ Paso Robles*
[redacted]

[redacted]

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:27 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]redistricting map

**From:** Rodney blackner [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 1:41 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]redistricting map



I'm very glad to see you have picked map 74786. I feel it best follows the newer rules of redistricting. Thank You, Rod Blackner Paso Robles

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:27 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment - ID 320

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 1:50 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** Public Comment - ID 320

| | |
|---|---|
| RedistrictingID | 320 |
| Form inserted | 12/6/2021 1:49:34 PM |
| Form updated | 12/6/2021 1:49:34 PM |
| First Name | Doug |
| Last Name | Scheel |
| Email | [redacted] |
| Phone | [redacted] |
| Name of Organization Represented | |
| City | LOS OSOS |
| Zip | 93402 |
| Comment | Your efforts to gerrymander secure positions is an abhorrence of the democratic process. You should be ashamed of yourselves, but obviously you have no shame. Stop this illegal activity now. Accept the SLO County 2030 map. |
| Public Records Notice | True |

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:27 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]In support of Map ID 74786

**From:** Cheryl Wieczorek [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 3:32 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]In support of Map ID 74786



Dear Board of Supervisors of San Luis Obispo County,
I support the vote to adopt the Map ID 74786 as it keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and keeps the community of interest with Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo together.
This map qualifies as the map with the most integrity and satisfies the fair maps act.
It is time to bring fairness and proper representation back to San Luis Obispo County.

Thank you,
Cheryl Wieczorek
[redacted]

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:27 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Support map id 74786

---

**From:** Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 3:51 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Cc:** BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Support map id 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:** Cheryl Wieczorek [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 3:38 PM
**To:** Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]Support map id 74786



Dear Supervisor Ms. Arnold,
Thank you for listening to all the arguments regarding the redistricting of San Luis Obispo County. I support the map 74786 and did speak before the Board on November 19th. This map keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and also aligns Cal Poly with the City of San Luis Obispo.
I support and commend your vote to adopt this map. I believe you acted with integrity and invoked the most fair representation for all citizens of this county.

Thank you for your service!

Sincerely,
Cheryl Wieczorek
[redacted]

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:28 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting

---

**From:** Lois Garney [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 4:02 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting



We have been full time residents of Cambria since 1987. We do not think the new proposed redistricting serves our best interests. The current map is fine and has served the needs of Cambria well. Please do not change the Districts!

Lois & Fox Garney

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:29 PM
**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:** Monday, December 6, 2021 4:12 PM
**To:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** Item #39 FW: Contact Form Topic: Board of Supervisors meetings/business

For your review, this is a District 2 constituent. This email has been forwarded to all Supervisors, the Board-Clerk and redistricting.

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 3:07 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: Sandra Pendell

Your Email [redacted]

U.S. phone number: [redacted]

Message: I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the Board's adoption of the Patten redistricting map. There was no need for redistricting and adoption of the map is clearly nothing more than gerrymandering. I am appalled by this flagrant move to redistrict as a way to manipulate voters' voices in San Luis Obispo County. I would like to remind you that Election Code section 21500 (d) prohibits the board from choosing a map that discriminates or favors a political party. the Patten map is in violation of 21500 (d) and the free and fair election clause of the California Constitution. I am a resident of Morro Bay in District 2. The issues of Morro Bay are obviously shared by other coastal towns in current District 2 and not those of the City of San Luis Obispo. How ridiculous to think that the issues of Cayucos are connected in any way to those of San Miguel! I am angered by the Board's action which clearly ignored the voices of citizens of San Luis Obispo County in favor of adopting a map which transfers power for political purposes.

Public Records Notice: True

Security Check: 023832

BoardOfSupervisorsID: 2941

Form inserted: 12/6/2021 3:07:00 PM

Form updated: 12/6/2021 3:07:00 PM

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:30 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]REDISTRICTING MAP

**From:** Susan Rodeck [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 4:39 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]REDISTRICTING MAP



I support your vote to adopt redistricting Map #74786.

Thank you,
Sue Rodeck
[redacted]

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:30 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]REDISTRICTING MAP

---

**From:** Kathleen Goble <kgoble@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 5:04 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Cc:** BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]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**

---

**From:** Susan Rodeck [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 4:43 PM
**To:** Debbie Arnold [redacted]
**Subject:** [EXT]REDISTRICTING MAP



I support your vote to adopt redistricting map #74786.

Thank you,
Sue Rodeck
[redacted]

**Maria G. Brown**

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:30 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting

**From:** Donna Jordan [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:07 PM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting



December 06, 2021

To SLO County Board of Supervisors,

I am in support of the approved map ID 74786

*Donna Jordan*

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 9:43 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** Fwd: [EXT]District map

---

**From:** Stanford Brown [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 7:43 PM
**To:** Redistricting
**Subject:** [EXT]District map



Please approve map 74786.

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:14 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]District Map ID 74786
**Attachments:** District map request to SLO.docx

---

**From:** shirley mark <[redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 7:48 AM
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** [EXT]District Map ID 74786



Please see the attached.

Thank you,

Shirley Mark

December 6, 2021

Memo to the San Luis Obispo Supervisors:

Please vote to approve the District Map, ID 74786.

This keeps together the cities of Templeton, Atascadero together, and puts Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo together.

This is the correct way, they should all stay together.

Thank you for doing the right thing for our County.

Shirley Mark
[redacted]

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Redistricting
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 6:28 PM
**To:** Maria G. Brown
**Subject:** FW: Item #39 FW: [EXT]Comments by Citizens for Preserving District #4 in Advance of 12.7.21 BoS meeting
**Attachments:** Citizens Preserve D4  Commens for 12.7.21 BOS.pdf

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 4:09 PM
**To:** BOS_Legislative Assistants Only <BOS_Legislative-Assistants-Only@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; AD-Board-Clerk <ad_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>
**Subject:** Item #39 FW: [EXT]Comments by Citizens for Preserving District #4 in Advance of 12.7.21 BoS meeting

For your review, I was not able to find this constituent in Voter Reg. 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:** Citizens Preserve District 4 [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 3:50 PM
**To:** John Peschong <jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us>; Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Dawn Ortiz-Legg <dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us>; Lynn Compton <lcompton@co.slo.ca.us>; Debbie Arnold <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>; Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>; Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>; rneal@slo.ca.gov.us; info@redistrictingpartners.com
**Subject:** [EXT]Comments by Citizens for Preserving District #4 in Advance of 12.7.21 BoS meeting



**TO:** **County of San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors**

**COPIES:** **Individual Supervisors**

**SLO County Staff Advisory Redistricting Committee**

**Redistricting Partners, Advisory Consultant**

**Rita Neal, County Counsel**

**FROM:** **Citizens for Preserving District #4**

**RE: SLO County Redistricting – Supervisorial Districts**

**DATE: December 6, 2021**

Board members, staff, Redistricting Partners, and Ms. Neal:

For the record, here's what's about to happen if the board (read three-member board majority) proceeds further toward final adoption of an ordinance and map with redrawn supervisorial district boundaries based on the Patten Map (id #74786):

**A. <u>The Board Majority will be taking a legally suspect action that:</u>**

1. Is totally not necessary, based on population changes or new Census data.

2. Ignores the potential adoption of maps and boundaries that are totally legally compliant, totally within acceptable deviation limits, and would not result in ANY acceleration or deferral issues.

3. Mis-applies the criteria found in Elections Code Sec. 21500(c).

4. Without asking for clarifying legal advice from County Counsel, totally and intentionally misinterprets AB 849, AB 1276 and the Elections Code by asserting these authorities make it illegal for the board to consider party as well as acceleration and deferral data and its connection to new boundaries being adopted for the unlawful purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.

5. Ignores advice from County Counsel that, while political party data cannot be used to draw new district lines, there's nothing in the law that prohibits the board from considering the political party implications of acceleration and deferral when determining whether adoption of certain new boundaries would run afoul of Elections Code Sec. 21500(d). In other words, one part of the statute (i.e., 21500(c) provides criteria for drawing lines, and then another part of the statute requires a determination as to whether the lines being contemplated are being drawn for improper purposes.

6. Ignores acceleration and deferral information provided by the staff advisory committee (which includes among its members a representative from County Counsel's office).

7. Ignores information and offers of information from the county-retained redistricting expert/consultant, Redistricting Partners, that has a "data team" who could provide the information specifically requested by supervisors Dawn Ortiz-Legg and Bruce Gibson.

8. Ignores analysis, conclusions, and warnings from a nationally recognized redistricting expert, Cal Poly Professor Michael Latner.

9. Essentially ignores, and certainly is inconsistent with, most of the public written and verbal comment.

10. Essentially ignores, is certainly inconsistent with, and provides no substantive response to written and oral presentations with data provided by the SLO League of Women Voters (SLOLWV).

11. Totally ignores and provides no substantive response to the memorandum/analysis and data being attached to these comments as Exhibit A, which also were submitted into the record of proceedings in the same form on November 30, 2021.

**B. <u>In the new "Patten Map" world, District #4 incumbent supervisor Lynn Compton would be in a prime position to take advantage of a district boundary adopted for "the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party" by:</u>**

1. No longer having to fulfill any obligation to do what's best for what she has called "my constituents" in Oceano.

2. No longer needing be concerned about synergies between Oceano and Nipomo on many policy issues impacting both unincorporated areas.

3. No longer having an obligation to advocate for the interests of Oceano and its residents on any issues.

4. No longer having any commitment toward businesses or residents of Oceano as they work toward a new future after changes that will occur at the Oceano Dunes State Vehicular Recreation Area (ODSVRA).

5. No longer having any commitment to listen to, interact with, or consider the views of the Oceano Advisory Council.

6. No longer having any commitment to listen to, interact with, or consider the views or needs of the Oceano Community Services District (OCSD).

7. Not seeming to care that movement of the OCSD into a new District 5 would pack into another Community Service District (CSD) district while District 4 would have just one full-service CSD.

8. Advocating as she sees fit, without giving any consideration to Oceano "constituents," on matters relating to the ODSVRA; including advocating *for* pro-OHV positions and *against* the Coastal Commission's decisions that are based significantly on environmental justice issues that directly impact Oceano.

9. Advocating as she sees fit on air quality issues without having to be concerned about an Oceano constituency.

10. Advocating as she sees fit on matters relating to the re-purposing of the Phillips 66 property without having to give any consideration to the residents, businesses, or voters of Oceano, and the synergies created between Oceano and Nipomo.

11. Advocating as she sees fit on behalf of the accelerated Republican voters who have been conveniently donated to District #4 from the old District #5.

12. Advocating without having to be concerned, or as concerned, about the potential voices of Latino populations in both Oceano and Nipomo, which rank #2 and #3 in size in the county.

13. Being less concerned about the diluted voice of the Latino population in Nipomo and the voice of the Nipomo and Nipomo Mesa communities in general.

14. Accomplishing the cracking of two heavily weighted Latino communities of interest in Oceano and Nipomo, and the packing of Oceano into a new District 5 where the voice of the Latino community would be severely diluted within the new demographic mix of that district.

15. Accomplishing the deferrals of the vote of historically Democrat-leaning voters in Oceano (a majority of the overall vote there) until at least 2024.

16. Accomplishing adding into District 4 from District 5 areas that include Edna and the SLO Country Club, where historically Republican-leaning votes would be accelerated from 2024 into 2022.

17. Contributing to the efforts of fellow supervisors Peschong and Arnold in sacrificing portions of their districts to accelerate and defer votes for party advantage into other districts.

18. Republican/Incumbent District #4 Mission Accomplished!

All of these are reasons that support a fair conclusion that a vote by Supervisor Compton in favor of the Patten Map will clearly be a vote for adoption of new district boundaries for the unlawful purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.

Citizens for Preserving District #4 also confirms that the coalition has sought, incurred costs and obtained political party and acceleration and deferral data that is now part of the public record in these redistricting proceedings. The data clearly shows favoritism for and discrimination against political parties. A copy of the material is attached as Exhibit B.

The Citizens coalition asks the following questions in connection with this data:

Why should this critically important and useful information have to come from citizens or citizen groups?

Why is the board majority not interested in asking about the data or interested in ascertaining the accuracy of the information?

Why is this information not being obtained (or now confirmed) by resources available to the BOS, especially when (a) it appears that Redistricting Partners has a “data team” in-house that could provide it quickly, and (b) Redistricting Partners has already essentially validated the accuracy of our report’s acceleration and deferral figures?

Why is County Counsel not swiftly correcting the misinformation coming from the board majority about it being “illegal” to consider such data in order to assess whether the new district boundaries they want to adopt would likely violate Elections Code Sec. 21500(d)? Just how could or would the board determine whether a potential problem exists for 21500(d) compliance without having political party information? Isn’t that analysis explicitly anticipated by the language of the provision itself?

Why has County Counsel not clarified for the benefit of the BOS, in keeping with Professor Latner’s comments, that the creation of potential district boundaries under 21500(c) is a different exercise than taking the next required step of analyzing whether the boundaries being considered run afoul of 21500(d)? It’s much more than a matter of whether the BOS “can” or “could” consider such information.

Why does the board majority accept the information provided from Redistricting Partners about incredibly high and totally unnecessary acceleration and deferral figures, but not ask for – and then join to deprive other board members from getting – the “political party” data that is a necessary ingredient for completion of the 21500(d) analysis?

We view the joint efforts of the board majority to keep relevant information from coming to the surface, to keep it from being discussed, and to wrongly characterize it as being “illegal to consider” as all speaking to the unlawful purpose behind adopting the Patten Map: to favor one political party and discriminate against another.

This theme is also supported by information in the table attached as Exhibit 2. The table shows the “flow out” and “flow in” of Latino residents and voters in the various districts from a Map A scenario (based on current district boundaries) to a Patten Map scenario (based on Patten Map boundaries. The largest outflow is from the current District 4 and the largest inflow is into the newly created, adjacent District 5.

Applying and interpreting rules in keeping with legislative purposes and statutory requirements is one thing. Intentionally ignoring, contorting, and re-writing rules to serve a particular politically-motivated need and narrative is quite another.

Finally, there's also a world of difference between a "clean record" and a 'bad record." What the board majority now has before it is both.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Citizens for Preserving District #4 | December 6, 2021 | Exhibits are included in the complete package (PDF Attachment) |

**TO:** **County of San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors**

**COPIES:** **Individual Supervisors**
**SLO County Staff Advisory Redistricting Committee**
**Redistricting Partners, Advisory Consultant**
**Rita Neal, County Counsel**

**FROM:** **Citizens for Preserving District #4**

**RE:** **SLO County Redistricting – Supervisorial Districts**

**DATE:** **December 6, 2021**

Board members, staff, Redistricting Partners, and Ms. Neal:

For the record, here's what's about to happen if the board (read three-member board majority) proceeds further toward final adoption of an ordinance and map with redrawn supervisorial district boundaries based on the Patten Map (id #74786):

**A. <u>The Board Majority will be taking a legally suspect action that:</u>**

1. Is totally not necessary, based on population changes or new Census data.
2. Ignores the potential adoption of maps and boundaries that are totally legally compliant, totally within acceptable deviation limits, and would not result in ANY acceleration or deferral issues.
3. Mis-applies the criteria found in Elections Code Sec. 21500(c).
4. Without asking for clarifying legal advice from County Counsel, totally and intentionally misinterprets AB 849, AB 1276 and the Elections Code by asserting these authorities make it illegal for the board to consider party as well as acceleration and deferral data and its connection to new boundaries being adopted for the unlawful purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.
5. Ignores advice from County Counsel that, while political party data cannot be used to draw new district lines, there's nothing in the law that prohibits the board from considering the political party implications of acceleration and deferral when determining whether adoption of certain new boundaries would run afoul of Elections Code Sec. 21500(d). In other words, one part of the statute (i.e., 21500(c) provides criteria for drawing lines, and then another part of the statute requires a determination as to whether the lines being contemplated are being drawn for improper purposes.

6. Ignores acceleration and deferral information provided by the staff advisory committee (which includes among its members a representative from County Counsel's office).
7. Ignores information and offers of information from the county-retained redistricting expert/consultant, Redistricting Partners, that has a "data team" who could provide the information specifically requested by supervisors Dawn Ortiz-Legg and Bruce Gibson.
8. Ignores analysis, conclusions, and warnings from a nationally recognized redistricting expert, Cal Poly Professor Michael Latner.
9. Essentially ignores, and certainly is inconsistent with, most of the public written and verbal comment.
10. Essentially ignores, is certainly inconsistent with, and provides no substantive response to written and oral presentations with data provided by the SLO League of Women Voters (SLOLWV).
11. Totally ignores and provides no substantive response to the memorandum/analysis and data being attached to these comments as Exhibit A, which also were submitted into the record of proceedings in the same form on November 30, 2021.

**B. In the new "Patten Map" world, District #4 incumbent supervisor Lynn Compton would be in a prime position to take advantage of a district boundary adopted for "the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party" by:**

1. No longer having to fulfill any obligation to do what's best for what she has called "my constituents" in Oceano.
2. No longer needing be concerned about synergies between Oceano and Nipomo on many policy issues impacting both unincorporated areas.
3. No longer having an obligation to advocate for the interests of Oceano and its residents on any issues.
4. No longer having any commitment toward businesses or residents of Oceano as they work toward a new future after changes that will occur at the Oceano Dunes State Vehicular Recreation Area (ODSVRA).
5. No longer having any commitment to listen to, interact with, or consider the views of the Oceano Advisory Council.
6. No longer having any commitment to listen to, interact with, or consider the views or needs of the Oceano Community Services District (OCSD).
7. Not seeming to care that movement of the OCSD into a new District 5 would pack into another Community Service District (CSD) district while District 4 would have just one full-service CSD.
8. Advocating as she sees fit, without giving any consideration to Oceano "constituents," on matters relating to the ODSVRA; including advocating *for* pro-OHV positions and *against* the Coastal Commission's decisions that are based significantly on environmental justice issues that directly impact Oceano.

9. Advocating as she sees fit on air quality issues without having to be concerned about an Oceano constituency.
10. Advocating as she sees fit on matters relating to the re-purposing of the Phillips 66 property without having to give any consideration to the residents, businesses, or voters of Oceano, and the synergies created between Oceano and Nipomo.
11. Advocating as she sees fit on behalf of the accelerated Republican voters who have been conveniently donated to District #4 from the old District #5.
12. Advocating without having to be concerned, or as concerned, about the potential voices of Latino populations in both Oceano and Nipomo, which rank #2 and #3 in size in the county.
13. Being less concerned about the diluted voice of the Latino population in Nipomo and the voice of the Nipomo and Nipomo Mesa communities in general.
14. Accomplishing the cracking of two heavily weighted Latino communities of interest in Oceano and Nipomo, and the packing of Oceano into a new District 5 where the voice of the Latino community would be severely diluted within the new demographic mix of that district.
15. Accomplishing the deferrals of the vote of historically Democrat-leaning voters in Oceano (a majority of the overall vote there) until at least 2024.
16. Accomplishing adding into District 4 from District 5 areas that include Edna and the SLO Country Club, where historically Republican-leaning votes would be accelerated from 2024 into 2022.
17. Contributing to the efforts of fellow supervisors Peschong and Arnold in sacrificing portions of their districts to accelerate and defer votes for party advantage into other districts.
18. Republican/Incumbent District #4 Mission Accomplished!

All of these are reasons that support a fair conclusion that a vote by Supervisor Compton in favor of the Patten Map will clearly be a vote for adoption of new district boundaries for the unlawful purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.

Citizens for Preserving District #4 also confirms that the coalition has sought, incurred costs and obtained political party and acceleration and deferral data that is now part of the public record in these redistricting proceedings. The data clearly shows favoritism for and discrimination against political parties. A copy of the material is attached as Exhibit B.

The Citizens coalition asks the following questions in connection with this data:

Why should this critically important and useful information have to come from citizens or citizen groups?

Why is the board majority not interested in asking about the data or interested in ascertaining the accuracy of the information?

Why is this information not being obtained (or now confirmed) by resources available to the BOS, especially when (a) it appears that Redistricting Partners has a "data team" in-house that could provide it quickly, and (b) Redistricting Partners has already essentially validated the accuracy of our report's acceleration and deferral figures?

Why is County Counsel not swiftly correcting the misinformation coming from the board majority about it being "illegal" to consider such data in order to assess whether the new district boundaries they want to adopt would likely violate Elections Code Sec. 21500(d)? Just how could or would the board determine whether a potential problem exists for 21500(d) compliance without having political party information? Isn't that analysis explicitly anticipated by the language of the provision itself?

Why has County Counsel not clarified for the benefit of the BOS, in keeping with Professor Latner's comments, that the creation of potential district boundaries under 21500(c) is a different exercise than taking the next required step of analyzing whether the boundaries being considered run afoul of 21500(d)? It's much more than a matter of whether the BOS "can" or "could" consider such information.

Why does the board majority accept the information provided from Redistricting Partners about incredibly high and totally unnecessary acceleration and deferral figures, but not ask for – and then join to deprive other board members from getting – the "political party" data that is a necessary ingredient for completion of the 21500(d) analysis?

We view the joint efforts of the board majority to keep relevant information from coming to the surface, to keep it from being discussed, and to wrongly characterize it as being "illegal to consider" as all speaking to the unlawful purpose behind adopting the Patten Map: to favor one political party and discriminate against another.

This theme is also supported by information in the table attached as Exhibit 2. The table shows the "flow out" and "flow in" of Latino residents and voters in the various districts from a Map A scenario (based on current district boundaries) to a Patten Map scenario (based on Patten Map boundaries. The largest outflow is from the current District 4 and the largest inflow is into the newly created, adjacent District 5.

Applying and interpreting rules in keeping with legislative purposes and statutory requirements is one thing. Intentionally ignoring, contorting, and re-writing rules to serve a particular politically-motivated need and narrative is quite another.

Finally, there's also a world of difference between a "clean record" and a 'bad record." What the board majority now has before it is both.

Citizens for Preserving District #4 December 6, 2021 Exhibits Follow:

Exhibit A
Citizens for Preserving District #4
Acceleration/Deferral Memorandum & Analysis and Data

MEMORANDUM

November 29, 2021

RE: Analysis of political party registrations and voter accelerations/deferrals in proposed supervisorial redistricting maps

This memo reports and analyzes political party registration for the current and two proposed supervisorial district maps. The current districts are delineated in "Map A" and the proposed maps are designated the "Patten" map (county ID 74786) and the "Chamber" map (county ID 75760).

## Summary of results

- Relative to current districts, the Patten map results in increased Republican voter registration advantage in three of five resulting districts (1, 2, and 4) by "packing" Democratic voters into two of the resulting districts (3 and 5). Packing is defined as increasing the percentage of registered voters of a given party into the identified district.
- The Republican advantage and Democratic packing are both accomplished by "cracking," defined here as separating communities in existing Districts 2 and 4 from those districts and inserting them into radically reconfigured Patten map districts. Los Osos, Morro Bay, Cayucos, San Simeon, and Oceano are the communities affected.
- As a whole, all five Patten map districts show increased partisan advantage (Republican or Democrat) relative to the partisan balance in the five current districts.
- "Acceleration" of voters is defined as permitting voters who had previously voted in the most recent election, not otherwise scheduled to be able to vote again for a supervisor for four years, to instead be scheduled in the new redrawn district to be eligible to vote at the next election, two years after their most recent supervisorial vote. "Deferral" is defined as delaying the next vote otherwise scheduled for the next election, by delaying it in the redrawn district by an extra 2 years.
- Of 34,139 registered voters who will have their votes accelerated by the Patten map (voting in both 2020 and 2022), 41.4% are Republican to 31.8% Democratic.
- Of 29,063 registered voters who will have their votes deferred by the Patten map (voting in 2018, but not again until 2024), 46.9% are Democratic to 24.7% Republican.
- A total of 48,464 people (total population) live in areas that will be accelerated by the Patten map; 49,399 live in areas that will be deferred.
- The San Luis Obispo County Republican Party has actively promoted the Patten map.

## Summary of conclusions

- The Patten Map violates California Election Code 21500 (d) by explicitly favoring the Republican party, both in the overall distribution of party members and in the acceleration and deferral of voters. The conclusions arrived at and the statistical analysis reported are derived exclusively from the official voter registration referenced and the analytic approach identified in the methodology section below.

## Background

On November 30, 2021, the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors (BOS) will conduct a hearing to select a map of supervisorial district boundaries based on 2020 census data. In a previous hearing (November 19, 2021), the BOS selected two maps as "finalists," with the apparent intent of selecting one of them as the new district boundaries. These are designated the "Patten" map (county ID 747860) and the "Chamber" map (county ID 75760).

In previous hearings (e.g., October 26, 2021) the BOS was informed that the current district boundaries (based on the 2010 census) meet state redistricting statutes and don't need to be redrawn. County staff prepared "Map A" as a representation of current districts – the only (minor) changes being to align current district boundaries to 2020 census blocks.

## Methodology

The current, Patten and Chamber maps were created in the mapping tool Redistrict-R using 2020 census blocks and population data.

Current voter registration data for November 2021 was purchased from the San Luis Obispo County Clerk-Recorder's Office.

The address of each registered voter was mapped into the appropriate census block using the product Geocodio. This product locates the latitude/longitude coordinate for each address to be analyzed, then appends the 2020 census block, block group, and tract to each address, as well.

The voter registrations were totaled for each district in each of the three maps.

To analyze accelerated and deferred voters, each census block was coded for its current and proposed district.

- If a census block that is in current District 2 or 4 is assigned to a new proposed District 1, 3 or 5, those voters will be "deferred," since the odd districts won't vote in a regular election until 2024.
- If a census block that is in current District 1, 3, or 5 is assigned to proposed District 2 or 4, those voters will be "accelerated," since the even districts will vote in 2022.

## Exhibits

Exhibit 1. Political party registrations in each district of the current, Patten and Chamber maps. The column "R % adv" shows the percentage of Republican Party registration advantage (+ values) or disadvantage (- values) over Democratic Party registration.

Exhibit 2. Summary table of political party advantage taken from data in Exhibit 1. Top two tables show advantages by district for the Patten and Chamber maps. The bottom two tables

show the same advantages, ranked from most Republican advantage to most Democratic advantage (district numbers on the relevant map in parentheses).

The Patten map:

- Flips current D2 from strong Dem to mild Rep advantage (Dem+22.0 to Rep+4.0).
- Flips current D5 from mild Rep to strong Dem advantage (Rep+2.5 to Dem+15.6).
- Doubles the margin of Dem advantage in current D3 (Dem+14.5 to Dem+28.1).
- Of five resulting Patten districts, one (D1) maintains strong Rep advantage, two (D2 and D4) show mild Rep advantage, and two show strong Dem advantage (D3 and D5). This is the same pattern for the five current districts (although the district numbers differ). In each district, the Patten map increases the partisan advantage for the advantaged political party.
- These changes advantage the current D1 and D4 incumbents (registered Reps); advantage the current D3 incumbent (a registered Dem); and disadvantage the D2 incumbent (a registered Dem). The current D5 incumbent does not live in the proposed D5.

Conclusion: The Patten map increases advantage for the Republican Party in three of five districts, enough to hold a BOS majority.

Exhibit 3. Analysis of voters accelerated and deferred by adoption of the Patten map. The definition of acceleration and deferral is given in the section on methodology. Results of adopting the Patten map:

- Of 34,139 registered voters who will have their votes accelerated by the Patten map (voting in both 2020 and 2022), 41.4% are Republican to 31.8% Democratic.
- Of 29,063 registered voters who will have their votes deferred by the Patten map (voting in 2018, but not again until 2024), 46.9% are Democratic to 24.7% Republican.
- A total of 48,464 people (total population) live in areas that will be accelerated by the Patten map; 49,399 live in areas that will be deferred.

Conclusion: The Patten map accelerates and defers a huge number of voters – collectively accelerates and or defers over 34% of the total county population of 279,220. The Patten map advantages the Republican Party by accelerating dominantly Republican voters and deferring dominantly Democratic voters. This will disenfranchise over 29,000 voters for two years, of which Democrats are 46.9% and Republicans are 24.7%. A total population of over 49,000 residents will not be represented by a supervisor elected by their community until 2025 (after the 2024 elections).

Exhibit 4. Flyers from the SLO County Republican Party. These advertise training on Patten map advocacy and form email submission buttons. Other versions of this flyer are in the record, as well as multiple form emails generated by the Republican Party.

Conclusion: The SLO County Republican Party is the prime advocate for the Patten map because it favors that political party. Due to this, the Patten map is not compliant with Election Code Sec. 21500(d).

Exhibit 5. Resume of Todd Stump. Mr. Stump is the data analyst who prepared the voter registration data in this memo.

| District | Current | | | | | | Patten | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Population 2020 | Registered Voters | DEM% | REP% | NPP% | R % adv | Population 2020 | Registered Voters | DEM% | REP% | NPP% | R % adv |
| 1 | 57,800 | 36,035 | 29.7% | 43.3% | 19.3% | 13.6% | 55,929 | 35,258 | 29.7% | 43.8% | 19.0% | 14.1% |
| 2 | 56,511 | 33,163 | 47.3% | 25.3% | 20.1% | -22.0% | 56,813 | 37,290 | 34.6% | 38.7% | 19.0% | 4.0% |
| 3 | 54,286 | 38,621 | 43.1% | 28.6% | 21.1% | -14.5% | 55,972 | 29,457 | 49.5% | 21.4% | 22.0% | -28.1% |
| 4 | 57,605 | 39,687 | 35.3% | 37.7% | 19.7% | 2.4% | 56,368 | 40,636 | 34.4% | 39.1% | 19.3% | 4.7% |
| 5 | 56,220 | 35,238 | 35.1% | 37.6% | 19.7% | 2.5% | 57,342 | 40,103 | 43.5% | 27.9% | 21.0% | -15.6% |

| District | Chamber | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Population 2020 | Registered Voters | DEM% | REP% | NPP% | R % adv |
| 1 | 57,766 | 36,579 | 29.4% | 43.8% | 19.1% | 14.3% |
| 2 | 57,239 | 39,128 | 45.6% | 27.2% | 19.9% | -18.4% |
| 3 | 54,969 | 39,453 | 43.0% | 28.5% | 21.2% | -14.5% |
| 4 | 56,396 | 38,831 | 35.4% | 37.6% | 19.6% | 2.2% |
| 5 | 56,054 | 28,753 | 34.9% | 37.3% | 20.1% | 2.3% |

Exhibit 1.

**Advantages by district (%)**



**Advantages ranked by size (%, with district no.)**



Exhibit 2.

| District | Current | | | | | | Patten | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Population 2020 | Registered Voters | DEM% | REP% | NPP% | R % adv | Population 2020 | Registered Voters | DEM% | REP% | NPP% | R % adv |
| 1 | 57,800 | 36,035 | 29.7% | 43.3% | 19.3% | 13.6% | 55,929 | 35,258 | 29.7% | 43.8% | 19.0% | 14.1% |
| 2 | 56,511 | 33,163 | 47.3% | 25.3% | 20.1% | -22.0% | 56,813 | 37,290 | 34.6% | 38.7% | 19.0% | 4.0% |
| 3 | 54,288 | 38,621 | 43.1% | 28.6% | 21.1% | -14.5% | 55,972 | 29,457 | 49.5% | 21.4% | 22.0% | -28.1% |
| 4 | 57,605 | 39,687 | 35.3% | 37.7% | 19.7% | 2.4% | 56,368 | 40,636 | 34.4% | 39.1% | 19.3% | 4.7% |
| 5 | 56,220 | 35,238 | 35.1% | 37.6% | 19.7% | 2.5% | 57,342 | 40,103 | 43.5% | 27.9% | 21.0% | -15.6% |
| | | | | | | Accelerated | 48,464 | 34,139 | [illegible] | [illegible] | 19.1% | 9.5% |
| | | | | | | Deferred | 49,399 | 29,063 | [illegible] | [illegible] | 20.9% | -22.2% |

Exhibit 3.

RP ☆ SLO County | REPUBLICAN PARTY SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

# ☆ TUESDAY NOV 16☆

## Redistricting Training

Atascadero Republican HeadQuarters
7387 El Camino Real, Atascadero

Tuesday, November 16 • 2:00PM - 4:00PM

✦ RSVP Tuesday, NOV 16 ✦ Redistricting

## Learn What to Write
## What to Say

EXAMPLE OF WHAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO SAY IN EMAIL AND IN PERSON AFTER THE TRAINING:

I like the Citizen, Richard Patten's Map Rev_1 for these reasons:

1. Templeton is NOT split it is kept whole.
2. District 5 NO LONGER reaches into SLO City and grabs Cal Poly
3. SLO city is NOT divided among 3 different supervisors instead it is kept whole.

Keep the CITIES whole!

At the training we will have more discussion as you understand the map choices and you on your own will be able to tell the county board of supervisors what you want them to choose.'

WATCH VIDEO
Tom O'Malley interviewing Richard Patten on Redistricting in our county and preparing for the Friday Nov 19 Board Meeting.



Exhibit 4 – 1 of 4

Here are the rules.

What criteria will be used when drawing district lines?

Out of compliance here

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

1. To the extent practicable, supervisorial district boundaries shall be geographically contiguous. Areas that meet only at the points of adjoining corners are not contiguous. Areas that are separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not contiguous.
2. To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of any local neighborhood or local community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division. A "community of interest" is a population that shares common social or economic interests that should be included within a single supervisorial district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.
3. To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of a city or census designated place shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.
4. Supervisorial district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents. To the extent practicable, supervisorial districts shall be bounded by natural and artificial barriers, by streets, or by the boundaries of the county.
5. To the extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria in this subdivision, supervisorial districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness in a manner that nearby areas of population are not bypassed in favor of more distant populations.

Finally: The above criteria, districts shall not be drawn for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

Visit our website www.rpslo.org for more information

A member communication paid for by the Republican Party of San Luis Obispo County
FPPC ID: 841631/FEC ID: C00050033

Our mailing address is:
P.O. Box 1079
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Exhibit 4 – 2 of 4

RP ☆ SLO County | REPUBLICAN PARTY SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

# ☆ Videos ☆

## Redistricting Nov 19 Meeting***

VIEW THE VIDEOS FROM NOV 19, 2021 MEETING

View the crowd and clipped public comment 8min

View detailed public comment reduced from over 7 hours. 1hr 21min

Our Endorsed Supervisors represented us well view the VOTE! 56min

# TAKE ACTION NOW!

Exhibit 4 – 3 of 4

1. ✉ ☆ MOST IMPORTANT ☆ BE THERE ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30 TO SPEAK.

2. ✉ Create your email (easy just click the button BELOW it will have the proper email addresses).

3. ✉ Tell all your friends and relatives

- ✉ Submit their email too
- ✉ Have them join you to speak at the board on November 30

It is urgent that you send in your email

ASAP

no later than Wednesday, Nov 24 as the

county will be closed for ThanksGiving

Email Statements select one then

add your own personal comments.

* EMAIL FOR NORTH

* EMAIL FOR CENTRAL

* EMAIL FOR SOUTH

* EMAIL FOR COAST

* EMAIL AG/RANCHING

* EMAIL ON WATER

* EMAIL ON TOURISM

Two maps were brought forward and we are still promoting Richard Patten Map Rev_1

RICHARD PATTEN MAP REV_1

***This is a Member Communication and a big Thank You for all that have and will participate in this example of representative government ☆ We are a Republic!

Of The People

By The People

For The People

Exhibit 4 – 4 of 4

Visit our website www.rpslo.org for more information

A member communication paid for by the Republican Party of San Luis Obispo County
FPPC ID: 841621/FEC ID: C00000000

Our mailing address is:
P.O. Box 1075
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

# Exhibit 2: Latino Population Distribution in San Luis Obispo County

| Latino Population % | District 1* | | District 2* | | District 3* | | District 4* | | District 5* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" |
| | 33.1% | 31.1% | 17.2% | 21.5% | 20.5% | 17.1% | 30.4% | 26.4% | 17.6% | 23.6% |
| Voting Age (CVAP) Latino Population % | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" | "A" | "P" |
| | 20.8% | 18.8% | 11.5% | 13% | 13.5% | 11.5% | 20.3% | 16.9% | 12.6% | 14.7% |
| Pop (A→P) | 19188 (-1159) | | 9097 (+2274) | | 11175 (-1853) | | 17540 (-2280) | | 9906 (+3368) | |
| CVAP (A→P) | 8283 (-796) | | 5735 (+1186) | | 5507 (-816) | | 8444 (-1414) | | 5680 (+947) | |

***Districts are numbered according to county maps designated "Plan 74786" (AKA "Richard Patten Map" or "P") and County Draft Map "Plan A" ("A")**

**Total County Latino Population as of the finalized 2020 Decennial Census: Approx. 67,000 / 24%; CVAP Approx. 33,649 / 14.8%**

**County Total Population (adjusted): 279,220**

# Todd Matthew Stump

[redacted]

## Employment

**Minnesota Department of Human Services.** ***Research Analysis Specialist, Public Policy Fellow.*** July 2012 – current day

I serve as a data analyst for the Aging and Adult Services Division, where I lead projects within the world of senior services. Most of my work involves analytics, mapping, surveys, and data coordination.

## Education

**Masters of Public Policy**
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota
**Specialization:** policy analysis, non-profit management, survey research, diversity
**Professional paper topic:** Oregon's Vote by Mail system (copy available upon request)

**Masters of Social Work**
College of Education & Human Development, University of Minnesota
**Specialization:** public policy, community practice, program evaluation

**Bachelor of Arts, History (music minor)**
Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky

Exhibit 5.

# Exhibit B: Latino Population Distribution in San Luis Obispo County

| Latino Population % | District 1* "A" | District 1* "P" | District 2* "A" | District 2* "P" | District 3* "A" | District 3* "P" | District 4* "A" | District 4* "P" | District 5* "A" | District 5* "P" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 33.1% | 31.1% | 17.2% | 21.5% | 20.5% | 17.1% | 30.4% | 26.4% | 17.6% | 23.6% |
| Voting Age (CVAP) Latino Population % | "A" 20.8% | "P" 18.8% | "A" 11.5% | "P" 13% | "A" 13.5% | "P" 11.5% | "A" 20.3% | "P" 16.9% | "A" 12.6% | "P" 14.7% |
| Pop (A→P) | 19188 (-1159) | | 9097 (+2274) | | 11175 (-1853) | | 17540 (-2280) | | 9906 (+3368) | |
| CVAP (A→P) | 8283 (-796) | | 5735 (+1186) | | 5507 (-816) | | 8444 (-1414) | | 5680 (+947) | |

***Districts are numbered according to county maps designated "Plan 74786" (AKA "Richard Patten Map" or "P") and County Draft Map "Plan A" ("A")**

**Total County Latino Population as of the finalized 2020 Decennial Census: Approx. 67,000 / 24%; CVAP Approx. 33,649 / 14.8%**

**County Total Population (adjusted): 279,220**

**Maria G. Brown**

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 4:42 PM
**To:** John Peschong
**Subject:** [EXT]REDISTRICTING MAP



I support your vote to adopt redistricting map #74786.

Thank you,
Sue Rodeck
[redacted]

**Maria G. Brown**

**From:** Murray Powell
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 3:30 PM
**To:** John Peschong; Debbie Arnold
**Cc:** bnj13536@gmail.com; Erik Gorham
**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:** Barbara Kastner [redacted] >
**Sent:** Sunday, December 5, 2021 10:11 AM
**To:** John Peschong
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting Map



John,
Please accept map, ID 74786!
Thank you very much

Best regards,
Barbara

**Barbara Kastner**
**Atascadedro CA 93422**
[redacted]

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Cindi Gehrung [redacted] >
**Sent:** Sunday, December 5, 2021 9:40 AM
**To:** John Peschong; icompton@co.slo.ca.us
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting

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

Good morning,
I am emailing to support the approved redistricting map ID 74786 which keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and brings Cal Poly and SLO City together.
Thank you,
Cindi Gehrung
Templeton

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Debbie Frye [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 9:38 PM
**To:** John Peschong
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting map



I support this map, ID 7478 keeping Templeton and Atascadero together.

Debra Frye

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPhone

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Dan Hathaway [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 9:02 PM
**To:** John Peschong
**Subject:** [EXT]redistricting--thanks for selecting a good map



For too long I have lived in districts where the supervisor had to represent individuals with vastly different wants and needs. I lived in SLO for more than 50 years, currently I live in Atascadero and have for 10 years. I also graduated from Cal Poly, so I know what is like to be a student. While both SLO and Atascadero are in the same county and are only 15 miles apart, they are very different in terms of what they need and want and how they need to be governed. Putting them in the same district was wrong and including Cal Poly in the same district as Atascadero made no sense. There is no commonality between SLO, Cal Poly and Atascadero. Thanks for finally giving me peace of mind in knowing that the supervisor representing my district will be looking out for the best interests of my community.

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** juanita mcdaniel [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 6:50 PM
**To:** John Peschong
**Subject:** [EXT]Please support map ID 74786



Please support map ID 74786. This map keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and also brings Cal Poly and SLO City together.

Juanita McDaniel

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Linda Becker [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 1:58 PM
**To:** John Peschong
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting Map Support

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

I support the map ID 74786, which was approved at the November 30, 2021 Redistricting meeting.This map keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and also brings Cal Poly and SLO City together.

Thank you for upholding the criteria in selecting a new map for SLO County.

Linda Becker
Paso Robles

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Robert Conlen [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 11:08 AM
**To:** John Peschong
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting



Supervisor Peschong; "more distorted, more disjointed, and more gerrymandered...". Right out of the Trump, McCarthy, and McConnell playbook! Congratulations!



Farms

s actually hard-
ports into the

unts for about
ca's goods ex-
20 percent of
and ranchers
d. The indus-
ricate chore-
ated trucks,
and ware-
sh products
often seam-

have risen
ge A18

# Jagged Maps Tilt Key Races Toward G.O.P.

By REID J. EPSTEIN and NICK CORASANITI

WASHINGTON — A year before the polls open in the 2022 midterm elections, Republicans are already poised to flip at least five seats in the closely divided House thanks to redrawn district maps that are more distorted, more disjointed and more gerrymandered than any since the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965.

The rapidly forming congressional map, a quarter of which has taken shape as districts are redrawn this year, represents an even more extreme warping of American political architecture, with state legislators in many places moving aggressively to cement their partisan dominance

What is ce
weapon that
"ghost gun."
Ghost gun
arms withou
sembled fro
online — ar
ing the leth
cess for thc
buying or o
country.
ground ha
weapons
numbers,
sent a di

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Linda Becker [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 1:59 PM
**To:** Debbie Arnold
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting Map Support

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

I support the map ID 74786, which was approved at the November 30, 2021 Redistricting meeting.This map keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and also brings Cal Poly and SLO City together.

Thank you for upholding the criteria in selecting a new map for SLO County.

Linda Becker
Paso Robles

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** juanita mcdaniel [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 6:51 PM
**To:** Debbie Arnold
**Subject:** [EXT]Please support map ID 74786



- Please support map ID 74786. This map keeps Templeton and Atascadero whole and also brings Cal Poly and SLO City together.

  Juanita McDaniel

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Debbie Frye <[redacted]>
**Sent:** Saturday, December 4, 2021 9:40 PM
**To:** Debbie Arnold
**Subject:** [EXT]Map



I support ID 74786, which keeps Atascadero $ Templeton together

Debra Frye

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPhone

## Maria G. Brown

**From:** Barbara Kastner [redacted]
**Sent:** Sunday, December 5, 2021 10:12 AM
**To:** Debbie Arnold
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting Map



HI Debbie,
Please accept and ratify map ID 74786!
Thank you very much.

Best regards,
Barbara

**Barbara Kastner**
**Venture Enterprises**
[redacted]
**Atascadedro CA 93422**
**Barbara@venturenterprise.com**
[redacted]

**Maria G. Brown**

---

**From:** shirley mark [redacted]
**Sent:** Monday, December 6, 2021 7:49 AM
**To:** Debbie Arnold
**Subject:** [EXT]District Map ID 74786
**Attachments:** District map request to SLO.docx



Please see the attached.

Thank you,

Shirley Mark

December 6, 2021

Memo to the San Luis Obispo Supervisors:

Please vote to approve the District Map, ID 74786.

This keeps together the cities of Templeton, Atascadero together, and puts Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo together.

This is the correct way, they should all stay together.

Thank you for doing the right thing for our County.

Shirley Mark
[redacted]
Paso Robles, Ca. 93446