

From: sunil sehgal [REDACTED]

Date: 6/27/2011 9:59 AM

To: "[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map
2. Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

Thanks

Sunil Sehgal

Sent from my iPhone

Subject: Public Comment

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 6/27/2011 4:49 PM

To: [REDACTED]

June 27, 2011

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Lawrence Molton, and I live in Castro Valley, California.

I had the opportunity to testify briefly at the Oakland group hearing on May 24, and also attended the San Jose public hearing on June 25. I wanted to submit my comments on the proposed district maps as regards the East Bay and San Jose areas.

The East San Jose speakers took up the first hour of the June 25 hearing with eloquent testimony about the history of the Latino community in the area, and how it took many decades to gain the representation it has now.

I support their complaints about the first draft Assembly maps, that divide the downtown and East Side area into three. Even though there may be no way to draw a "majority-minority" Section 2 district in that area, the Commission should attempt to maximize Latino representation by keeping that area in one district.

CONGRESSIONAL MAPS

Because of their particular size, CDs are the most difficult maps to draw in the Bay Area.

You have heard large amounts of testimony about the need to respect the natural barrier of the East Bay hills, and detailed COI testimony regarding the connections among the cities in the Tri-Valley region. Residents of the Amador, Livermore, and San Ramon Valleys share transportation, employment, and cultural ties.

Nevertheless, the CRC's first draft placed the residents of Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore in a CD with the Union City area. And other groups have suggested placing those three cities in a CD with downtown San Jose. Neither of these approaches will work.

I have lived in the Bay Area for more than 50 years, and I would be hard pressed to think of two places less alike than Livermore and the area just east of downtown San Jose.

The principal employer in Livermore is LLNL. Its representative has been vitally concerned with preserving the programs and jobs for a large mass of Ph.D. physicists and chemists. I doubt that has ever been a concern for any political representative from East San Jose.

The working-class Latino neighborhoods on the East Side, and the vibrant and densely compact LGBT community near downtown, are not to be found in Pleasanton or Livermore.

Similarly, there is very little to connect Livermore with the very diverse, heavily immigrant community of Union City.

The Commission also heard testimony from a well-organized group from Fremont, which was very clear

about the longstanding links and cooperation between the cities of Newark, Fremont, and Union City.

Before I moved to Castro Valley, I lived in Fremont from 1990-98 and was involved in local political activities there. I agree that these three cities need to be in the same district if at all possible. They were created within a year of each other. Two of them compose the Fremont-Newark CCD, and there are many other similar local districts.

The Commission's first draft placed Newark and half of Fremont into one CD, and placed Union City and northern Fremont in a different CD. This needs to be changed.

However, the Fremont group's plan did so by placing San Ramon into the Fremont district. Again, that totally contradicts the extensive COI testimony provided by a long list of elected officials and community leaders from San Ramon, who demonstrated that San Ramon belongs with the Tri-Valley, and not as an "orphan" in an Alameda County district with which it has nothing in common. San Ramon has a huge regional job center, Bishop Ranch, whose interests will not matter to a representative based in Hayward or Fremont.

COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST

Propositions 11 and 20 speak of COIs, and list cities, counties, and many other examples of such communities.

I believe the process to date has overemphasized keeping urban counties together in a way that is not borne out by the reality of people's lives.

Of course, in sparsely populated areas, county lines are crucial. The county is the body that provides services and representation for most residents, and I would not suggest that you should divide large area counties, such as those in the northern part of the state.

But in dense urban areas, the county lines can mean very little. I still recall driving from Westlake Village to Thousand Oaks, and noticing the county line border at the end of a block in the middle of a housing tract. Similarly, I've gone from La Habra to La Mirada, and from Pomona to Montclair, and can never figure out where the border is.

Those borders are historical accidents from the 19th Century, and don't reflect development patterns and social reality today.

This is relevant to the Bay Area, because it is sometimes necessary to split counties to keep cities and other COIs together. Most people receive their primary services from cities, which have significant government revenues, and identify most with their city of residence, rather than a county or special district. It is better to have a two-county district that keeps cities and COIs whole, rather than a one county district that violates the other principles.

RECOMMENDATION

Therefore I would ask the Commission to consider the approach taken in the maps submitted by Mr. Chris Bowman, in connection with the CCAG group. Mr. Bowman's maps emphasize maximizing representation for both Asian-Americans and Latinos, especially by creating a long-overdue Asian influence district in the Fremont area.

They also adhere to the natural boundary of the East Bay hills, keep the Fremont-Newark-Union City residents in one district at all times, and keep East San Jose together.

The mathematics simply do not allow for the creation of a CD based in Fremont, another one based in East San Jose, and another two in Silicon Valley. The only way to do that is to chop up the Contra Costa and East Alameda communities and use them as "filler" in the other districts. That would be an unacceptable form of gerrymandering.

The alternative is to place adjacent regional centers in the same district when necessary to reach sufficient population, while ensuring that smaller subcommunities, such as Berryessa, are no longer gerrymandered as they were in the past.

Thank you and the best of luck on this Herculean task.

Larry Molton

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: William Fazakerly <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 1:20 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: William Fazakerly <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Do Not Combine Pleasanton with Fremont

Message Body:

Pleasanton is adjacent to Livermore and Dublin, and the city of San Ramon is in a contiguously populated area. I live at the south of this area, and I am still 13 miles from Fremont, separated by a sparsely populated area, and separated even further from a common interest perspective. The objective of redistricting is to draw compact districts with contiguous population; it is not to meet the objectives of special interests. Please KEEP PLEASANTON, LIVERMORE, DUBLIN and SAN RAMON in a single compact district.

Thank you,
William Fazakerly
Pleasanton CA

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Carol Ferrara <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 1:36 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Carol Ferrara <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Tri Valley (San Ramon, Livermore, Pleasanton)

Message Body:

Please do not lump... these cities into the area of Fremont.

We have different conditions, populations and concerns than Fremont. Please do not do this to our area...

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Mayor Jean Quan <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 4:47 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Mayor Jean Quan <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Urban Issues

Message Body:

On behalf of the people of Oakland, let me first thank you for hosting a public hearing here at our historic City Hall on May 21. I regret that a previous commitment to our resident-led Town Hall meetings kept me from attending in person, but I received many reports of a successful and informative day. I was particularly pleased to hear from several respected colleagues in the African-American, Asian-American and Latino-American communities about their comments to the Commission.

I wanted to add my voice to those urging continued representation for our major East Bay cities, which I believe is reflected in your draft maps to date. As the former chair of the Urban School Boards Association, a City Councilmember, active participant in the League of Cities and now U.S. Conference of Mayors, I know from direct experience how distinct and urgent the needs of our cities are. Nesting the Assembly and Senate Districts, and maintaining urban cohesion in the Congressional Districts, is critical to our residents' opportunity to access state and federal funding and to advocate for neighborhood safety, education, healthcare, transportation, and other policies that improve quality of life.

Oakland residents have a lot at stake in the coming decade, and your actions on redistricting will have great impact on the success of our City and future Mayors. Thank you for hosting a meeting in Oakland and for listening to our residents.

Best wishes for all future success.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: David Salniker <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 10:21 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: David Salniker <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Keep our district number odd

Message Body:

When assigning Senate District numbers to the East Bay, please assign odd numbers to the current odd numbered district (SD 07 and SD 09). In doing so, you will ensure that over 1.5 million residents of the East Bay will not be disenfranchised. Thanks for considering this and for all your hard work.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting Fremont, Newark, Union City

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 6/27/2011 6:45 AM

To: [REDACTED]

To Hon'ble members of Redistricting Commission:

My family, along with many other families of our friends & relations, have been living in the Fremont,-Newark- Union City tri-city area, for last 40 years. There is a natural common bond between these three cities.

We strongly feel that Fremont, Newark and Union City should be together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Districts.

We strongly support the re-drawn Tri-Cities map.

Bansi Tikku

Newark, CA

Subject: Redistricting Commission

From: Harsh Singh <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 10:10 AM

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map
2. Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

-Harsh Singh

I will remind the Citizens Redistricting Commission that the citizens of California overwhelmingly sent a message that they wish to be represented in Washington and Sacramento. Underlying their vote is the desire to end districts designed for party political stability. **Draw districts that make sense!** Initially recognizing Oakland/East Bay hills as a natural dividing line was a correct first step. The next step is to recognize a commonality of Lamorinda, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, Clayton, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, Byron/Discovery Bay, and the Tri-Valley.

San Ramon, Danville, Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore have worked together cooperatively since before their incorporations. They pay more than their fair share of taxes and deserve to be recognized with representation at the state and federal level. Examples of this working relationship include:

The cities in the Tri-valley meet at least quarterly and share many programs like a shared lobbyist in Washington and funding for the Tri-valley Convention and Visitors Bureau. We have a shared affordable housing solution and a shared development fee for regional transportation improvements with a required unanimous vote to change project funding.

In the 1970's, Dublin and San Ramon actually had a ballot measure to become one city. If the Tri-valley were one city today we would have the 3rd highest allotment for low income affordable housing assessment in the entire nine counties of the bay area from ABAG.

Four of the cities have proven that they each can generate over \$300,000,000 in taxable sales in a quarter. San Ramon currently is the highest total property tax evaluation of any city in Contra Costa.

Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore border the second busiest freeway in the nation. The strategic expenditure plan for the Tri-valley transportation committee shows support from Danville, San Ramon, and the Contra Costa board of supervisors to tax themselves primarily to benefit their fellow members from Alameda County.

I have served on a transportation subcommittee with the Tri-valley as well as Lamorinda and we have always found common ground and understood each other's wants and needs. Dublin and San Ramon still serve on a fire board of directors together. We act as one.

It is important to note that the cities I listed regardless of county as well as unincorporated areas will have a total population of nearly 700,000 residents in the city limits and close to 800,000 when you include the outlying areas and unincorporated cities. I currently serve on 4 regional/County committees as a representative from Contra Costa County and I personally can point to at least one elected official in each of these cities I named that is aware of the desires of each of the other cities in the area encompassing the district I am proposing. We have served together. We don't always agree but we do know the issues and concerns and we have proven that we are responsible to our region. We find solutions and commit to action plans which have considered the needs of each other. We tax ourselves to accomplish these solutions.

Initially the work of this commission seemed to be headed in the right direction. Lately there have arisen some grave concerns that can only be attributed to party politics. The Tri-valley is not San Jose and can't be represented from Santa Clara County or Fremont. Yet only San Jose and San Francisco will be asked to produce more affordable low cost housing. The funding for infrastructure required to meet the needs of these residents is rarely forthcoming. Who will bring this message to Sacramento and Washington when you break up the Tri-valley to make someone's area work that is not paying to be part of the solution? This is not about county lines or assembly majority. The lines do not need to change that much in Alameda if you include Dublin and Pleasanton in district 15. The congressional district will fit nicely into the area I described. The representative who is elected will have to reach across party lines and show that they are representing our region. Isn't that what this commission seeks?

Sincerely,

Dave Hudson

San Ramon City Council

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

Association of Bay Area Governments

Subject: Redistricting Lines

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 6/27/2011 10:33 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Citizens Redistricting Commission:

As a long time voter in the San Ramon Valley I have been looking at the redistricting maps in the local paper and wondering why our local areas are to be combined into a new district with Fremont, Newark, Union City and Hayward. This would give our area an unbalanced local voting power and should keep our district using the Oakland/East Bay hills as a natural dividing line between the districts. Please think of the recommendation for a more logical decision..

Respectively,

Gerald Lindahl

[REDACTED]

Danville. Ca 94526-2203

(Resident since 1968)

Subject: Redistricting Maps

From: Toni Shellen <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 2:46 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Members of the Redistricting Commission,

I am a long-time resident of Fremont. I am writing to you regarding the proposed redistricting maps.

Residents of Fremont consider ourselves to be part of a larger community called the "Tri-Cities," which includes Newark, Union City, as well as Fremont. The three cities have worked well together for many years and share common concerns and interests. In a sense, we are part of the same "family."

Fremont, Newark, and Union City align together in our many charitable organizations like ABODE, SAVE, KIDANGO, Tri-Cities League of Volunteers and more. Other community organizations, such as the League of Women Voters, the AAUW, the Tri-Cities Ecology Center, and even the Tri-Cities Interfaith Council, work together as members of the Tri-Cities community.

I appreciate the opportunities that our residents have had to speak to the Redistricting Commission and to present an alternate Tri-Cities map. I support this re-drawn map and urge you to accept it.

Please keep Fremont, Newark, and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Districts. It is important to the well-being of our cities and our citizens.

Sincerely,

Antonette M. Shellen

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: "Jacqueline L. Cloidt" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 3:37 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jacqueline L. Cloidt <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Tri-Valley (San Ramon, Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin)/Fremont

Message Body:

Dear Commissioners:

There seems to be a move to bring Tri-Valley (or part of) into a district with Fremont.

I urge you to keep the inland Tri-Valley separate. It is an area with problems, issues, needs etc. quite different from those of Fremont. Both of these areas would be better served by being in separate districts.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jacqueline Cloidt

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting

From: Alan L Nagy <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 7:34 AM

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

Members of the Committee on Redistricting,

This email is in support of the redrawn Tri-Cities map which keeps Fremont, Newark, and Union City in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Districts. These communities have a strong history of working together on local, regional, state and federal issues. These relationships, which have been developed over years of hard work, should not be splintered. Again, please keep the Tri-Cities of Fremont, Newark, and Union City together.

regards,

Alan L. Nagy

Council Member

City of Newark

Subject: Redistricting

From: SKRelan <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 1:22 PM

To: [REDACTED]

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map
2. Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

Thanks,
Surendra & Shashi Relan

Subject: Redistricting

From: Kathleen Fazakerly <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 3:29 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear commissioners,

Our districts should be geographically compact so that we can easily access our legislators. Fremont is 13 miles away from where I reside in Pleasanton and is not part of the Tri Valley area. This is an opportunity to keep Dublin, San Ramon, Pleasanton and Livermore together as a contiguously populated area, not to cater to special interest groups.

Thank you,
Kathy Fazakerly

Subject: San Ramon Valley Redistricting

From: Linda King <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 4:09 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Commission Members

I have lived and voted in San Ramon for 23 years.

I support keeping the Tri-Valley and Eastern Alameda County to include Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore as part of the same Congressional District. This is my neighborhood, where I shop and work. San Joaquin County has its own set of unique circumstances and should not be a part of the San Ramon Valley Congressional District.

I support using the CCAAG's (California Conservative Action Group's) new Congressional District maps which have been revised from those that were presented in Oakland in May and are being submitted by Tuesday's deadline.



Linda King
San Ramon, CA



Subject: Sensible Redistricting

From: "Donna H. Olsen" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 5:16 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioners,

I Support the redrawn Tri-Cities Map!

Please keep Fremont, Newark and Union City in the same congressional, state senate and assembly districts.

It only makes sense!

Thanks,

Donna H. Olsen, voter

Subject: Support Tri-Cities as is

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 6/27/2011 7:03 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Redistricting Commission,

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map.
2. Request that you keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

Thank you.

**The Honorable Teresa Cox
Ohlone College Board of Trustees**

Subject: SUPPORT

From: Jan Giovannini-Hill <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 11:33 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Commission Members:

I support the recently redrawn maps submitted and discussed at the 6/25/11 meetings which put the cities of Fremont, Union City, and Newark within the same congressional, assembly and state senate districts. This 'tri-cities' geographical area has much history in common, we have many current organizations and groups and clubs in common, and we are all part of Alameda County (one county).

Thank you for your consideration,

Jan Giovannini-Hill

[Long time community resident]

Subject: Tri Cities Map

From: jane bark <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 11:05 AM

To: [REDACTED]

I would like to register my support for the redrawn Tri-Cities map which will keep Fremont, Newark and Union City in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly districts.

Thank you

Jane Bark

[REDACTED]
Fremont CA 94539

Subject: Tri_Valley

From: "Ernest wheeler" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 3:22 PM

To: <[REDACTED]>

Dear Commissioners;

I was stunned to hear that the group from Fremont wanted to incorporate the Tri Valley – Livermore, Pleasanton, San Ramon, and Dublin in with a district with Fremont. I respectfully disagree with this approach. The Tri-Valley has nothing in common with the Fremont part of the 680 corridor. I believe the Tri-Valley should be kept with the “CoCo” district.

I highly recommend that you use the latest maps prepared by Allen Payton of the CCAG for the Congressional, Assembly and Senate districts. The maps better incorporate your guidelines of contiguous, compact, districts which maintain communities of interest. In addition, the Oakland/East Bay/Richmond hills serve as a natural dividing line, with Pleasanton, Dublin and Livermore on the opposite side of those hills from Fremont. Your guidelines require compactness as well as respecting natural boundaries.

The Tri-Valley community shares much more in common with the other cities in the CoCo district than it does with the Fremont District. The Pleasanton Weekly recently had an article stating that the 5 cities of Danville, San Ramon, Pleasanton, Livermore and Dublin had signed a letter to your committee requesting that they all be kept together in one district due to the many areas of common interest that they have. In addition, I am aware that hundreds of grass-roots citizens (as opposed to paid, political hacks) have also expressed to your committee their wishes that the Tri-Valley cities be in the same district as the inland district (CoCo).

We share common newspapers. Our high schools compete in sports events. We share the same concerns regarding transportation networks. We have similar demographics. Our residents live and work in each other’s cities. Our city officials meet together several times a month for regional planning purposes. We attend church together.

The Tri-Valley has little or no interaction with Fremont and the other Tri-Cities that are trying to pull the Tri-Valley away from the district and community they have historically been a part of.

We understand Fremont not wanting to be split up. We understand their request to be coupled with the other Tri-City cities. We have no problem with that request, but we have a BIG problem with taking the Tri-Valley out of the CoCo District.

I notice that your first draft includes the Tri-Valley in the CoCo Assembly District and the Senate District, but not the Congressional District. I strongly encourage you to include the Tri-Valley in the CoCo Congressional District in the same manner that you did for the Assembly and Senate.

Please review the most recent maps proposed by the CCAG. These maps best reflect the wishes of the grassroots citizenry in these affected areas and seem to be the most fair way to get rid of the awful Gerrymandering that we have had in the past.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ernest Wheeler

Date: June 27, 2011

Subject: Comprehensive Response to Commissioners and Plea for Fairness

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for listening to our map proposal that puts the Tri-Cities back into an Alameda County Congressional district. The community members present at the public hearing on June 25th came away a little surprised at the questions about our outreach efforts to other communities when preparing our map. Our task is to champion our cause and based on your specific input, we put together a proposal that furthers our goals and at the same time minimizes the impacts to other communities. We do not believe it is our responsibility to speak for other groups and communities.

We understand that any proposal will raise concerns and that this Commission has difficult choices to make. No solution is perfect. That said, we request that this Commission use our map as the starting point for any discussion about an Alameda County Congressional seat instead of the first draft proposed by Q2. Our map keeps the Tri Cities in a Congressional district that has existed for decades. It also keeps the South Asian voice cohesive. The burden of proof should be on anyone proposing to split the Tri-Cities or disenfranchise the South Asian voice, not vice versa.

Our map is superior to Q2's initial draft. Let us analyze that initial map with the same scrutiny that ours received. Did anyone ask whether Livermore has anything in common economically with Union City or Newark? The answer, according to community of interest testimony, is a resounding no. Did anyone ask Chambers of Commerce whether Southern Fremont has any economic ties with East San Jose? The answer again is no. Did anyone investigate whether the affluent residents of Pleasanton share anything in common with the largely blue collar and minority residents of Hayward? Again, the answer is no. In the initial map, cities were put together, and in some cases dismembered, simply to serve population needs. We were upset by the map, and you have heard robust testimony from our community.

In stark contrast to that draft Q2 map, our map takes citizen input seriously. We did not listen to special interest groups. Rather, we talked to actual citizens and their elected leaders. We listened to the citizens of Richmond. That is why our map restores Richmond to a Contra Costa district. We listened to the citizens of San Leandro who were seriously concerned with first draft maps because the city was split. We took seriously the testimony of Livermore and Pleasanton residents who made it clear they had nothing in common with the Tri-Cities and want to be part of an inland district. We listened to the Commissioners who do not want any Bay Area district to cross a bridge. We should not have had to make such an enormous effort simply to preserve a South Asian voice in a Tri-City Congressional seat that already exists. But, we did so to be team players. We want to be part of offering solutions and constructive participants in this dialogue.

There is understandable concern about whether our proposal of putting Livermore and Eastern Alameda County with San Jose makes sense. But, that is not the right question because it obfuscates the reality that the Commissioners face a difficult choice. What the Commissioners need to ask is which is the *better* alternative: (1) putting Livermore and Eastern Alameda County with Hayward while splitting the Tri-Cities or (2) Putting Livermore and Eastern Alameda County with San Jose. In the first case, you disrupt a Tri-City district that has existed for decades, disenfranchise the only cohesive South Asian voice in the state, and blatantly disregard hundreds of activists, sending a message that their voice does not matter. In the second case, you abide by significant community of interest testimony and create an *innovation corridor*. Granted, there will be residents in San Jose and some in East Alameda County who will not be happy with the proposal. But, these few citizens pale in comparison to the hundreds of Tri-City residents who have spent a lot of time to make sure that the Tri-Cities stay together in Alameda County. If the Commission needs to make a difficult decision about what to do with Eastern Alameda County, the choice is clear. The Tri-Cities should be kept in Alameda County as a first priority in a Congressional seat.

When the Commission first started, I had great faith in this process. I still have respect personally for the Commissioners. But, some in the South Asian community feel their voice is not getting through. The South Asian community is concerned that its voice is not being considered on par with the testimony of other minority communities. While other minority communities are pushing for numerous districts, the South Asian community is struggling to preserve a *single* district in the entire state of California where it has a cohesive voice.

This issue is not simply about keeping the Tri-Cities in Alameda County. It's much larger. At stake is the process of a community having its voice heard. We know that our cause of keeping the Tri Cities together in Alameda County and the South Asian voice cohesive is a just one. We know that we have clearly demonstrated more passion or engagement in this process with our commitment to be true partners in the process.

I fully expect that the Commission will do the right thing by the people and restore the Tri Cities to an Alameda County Congressional district.

Thank you again for taking the time to read this letter and solicit our input.

Sincerely,

Anu Natarajan
Fremont City Councilmember

From: AMRIK CHAND <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 11:12 AM

To: [REDACTED]

To the Commission,

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map
2. Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

Sincerely,
Amrik Chand

Amrik Chand, CPA

[REDACTED]

Fremont, CA 94539

[REDACTED] Phone
[REDACTED] Fax

Subject: Tricities Map

From: Desrie Campbell <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 8:03 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Commission:

I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map. Please Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Districts.

Desrie Campbell

Subject: Tri-Cities Map

From: Herbert Nagel <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 9:23 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Gentle Persons:

Please keep the Tri-Cities (Fremont, Newark & Union City) together, per the map submitted.

Thank you,

Herbert Nagel

[REDACTED]

Fremont, CA. 94539-3755

From: Keshab Chopra <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 6:31 PM

To: [REDACTED]

CC: [REDACTED]

Dear Commisionar,

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map
2. Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

Regards,

Keshab Chopra,

[REDACTED]

NEWARK, CA, 94560

[REDACTED]

Subject: Keep our Tri-City districts together

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 6/27/2011 11:28 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Redistricting Commission:

Please keep our tri-cities together in the same districts they now are, and don't divide us . We support the map presented at the meeting on Saturday for our new district boundaries.

Sincerely,
Mavis and Ruel Brown

Subject: Keep the Tri cities together

From: Jean Holmes <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 8:01 PM

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

I support the re drawn map submitted by the Fremont delegation.

Please keep Fremont Newark Union City together in Alameda County and in the same federal state and county districts.

Thank you

Jean Holmes

Fremont

Sent from my iPhone

Subject: Keep the Tri-City Area together

From: Debra Pearson <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 6:48 PM

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

Dear Re-Districting Commission,

I was at your meeting in San Jose on Saturday, June 25th. I found it very interesting and can see what a hard job you have. I also understand that the Tri-city group that was there have followed the directions you have given up and down the State. I was very glad to see that the citizens that came forward represented the area well.

I felt that because you did not have opposition from the Livermore/Pleasanton area speaks volumes. There is a Fremont teacher who is on the City Counsel and she was not there.

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map
2. Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

Thanks

Debbi Pearson

Sent from my iPhone

Subject: Please Keep Fremont, Newark, and Union City together

From: Bryan Gebhardt <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 7:45 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Members of the California Redistricting Commissions,

I am president of the Fremont Unified School District Board of Education. We span all of Fremont and serve over 31,000 students. Our student population is as diverse as the city of Fremont we are in with over a 100 languages represented. Part of the secret to our district's great success is that we are united. It is crucial to our community that we be kept together. I urge you to keep Fremont, Newark, and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Districts.

Furthermore, the Tri-Cities community has presented you with an alternate map which strikes the right balance for our community and others. I support this redrawn map. I respectfully request that the Commission adopt this map which will be responsive to the overwhelming and unanimous citizen testimony and the Commission's direction.

Thank you for taking my input on these issues.

Thanks,
Bryan Gebhardt
Board President, Fremont Unified School District
[REDACTED]

Subject: Please Keep the Tri-Cities Together

From: "Nancy Thomas" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6/27/2011 9:28 AM

To: <[REDACTED]>

1. I support the redrawn Tri-Cities map
2. Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together in the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly Dists.

Nancy Thomas
Newark Unified School District Board Member