

Kristine Enea
[REDACTED]
San Francisco, CA 94124
[REDACTED]

28 June 2011

Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Keep San Francisco “Odd”

Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission:

As the Citizens Redistricting Commission continues the unprecedented exercise of transferring political power to the hands of ordinary Californians, I write to urge the Commission to exercise that power in a way that ensures representation for the residents of the rapidly changing Southeast Sector of San Francisco. Specifically, I ask that you provide the proposed San Francisco Senate district with an odd number.

During the previous redistricting cycle, San Francisco was divided between two Senate districts, with an odd numbered district extending north to Marin and an even numbered district extending south of San Francisco. The Commission’s extensive deliberations and first draft maps indicate that the Commission now intends to collapse San Francisco into a single Senate district. Although I understand the rationale for this consolidation, I feel it is imperative that consolidation is done in a manner that ensures continuous representation for all San Franciscans in the California State Senate.

Consolidation of San Francisco’s Senate districts will affect all San Franciscans living in the current Senate District 3, including dense populations of Black, Latino, API and LGBT, and San Francisco’s lowest-income census tracts. Indeed, estimates show that more than 451,000 San Franciscans – **more than half of the current population of the third largest city in California** – currently reside in this area of San Francisco, **with a near-term population increase of many more expected** as developments progress on Treasure Island and in Mission Bay, the Eastern Neighborhoods, Bayview, Hunters Point Shipyard and Visitacion Valley. Failing to assign the proposed San Francisco Senate district an odd number would disenfranchise each and every one of these residents for a period of two years. This disenfranchisement would affect San Francisco’s waterfront communities disproportionately, as we struggle to preserve public access to our shoreline and grapple with tremendous change in population density and the accompanying traffic congestion and loss of public space. Indeed, development pressures and the forthcoming America’s Cup hint at a weakening or even dissolution of the laws that keep our waterfront free from residential development and, therefore, from privatization. Our waterfront communities need representation in Sacramento more than ever at this critical juncture.

Propositions 11 & 20 granted the Citizens Redistricting Commission with broad discretion in the numbering of legislative districts, merely requiring that numbering be done north to south. I urge you to exercise that discretion in a manner that protects the rights of the residents of the Southeast Sector and our fellow citizens of San Francisco.

Ensuring continuous representation at all levels of government is an essential and fundamental right in a democracy. Please ensure that our voice is heard in Sacramento at this crucial crossroads.

Subject: South San Francisco Redistricting

From: "Peggy Deras, CKD, CID" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, 28 Jun 2011 16:26:45 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioners,

I hope you will be able to find a solution to the proposed spitting of South San Francisco into two state Senate districts and two Assembly districts as proposed by your commission's draft legislative maps.

The proposed boundaries would marginalize city voters.

It would interfere with the City's ability to advance its interests in a cohesive and efficient manner and the City of South San Francisco would be faced with the challenge of coordinating the efforts of two Assembly and two Senate Members who would likely have competing interests with the other communities that they represent.

--

Peggy Deras, CKD, CID

Kitchen Artworks

Kitchen Design - Problem Solving - CAD Drafting - Cabinetry Design

[REDACTED] South San Francisco, CA 94080

Subject: Supplemental Information Regarding LGBT Community and Proposition 8 Geographical Patterns

From: Owen Stephens <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, 28 Jun 2011 11:17:54 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

Name: Owen Stephens

Email: [REDACTED]

Subject: Supplemental Information Regarding LGBT Community and Proposition 8 Geographical Patterns

Region: 8 - San Francisco

Dear Commissioners:

In follow up to the discussion at the Public Hearing in San Francisco on 6/27/2011 regarding the San Francisco Assembly lines and the LGBT community's desire to ensure that the Eastern San Francisco District contains an intact LGBT community and remains supportive of the LGBT community, enclosed please find the following documents:

1. A San Francisco Chronicle article describing the San Francisco Prop 8 precinct results by neighborhood.
2. A color-coded precinct map showing the results for Proposition 8 in San Francisco. As you will see, Pacific Heights, the Marina, and Laurel Heights voted overwhelmingly against Prop 8. Some parts of the City supported Prop 8 or were split. In other words, for the LGBT community, even within generally supportive San Francisco, district lines matter in terms of support for our community.
3. Another copy of the Equality California LGBT Community of Interest map for the LGBT community. A number of you received black and white copies of this map last night, so I am resubmitting a color version.

Thank you.

Owen Stephens
[REDACTED]

