

Subject: Fw: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara
From: "J Nibert" <[REDACTED]>
Date: 7/24/2011 5:39 PM
To: <[REDACTED]>

Commissioners,

Commissioner Galambos Malloy is discussing the primary hotspot for which the attached chart is intended. Please consider the attachment. Thank you.

Jeff Nibert

From: [J Nibert](#)
Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2011 5:33 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara

Commissioners,

The proposal that I have attached accommodates the rotation for Fremont and Tri-Valley cities that you are about to discuss. In my humble opinion, the attachment deserves a look. Has this been given to the commissioners?

Thank you.

Jeff Nibert

From: [J Nibert](#)
Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2011 5:04 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara

With half of Gilroy now available under the new proposal right now to move back into SNACL, this proposal is even more feasible! (5:04 p.m., 7/24)

Jeff Nibert

From: [J Nibert](#)
Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2011 4:58 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara

Commissioners,

I am watching online right now. There is a proposed rotation that was suggested for San Joaquin counties and neighboring counties that was not brought up! (It is not the swap that was rejected just now.)

I submitted this on July 20 based on the July 19 visualization. The chart is attached for your use. Please reconsider.

Thank you.

Jeff Nibert
Pleasanton

— Attachments: —

CD Redistricting for East and South Bay Area based on 07-19-2011 Visualization.pdf 25.6 KB

"Hotspot" Refinements for Counties of Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, Stanislaus & San Joaquin

(based on CRC Working Congressional District visualization for Northern California dated July 19)

Here's how to do it. It all works out!

Coming from this CD	Move these Places <i>INTO</i> adjacent CD (~ 70,000 total for each)	Into this CD	Population Shift (before final detail)	HOTSPOTS Addressed
COCO	Danville, Alamo and Blackhawk cities proper plus edge census blocks *	FRENE	70,768	THANK YOU! for uniting 4 Tri-Valley cities (<i>Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon</i>). Add Danville and apron-string towns to FRENE to keep the Tri-Valley whole!
FRENE	The rest of Fremont city proper (except tract 4411)	SANJO	70,524	Keep Fremont whole within SANJO!
SANJO	San Jose city center missing pieces (all areas West of US 101 as shown in 7/19 SANJO visual) **	SNACL	70,967	US 101 is clear and unambiguous line! Keep city center San Jose and San Jose State whole!
SNACL	Southeast Santa Clara County (as shown in the 7/19 SNACL visual -- no Gilroy) *** all areas in SNACL that are East of a rough north-south line with endpoints at (1) US 101 Interchange # 377A and (2) the intersection of Summit Rd & Croy Ridge Rd, Llagas-Uvas, CA.	STANI	70,723	STANI and South SNACL both are lower-density, agricultural and commuter communities. They are not like North SNACL
STANI	Manteca city proper (as shown in 7/19 STANI visual) plus adjoining 95 blocks, most to South of Manteca bounded by: - Austin Road on the East and - Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers to the South and West.	SNJOA	70,647	Keep Manteca with San Joaquin County!
SNJOA	Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Knightsen, Byron cities proper plus in-between census blocks ****	COCO	70,082	Keep East CoCo County with COCO!

Source: <http://2010.census.gov/2010census/popmap/>

Please make the above refinements to the working CD visualizations at your meetings Friday and Saturday, July 22 and 23. Thanks. - Jeff Nibert, Pleasanton

Footnotes:

* Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 3342 (block groups 1 & 2), 3452.04, 3461.01, 3461.02, 3462.01, 3462.03, 3462.04, 3551.12 (includes 25 blocks), 3551.13, and the portions of the following tracts that are in 7/19 COCO visual (i.e., not San Ramon): 3451.05, 3451.13, 3451.14, 3452.02, 3452.03, 3551.14
** Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 5001 (grp 2 & 3), 5009.02 (includes 6 blocks), 5010 (grp 1 & 5), 5011.02, 5012, 5014.01, 5014.02, 5015.01, 5015.02, 5016 (grp 1, 2, 3 & 5), 5031.05, 5031.10, 5031.11, 5031.12, 5031.17, 5031.18, 5031.22, 5052.02 (grp 1, 2 & 3), 5053.02 (includes 5 blocks), 5056 (includes 6 blocks)
*** Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 5120.01 (8 blocks in grp 1), 5120.01 grp 2, 5120.38 (8 eastern blocks), 5121, 5122 (6 blocks in grp 1, 41 blocks in grp 2), 5123.05, 5123.07, 5123.08, 5123.09, 5123.10, 5123.11 (part), 5123.12, 5123.13, 5123.14, 5135, and the portions of the following tracts that are in 7/19 SNACL visual (i.e., not Gilroy): 5124.01, 5124.02, 5125.03, 5126.02
**** Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 3020.08 (excluding 51 blocks), 3031.02, 3031.03, 3032.01 (excluding grp 1 and 28 blocks), 3032.02, 3032.03, 3032.04, 3032.05, 3040.01 (includes 24 blocks), 3040.02, 3040.03, 3040.04, 3040.05

Subject: Fw: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara

From: "J Nibert" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 5:33 PM

To: <[REDACTED]>

Commissioners,

The proposal that I have attached accommodates the rotation for Fremont and Tri-Valley cities that you are about to discuss. In my humble opinion, the attachment deserves a look. Has this been given to the commissioners?

Thank you.

Jeff Nibert

From: [J Nibert](#)

Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2011 5:04 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Fw: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara

With half of Gilroy now available under the new proposal right now to move back into SNACL, this proposal is even more feasible! (5:04 p.m., 7/24)

Jeff Nibert

From: [J Nibert](#)

Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2011 4:58 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara

Commissioners,

I am watching online right now. There is a proposed rotation that was suggested for San Joaquin counties and neighboring counties that was not brought up! (It is not the swap that was rejected just now.)

I submitted this on July 20 based on the July 19 visualization. The chart is attached for your use. Please reconsider.

Thank you.

Jeff Nibert
Pleasanton

— Attachments: _____

CD Redistricting for East and South Bay Area based on 07-19-2011 Visualization.pdf

25.6 KB

"Hotspot" Refinements for Counties of Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, Stanislaus & San Joaquin

(based on CRC Working Congressional District visualization for Northern California dated July 19)

Here's how to do it. It all works out!


Coming from this CD	Move these Places INTO adjacent CD (~ 70,000 total for each)	Into this CD	Population Shift (before final detail)	HOTSPOTS Addressed
COCO	Danville, Alamo and Blackhawk cities proper plus edge census blocks *	FRENE	70,768	THANK YOU! for uniting 4 Tri-Valley cities (<i>Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon</i>). Add Danville and apron-string towns to FRENE to keep the Tri-Valley whole!
FRENE	The rest of Fremont city proper (except tract 4411)	SANJO	70,524	Keep Fremont whole within SANJO!
SANJO	San Jose city center missing pieces (all areas West of US 101 as shown in 7/19 SANJO visual) **	SNACL	70,967	US 101 is clear and unambiguous line! Keep city center San Jose and San Jose State whole!
SNACL	Southeast Santa Clara County (as shown in the 7/19 SNACL visual -- no Gilroy) *** all areas in SNACL that are East of a rough north-south line with endpoints at (1) US 101 Interchange # 377A and (2) the intersection of Summit Rd & Croy Ridge Rd, Llagas-Uvas, CA.	STANI	70,723	STANI and South SNACL both are lower-density, agricultural and commuter communities. They are not like North SNACL
STANI	Manteca city proper (as shown in 7/19 STANI visual) plus adjoining 95 blocks, most to South of Manteca bounded by: - Austin Road on the East and - Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers to the South and West.	SNJOA	70,647	Keep Manteca with San Joaquin County!
SNJOA	Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Knightsen, Byron cities proper plus in-between census blocks ****	COCO	70,082	Keep East CoCo County with COCO!

Source: <http://2010.census.gov/2010census/popmap/>

Please make the above refinements to the working CD visualizations at your meetings Friday and Saturday, July 22 and 23. Thanks. - Jeff Nibert, Pleasanton

Footnotes:

* Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 3342 (block groups 1 & 2), 3452.04, 3461.01, 3461.02, 3462.01, 3462.03, 3462.04, 3551.12 (includes 25 blocks), 3551.13, and the portions of the following tracts that are in 7/19 COCO visual (i.e., not San Ramon): 3451.05, 3451.13, 3451.14, 3452.02, 3452.03, 3551.14
** Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 5001 (grp 2 & 3), 5009.02 (includes 6 blocks), 5010 (grp 1 & 5), 5011.02, 5012, 5014.01, 5014.02, 5015.01, 5015.02, 5016 (grp 1, 2, 3 & 5), 5031.05, 5031.10, 5031.11, 5031.12, 5031.17, 5031.18, 5031.22, 5052.02 (grp 1, 2 & 3), 5053.02 (includes 5 blocks), 5056 (includes 6 blocks)
*** Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 5120.01 (8 blocks in grp 1), 5120.01 grp 2, 5120.38 (8 eastern blocks), 5121, 5122 (6 blocks in grp 1, 41 blocks in grp 2), 5123.05, 5123.07, 5123.08, 5123.09, 5123.10, 5123.11 (part), 5123.12, 5123.13, 5123.14, 5135, and the portions of the following tracts that are in 7/19 SNACL visual (i.e., not Gilroy): 5124.01, 5124.02, 5125.03, 5126.02
**** Includes these tracts or portions of tracts (zero-pop. blocks not counted): 3020.08 (excluding 51 blocks), 3031.02, 3031.03, 3032.01 (excluding grp 1 and 28 blocks), 3032.02, 3032.03, 3032.04, 3032.05, 3040.01 (includes 24 blocks), 3040.02, 3040.03, 3040.04, 3040.05



Subject: Redistricting

From: John L <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 7:14 PM

To: <[REDACTED]>

CC: <[REDACTED]>

Redistricting Commission

This is to let you know that I prefer that the City of Alameda not be combined with Oakland.

The city has its own:

city government

school district

hospital

taxes for school and hospital

Real Estate Board,

fire and police departments,

golf courses, and many other social and business organizations. There is practically no

interaction between the two separate cities except the electoral district and AC Transit.

Sincerely,

John Lee

[REDACTED]

Alameda, CA 94501

Cc: [REDACTED]

July 23, 2011

California Citizens Redistricting Commission
c/o votersfirstact/crc.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern –

We would like to protest your recommended East Bay Congressional District. Your proposal includes a portion of the San Francisco Bay Area that does not represent the interests or values of our community and those other communities in our area which have similar demographics and life styles. We moved to this area so we could enjoy the “country/suburban life” and all that goes along with it.

Including urban/working class citizens from large cities in our district is unfair, and makes it almost impossible, due to sheer numbers, to elect a representative who has our interests at heart. The Congressional District you propose results in a disenfranchisement of those in the communities of Contra Costa County and eastern Alameda County.

Implementing the recommendations of the California Conservative Action Group with the East Bay Hills as the dividing line of the district is the fairest to all. Citizens on both sides of these hills want this – a fair fight in home districts.

Thank you for your work on redistricting and for taking our comments into consideration.

Sincerely,



Richard Wilson



Barbara Wilson


Danville, CA 94506