

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Monterey

From: Vicki Williams <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 2011 02:02:56 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Vicki Williams <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting in Monterey/Santa Cruz

Message Body:

Including Santa Barbara and Ventura in with Monterey is not in the interest of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary. Their interest in our sanctuary is not on their agenda. These two areas of the state are very different and I'm sure they are not interested in having us determine what is happening in their area. Keep like area issues in the same districts. We have enough problems educating citizens who care about our unique areas without trying to understand what is going on in some other area in the state unrelated to our needs. Please reconsider for the sake of citizens and not politicians.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Monterey

From: Joshua Gross <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 2011 17:50:06 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Joshua Gross <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting Monterey area state senate seat

Message Body:

I find the district for the new senate seat to include Monterey to be ridiculous. It appears to be gerrymandering in the extreme. I don't understand the rationale for creating such a district. Monterey and Santa Cruz counties share distinct economics and culture, neither nocal nor social, and one that balances tourism, academia, and agriculture. To stretch down to Ventura (or stretch up to Monterey) in the same district breaks the ability of the senator, regardless of his or her party, to represent an even remotely unified area. It seems designed to put a moderate district into the battle of partisan politics; the northern end will have to move to the left to counterbalance a move to the right on the southern end.

Allow me to illustrate this with relatively simple geography. Where would you have a town hall meeting? I'm not talking about a meet and greet with the candidate, I'm talking about a chance for people from all over the district to meet one another. It can't happen, it won't happen, and as a result, your actions will result in two polarized sub-districts.

If your goal is to create more divisiveness in politics, then it seems that you are going to achieve that goal. If your goal is instead to make more rational and less political decisions (than the legislature would make), then you seem to have misoperationalized that goal.

I personally can't see what the goal was; I have to hope it wasn't to spawn divisiveness in a district with no meaningful geographic center, but I think I hope in vain.

Sincerely,
Joshua Gross

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission