

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Gary Lindgren [REDACTED] >

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 17:15:04 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Gary Lindgren <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Excellent Work

Message Body:

Dear Commission,

The first draft for the redistricting of California is excellent at least as far as Northern or Central CA. You did a very good job.

Gary Lindgren

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

To: Citizens Redistricting Commission, 901 P Street, Suite 154-A, Sacramento, CA 95814
from: Daryl Tempesta
Subject: Testimony
Date: June 10, 2011

Dear Madam or Sir,

This is formal testimony to the first draft redrawing of the proposed political boundaries.

The proposed boundary between Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley as proposed is a mistake.

I live in Scotts Valley city proper. In geographic terms when it rains hard and wind blows, we get the Blue herons from the coast which is easily viewable from our neighborhood. Our kids attend a Santa Cruz School; of which the principal is also a Scotts Valley resident, as well as many students at the school. That school being Spring Hill Advanced K-8 which is a Nationally recognized Blue Ribbon School. This illustrates the closeness of these entwined cities.

Both Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley are on the same side of "the Hill", and share that locational and economic link much closer than San Mateo. As well the State of California has designated Hwy 17 and other redwood highways in the area as designated as Officially eligible for protected "Scenic Route" status, (this would attract tourism and the tax dollar to follow). The State of California can use all the revenue it can get.

The fact is that Hwy 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the State, and needs to be in the fewest jurisdictions possible to improve it's safety. It would reduce the expense, save lives of police, visitors and commuters and speed decision making. HWY 17 is a growing hazard as the population increases and development decisions are pushed to increase the population. There needs to be one mind in the representation, preservation and improvement of this area. This is not trivial.

The political will to protect the heart of the Redwood peninsula in this part of the area is not there now. Recently Retail giant Target was trying to build a massive size structure on a country lane next to 17. After a strong City resistance, they were convinced to move to an appropriate city site at the Capitola Mall.

Despite this the city council STILL processed the application AFTER Target pulled out - and after the land holding company went into default! The will to develop in this sensitive area is off the mark and against the will of a majority of the citizens. Nor in the best interest for the region or California which receives millions of visitors yearly to this area. This area is also the gateway through Mount Herman and Hwy 9 corridor to the State Parks in the area.

By dividing these cities along the proposed boarder, it divides their critical resources artificially. It divides the codependent relationship of these cities in a way that is not reflective of the actual functioning of this big community.

These cities cooperate since they depend on each other so closely. Santa Cruz which is the Judicial seat for the cities. Scotts Valley shares very little with the San Mateo boundary (the one Scotts Valley is part of in the redraw). San Mateo draws it's tourism from development and Scotts Valley/Santa Cruz by the preservation. These are polar extremes. It would be FAR better to include Scotts Valley in the same group which can prosper due to preservation. SV/SC share the same community and local textures.

Gone are the days where Santa Cruz are on one end and Scotts Valley on the other end of the spectrum. The Council members of both cities share involvement's. Mayor of Scotts Valley is on MANY Santa Cruz area boards. You will find his election supporters are listed from Santa Cruz leaders. MANY of the residents live, work and play in Santa Cruz. By allowing this artificial boarder to would disenfranchise both communities where they clearly are entangled in every way possible just 5 minutes form city centers by 17.

As an exhibit of proof, the Scotts Valley paper, PressBanner" lists Scotts Valley, Boony Doon, San Lorenzo Valley, and Pasatiempo. Essentially the ares surrounding Santa Cruz City, and in Santa Cruz County and sharing the boarder to UCSC. As well the Santa Cruz Sentinal, Is located in Scotts Valley, the editor Don Miller, and the staff live in both Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley. The shared space in the papers are not San Mateo, or even Los Gatos. PLEASE give us access and representation and break up this artificial boundary that is being proposed.

also Seagate has moved to San Jose area. Scotts Valley is not seen by business as supporting high technology. Bell helmet has moved in and reflects the recreational aspect of the area. As well new manufacturer ZeroMotercycle has moved to Scotts Valley is an eco company that reflects Redwood community ethic.

If there is one BIG mistake, dividing these communities will be THAT mistake. They act, cooperate live and share together. Please bring the boarders into line that reflect this.

The proposed boundaries artificial boundaries and I does not represent the public interests. Scotts Valley/Santa Cruz needs to be included in the SAME boundary that reflects the closeness of their relationships and locality. Please adopt this view and check the facts that support it.

Thank you,

Daryl Tempesta

[REDACTED]

Scotts Valley, 95066

[REDACTED] (h)

[REDACTED] (c)

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Rebeca Armendariz <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 18:30:01 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Rebeca Armendariz <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Districts

Message Body:

As a 4th generation Gilroyan I can confidently say that our city has much more in common with Watsonville and Hollister than Campbell or Los Gatos. Our local economy, geography, agriculture and demographics are much more similar to the aforementioned cities, despite being in different counties, than those in the 27th Assembly District.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Simple Question

From: Marc Perkel <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 18:20:46 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

The new maps look somewhat similar to the old maps. I live in Gilroy. I'd like to see Gilroy, San Martin, and Morgan Hill, perhaps Hollister in the same district, and not necessarily sharing it with San Jose. I sometimes feel like Gilroy is the bastard stepchild of the San Jose area.

I don't understand why districts need to look like squashed insects.

Marc Perkel
Gilroy

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Gary Lindgren <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 23:05:39 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Gary Lindgren <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Old District Maps

Message Body:

Hello,

Never mind my previous request for the old district maps. I see them now on the web site.

Thank you,

Gary Lindgren

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Gary Lindgren <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 20:29:26 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Gary Lindgren <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Old District Maps

Message Body:

Hello,

First impression, 'not too bad'. Good work! But is it possible to also publish the districts as they are now, so we can compare, old and new. That would really help.

Thank you,

Gary Lindgren

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Dave Chapman <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 17:52:51 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Dave Chapman <[REDACTED]>

Subject: The SANMATSCSC Congressional Map

Message Body:

We are talking about the "Silicon Valley North" Congressional district, formerly known as the 14th district.

I would give the map a 5 out of 10.

While the proposed district lines are a big improvement over the last redistricting, there are still a number of oddities:

1. The district includes parts of three counties. There was no need to include Santa Cruz county in this district.
2. The low-population areas around Pescadero should have been part of the Santa Cruz city district, not part of Silicon Valley.
3. The protuberance which extends to Scotts Valley looks bad.
4. The swirl pattern of the district lines around Menlo Park is the sort of thing we wanted you to get rid of.

The map is not hideously bad, but I would not say that it's very good, either.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: "Erik D. Kaeding" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 02:48:02 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Erik D. Kaeding <[REDACTED]>

Subject: First Draft Maps

Message Body:

It seems that I misunderstood the point of this process. I thought the goal was to prevent gerrymandering, but the draft 2011 maps are as gerrymandered as the 2001 maps. San Jose has enough people to elect two people to the Assembly and one to the Senate, yet our city has been divided up in such a way that we will continue to be politically irrelevant. San Jose is a community of interest. I want to be in a San Jose/Silicon Valley district, not a district that stretches all the way to Oakland. I understand from the newspaper that my districts were drawn to ensure the election of an Asian candidate. That's a wonderful thing if an Asian candidate just happens to be the best qualified candidate on the ballot, but I don't think the goal of drawing election districts should be to favor any particular ethnic group over another. I am a member of the San Jose community, but not a member of an Asian community. It is in my interest, and in the interest of all of my neighbors, inc!

cluding my Asian neighbors, to have a San Josean represent me, be she Asian, Latina, Black, Native American, or White. In subsequent rounds of drafting, please re-draw the lines to give San Jose a stronger voice in the Legislature.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Craig <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 03:44:49 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Craig <[REDACTED]>

Subject: June 10 map...huh?

Message Body:

I was expecting to see the new assembly, senate and congressional districts. The maps are not user friendly, ergo '5th grade' level. The pre-map 2001 is clear, the post-map (2011) is mumbo-jumbo, mapping language?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Gary Lindgren <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 20:35:35 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Gary Lindgren <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Sound

Message Body:

Can you fix the sound for the press conference. It is very low.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Joe Dianda <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 23:48:44 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Joe Dianda <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting is Law

Message Body:

Stick to your plan. It is a good thing the politicians don't like what is happening.
This is the law, stick to the law.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Antonio Ferraro <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 04:03:08 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Antonio Ferraro <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting concept?

Message Body:

I think it would be very appropriate if there was a tool that would allow us to draw the lines in such a way that created districts of approximately the same population, while minimizing the lengths of all the boundaries as a whole across the state.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: John Stephen <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 03:57:48 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: John Stephen <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Thanks for your efforts

Message Body:

I'm sure it won't be easy to get the maps finalized, but I'd like to say "thank you" to the whole commission for this effort. It makes me proud to be a Californian 😊

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Manuel Alarcon <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 05:21:44 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Manuel Alarcon <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Distribution by political affiliation

Message Body:

Being an Independent I am tired of always being bound by one major party or the other because the boundaries were drawn politically in the past. I hope that the commission sees the value of evenly distributing all parties in a district as closely as humanly possible. This will allow votes the ability to listen to the messages and actually have a probability of getting a change in their political future because one party doesn't have a commanding control of the voting district. What a joy that would be real choice!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara

From: Kenneth Sheridan <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 15:22:44 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Kenneth Sheridan <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Good work

Message Body:

Keep up the good work; your boundaries seem more sensible than the existing gerrymandering. Opposition from politicians who worry that they will now face uncertainty is a good sign.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission