

June 24, 2011



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

Dear Redistricting Commission:

On Tuesday, June 21, the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors unanimously and strongly opposed the map proposal for the Gilroy Assembly district lines. The proposal is not taking into consideration the best interests of our community in both the Assembly (South Santa Clara/West Monterey) and Senate (Coast) plans.

With the proposed plan, the Commission splits Santa Clara County four times in the Senate plan and four times in the Assembly plan. In the Assembly, those splits come from South San Mateo, Contra Costa County, and two come from Monterey County!

Gilroy shares communities of interest with our neighbors in Santa Clara County: we are not on the coast and we are not in the Central Valley. Gilroy has a long heritage, and our roots are deep in this valley's history. Today, we play an integral part in the Santa Clara County region sharing in the community college system, water, road funding, health care programs, and economic and tourism development arenas.

We advocate that the Citizens Redistricting Commission recognize the importance of our request to remain in the Santa Clara region and that the efforts of the Redistricting Commission keep communities with similar interests intact.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Susan Valenta".

Susan Valenta
President/C.E.O.

CC: Gilroy Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors
CC: City of Gilroy
CC: Office of Supervisor Mike Wasserman

Subject: Keep Districts in Santa Clara County Only!

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 22:32:27 EDT

To: [REDACTED]

TO: Chair and members of the CRC,

I would prefer that Assembly, State Senate, and Congressional district lines be drawn to keep representation in Milpitas, San Jose, Santa Clara County. The Southbay constituents have little in common with Alameda County, Fremont, and Newark.

San Jose's Berryessa District should have better political identity with one Assembly district not parts of 3 or 4.

Thanks,

Frank De Smidt

[REDACTED]
Milpitas, CA 95035

Subject: FW: Testimony for June 25, 2011

From: Matthew Mo <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 17:01:15 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Matthew Mo
Resident of Evergreen

*Written Testimony to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission
Public Input Hearing: June 25, 2011 in San Jose, CA*

Good afternoon. My name is Matthew Mo. I have lived in the Evergreen neighborhood for 27 years. Thank you for keeping Berryessa whole with Milpitas. What about keeping Evergreen whole as well?

In the 2001 Redistricting process, I testified before the state legislature and asked that the Evergreen neighborhood be kept whole with San Jose. This did not happen. Instead, part of the Evergreen neighborhood was placed in Assembly District 28, a district in which we have nothing in common. Evergreen is very urban and not rural. On May 23, 2011, I testified before this Commission and asked that you keep Evergreen together and placed in a district with downtown San Jose. Instead, the Commission's draft assembly map places the Evergreen neighborhood with in three assembly districts - Milpitas/Berryessa, San Jose and Monterey districts. In addition, Evergreen is in three state senate districts. By dividing my community among three assembly districts, this Commission has ensured that we have even less voice at the state level than we had before. This is a bad configuration for our community.

Like the Berryessa area, it is about time that Evergreen is kept whole and placed with Little Saigon and the surrounding areas of San Jose, not Monterey County. Twenty years is a long time to be divided and voiceless. I suggest that you use the boundaries of the Evergreen Elementary School District, as these are commonly used boundaries for the Evergreen neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

[REDACTED]

Subject: Public Comment: 7 - Santa Clara
From: Frank Biehl <biehl@comcast.net>
Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 17:05:50 +0000
To: votersfirstact@crc.ca.gov

From: Frank Biehl <biehl@comcast.net>
Subject: June 7, 2011, Draft Assembly Boundaries

Message Body:
Citizens Redistricting Commission,

Please reconsider the boundaries you propose for assembly districts as they relate to the East San Jose community. The map that was proposed on June 10 divides this community between three assembly districts, significantly diminishing the political voice of this largely Latino community. Please reexamine the consequences of the arbitrary boundaries used to draw the preliminary lines and look again at communities of interest.

I live in the county, one-quarter mile from the boundary of San Jose. I live in a suburban community. I work, shop, and send my children to schools in San Jose and yet because my home is located in the foothills I find myself in a rural assembly district that includes Mt. Hamilton and extends past King City (SCLARAWMONT). Please recognize that those who live on the fringes of an urban area relate more to city interests than to rural. I consider myself a member of the East Side San Jose community. Please consider using an urban service area boundary instead of city limits when considering assembly boundaries of those who live in the foothills of East San Jose.

Please do not divide our community. Examine the consequences of arbitrary boundaries and look to maintaining coherent communities of interest when establishing Assembly, State Senate and Congressional boundaries.

Sincerely,

Frank Biehl
San Jose, CA 95148-1923

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission