

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: surrenderpal s walia <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 21:05:58 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: surrenderpal s walia <[REDACTED]>

Subject: FREMONT

Message Body:

DONOT DIVIDE THE FREMONT FOR
CONGRESSIONAL PURPOSE

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Jewell Hargleroad <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 00:45:05 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jewell Hargleroad <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Your web page's failure to outline maps

Message Body:

There's no detailed maps available showing where the lines are located in relation to streets etc. Further, when one clicks onto a district, one receives essentially an advertisement for the legislator!!!!

What are we getting, more of the same?

You need to provide much better maps online.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Susan Nicholson <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 17:09:25 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Susan Nicholson <[REDACTED]>

Subject: City of Piedmont - Assembly districts

Message Body:

The line separating the West Contra Costa and Oakland districts cuts off our street, Florada Avenue from the rest of Piedmont. While most of our properties are in both Oakland and Piedmont, we vote in Piedmont, send our children to Piedmont schools and are most involved in the Piedmont community. Homes with Florada Avenue addresses should be included with the rest of Piedmont in the West Contra Costa district. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Nigel Blampied <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 04:59:57 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Nigel Blampied <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Excellent work!

Message Body:

The 1st draft maps fulfill the Commission's charge very well. Congratulations!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Richard Wong <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 21:41:46 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Richard Wong <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Thank you!!!

Message Body:

Thank you for a job well-done! After having to deal with 30 years of twisted and convoluted districts that were designed to be incumbent protection plans, it is such a relief to see districts that respect political and geographic boundaries, keep communities of interest intact, and may be politically competitive both in the primary and general elections. Thank you so much for all your hard work!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: "Daniel O'Donnell" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 04:38:34 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Daniel O'Donnell <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Fremont should stay with TriCities and Alameda Co!

Message Body:

On so many levels Fremont should be 'districted' with other Southern Alameda counties. What affiliation do we have with Santa Clara county? We are part of a Tri City area: Fremont, Newark, Union City. Also, our city deserves representation from one district only to best serve our community, splitting us in two seems like it would be problematic from planning and development point of view. Our voice is stronger and clearer undivided. Thank you, Daniel.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Milpitas, San Jose, Berryessa Deserve Better!

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Sun, 12 Jun 2011 13:31:16 EDT

To: [REDACTED]

TO: The Chair and Members of the CRC,

I deplore keeping the Assembly district and Senate district overlapping Fremont, Milpitas, and San Jose. Milpitas and San Jose have little in common with Fremont, Newark, Union City! There must be separate districts for Alameda County and for Santa Clara County!

Having 3-4 Assembly districts representing Berryessa is a colossal flop of duty! There must be only one representing Berryessa not a menagerie!

Thank you,

Frank J. De Smidt

[REDACTED]
Milpitas, CA 95036
[REDACTED]

Subject: Alameda County Redistricting

From: Herbert Nagel <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 10:51:40 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

The Tri-City Democratic Forum (Fremont, Newark & Union City) is a cohesive and active organization working for the benefit of all of its citizens. This organization was instrumental in mobilizing a very effective voter registration drive prior to the 2008 national election. In addition, this organization is active in providing our elected officials with input from our grass roots. Our organization with its very effective leadership must not be fragmented as it will lead to the destruction of a vital citizen's organization.

Herbert Nagel

[REDACTED]
Fremont, CA 94539-3755

Subject: Feedback on new maps

From: "Michael Mace" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 2011 13:05:13 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

My name is Michael Mace, I live at [REDACTED] San Jose, CA.

I would like to congratulate the Commission and its staff on the proposed redistricting maps. I have a serious concern about one map, the proposed South Santa Clara Congressional district, and will describe my concerns below. But in general I want to tell you that the proposed maps are a vast improvement over the old ones. They are generally more compact, and they are closer to natural regional boundaries. In particular, it is good to see the Central Valley represented by its own districts, rather than sliced into districts that stretch all the way out to the oceans. You have applied similar principles along the coasts and the Sierras, and that all makes sense. Good work!

For my specific feedback, I focused on the three parts of the state I know best. Here are my comments:

South San Jose ([REDACTED], San Jose, 95135)

This is where I have my big concern. I've lived in the area for about 20 years, and my wife and I are both involved in local community groups and government. This area has in the past been very badly served by the district boundaries. The most notorious is Assembly district 15, which grouped us with San Luis Obispo for reasons that no one can explain. I was very glad to see that fixed.

However, the boundaries of the proposed South Santa Clara Congressional district need to be adjusted. The map as you've drawn it cuts in half the Silver Creek/Evergreen community of San Jose, which is a very distinct neighborhood with its own economic and political issues. You have even managed to bisect the Silver Creek Country Club, which makes no sense whatsoever.

I have enclosed a map showing a more logical boundary line, including everything west of San Felipe Rd. and south of Yerba Buena Rd. This area is a natural neighborhood and ought to be kept together.

 Proposed change to South Santa Clara Congressional district.jpg

The new senate and assembly districts for our area are vast improvements.

Jamestown, CA

My father retired here, and my brother and I still own a home in the area, so we know it well. Previous districts in this area are grouped together the Sierra foothills with urban bits of the Central Valley that do not necessarily have much in common. For example, the 19th Congressional district included parts of Fresno, which is very different politically from the Sierras. The new Congressional and state districts that cover Jamestown bring together much of the Sierra foothills. In my experience, these people have similar economic and political issues, and they are a natural community. It is a great improvement to have them grouped together.

I think you were right not to include the area east of the Sierras in these districts, as those residents have different issues and deserve their own representation.

The Foothills Senate district is a bit of a disappointment, because it includes part of the Central Valley flats around Madera. I think it would be better if this district stayed in the foothills and were extended either to the north or south (to include the area east of Yuba City or east of Visalia). Same comment on the Foothills Assembly district.

But overall, a vast improvement from today's districts.

Northern Los Angeles [REDACTED], Granada Hills, 91344)

I grew up here and lived here for about 20 years. The old 27th Congressional District made no sense, as it mixed

together parts of the east and west valley that have little in common. The new West Valley-Calabasas Congressional district combines together people with a similar set of economic and political issues. It's much more uniform and makes a lot more sense.

Assembly district 38 had the same problem, and I am glad to see that addressed.

Senate district 17 was a joke, combining parts of the high desert with suburban Los Angeles. I'm sure you will hear from a lot of desert residents who will be glad to be out of it. The new Santa Clarita district is strange looking, but at least it links communities with some similar issues around growth and open space preservation.

Sincerely,

Michael Mace

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Susan Longini <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 21:24:05 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Susan Longini <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting

Message Body:

I am contacting you to voice my concern regarding your split of Fremont into 2 districts. Fremont is ONE city, within Alameda County. It should remain districted as that. Breaking it into 2 district would immensely complicate the governing of this single political entit. Please reconsider your recommendation.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Susan Aro <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 19:32:57 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Susan Aro <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Splitting the City of Fremont Up

Message Body:

The City of Fremont is proposed to be split between two Counties through redistricting efforts. It is difficult to imagine the wisdom and reasonableness of this proposal. A City needs to be seen as one intity including all the neighborhoods and residents in it. To split our City will potentially compromise future funding opportunities Federally, through the State of California and in each County. We are one City and want to remain in Alameda County. Do not split out City in half it will work against the residents, businesses and day workers in Fremont.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: PUBLIC ACCOLADE

From: James Wright <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 17:51:19 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

Commission (Commissioners, Staff and Contractors),

Congratulations to you all on the release of the first draft maps.

You are all working as a TEAM to accomplish the goals of Propositions 11 and 20. I know that you will continue to do so as the pace quickens and your deadline looms ever closer.

California is already richer for your dedication and efforts.

Jim Wright
a voter from San Jose

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Jeff Nibert <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 20:22:27 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jeff Nibert <[REDACTED]>

Subject: SHAME on rejecting the Tri-Valley (Pleasanton-Dublin-San Ramon-Danville-Livermore) Community!

Message Body:

With complete and utter disregard for the overwhelming desire of the Tri-Valley (Pleasanton-Dublin-San Ramon-Danville-Livermore) Community to remain together at the Congressional level, you have split us apart. For SHAME!

The public testimony and written comments to the Commission were overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the Tri-Valley cities together.

I beseech you in the name of all that is fair, in the second draft map, please re-unite Danville, San Ramon, Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore to remain undivided.

Despite that a county line artificially crosses us, the residents of our cities identify far more with the Tri-Valley region than either Alameda or Contra Costa Counties.

We share a common identity. We depend on the same transportation. We have identical demographics and employers. Our children play in the same sports leagues. Our local governments collaborate.

We do not share ANY of these with the other cities over the hills that you also put us with!

Please re-draw this misbegotten map and REJECT any separation of the Tri-Valley.

Sincerely,

Jeff Nibert
Pleasanton

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Aarondeep Basrai <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 17:51:22 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Aarondeep Basrai <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Fremont redistricting

Message Body:

The new congressional districting maps maps should keep Fremont with the Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county and should not split Fremont between congressional and legislative districts.

Fremont is too large of a city to be split into 2. We are not a part of santa clara county.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Alameda

From: Jeff Nibert <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2011 21:31:04 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jeff Nibert <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Tri-Valley (Pleasanton-Dublin-San Ramon-Danville-Livermore)

Message Body:

My previous comment of today pertained, as I pointed out, only to the draft Congressional map. But I do believe in giving credit where credit is due.

As a matter of courtesy and recognition, I do also wish to thank the Commission for keeping the Tri-Valley cities together in the Assembly and Senatorial districts, and for nesting the Assembly district with the adjacent Contra Costa district.

I would appreciate it if the Commission likewise would unite the Tri-Valley (Pleasanton-Dublin-San Ramon-Danville-Livermore) Community at the Congressional level.

Sincerely,

Jeff Nibert
Pleasanton

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission