

College/Glen Neighborhood Association

June 24, 2011

To: California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, suite 54-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: Annette Deglow, President
College-Glen Neighborhood Association
[REDACTED]
Sacramento, CA 95826
[REDACTED]

Dear California Citizens Redistricting Commission:

For the past 20 years, the 3,000 households within our neighborhoods, College Greens and Glenbrook, all residents of the City of Sacramento, have been split between two assembly districts and on the fringe of each of those two districts. This has resulted in our being in assembly districts where we have little community of interest with others within those respective assembly districts.

The proposed assembly boundary changes provide our community with two positive changes: first all of the residents within our neighborhood are in the same assembly district, and second the number of City of Sacramento residents within the assembly district is increased. However, we continue to be a small cluster of residents from small communities within City of Sacramento being combined with residents from large rural areas outside the City and County of Sacramento. We have little in common with the Cities of Rocklin and Loomis that will make up the majority of the proposed district for our area. Sacramento, as the Capitol city, should have its own district and we would like to be included in the Sacramento Assembly District.

If one of the goals of redistricting is to preserve communities of interest then every effort should be made to include all the residents within city boundaries in the same assembly district unless the number within the specific city exceeds the number established for a single district.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Subject: Public Comment: 9 - Sacramento

From: "Gordon V. Scott" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 20:06:02 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Gordon V. Scott <[REDACTED]>

Subject: draft district map

Message Body:

While reviewing the drafts is a bit difficult I cannot see the reasons for splitting the eastern suburbs of Sacramento off from the rest of urban Sacramento and including them with rural Foothill counties. The issues facing a dense, suburban area are different from those facing a rural, farm based economic area. Take for example, transportation. Rural areas do not have the density of populations to support much mass transit, nor the economic centers of gravity for them. Urban areas do.

A legislative representative that has to serve both types of areas will not be able to do so effectively. That is one of the current problems with the existing districts. Please rethink your plans so that urban populations are grouped together and rural areas likewise. Then their elected officials can best serve the real needs of those different areas.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Eastern Sacramento County Redistricting

From: "Joe Hensler" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 15:20:00 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Hello

I am writing today to comment on the proposed redistricting plan for Eastern Sacramento County which inexplicably adds my neighborhood of Fair Oaks, Folsom, Gold River and much of Citrus Heights to the Placer County voting block.

It was my understanding that one of your primary goals was to respect county lines and community boundaries. To take this bite out of Sacramento County while leaving Eldorado Hills to the East in Sacramento County further adds to my confusion.

As Placer County residents will far outnumber the chunk of Sacramento County that you have added to Placer County, we will be effectively without representation. Given that the many of the County's elected representatives in State Government have historically been from the area in question makes this particularly offensive.

Please respect the residents of Sacramento County and your own guidelines and restore Fair Oaks, Folsom, Orangevale, Gold River and Citrus Heights to Sacramento County.

Thank you

Joseph Hensler

[REDACTED]
4750 Illinois Ave
Fair Oaks, Ca. 95628

Subject: Opposition to placing Elmhurst in "non-City" district

From: Gordon Olson <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 13:36:41 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

June 24, 2011

Dear Commission Members:

On behalf of the Elmhurst Neighborhood Association, I would like to thank you all for accepting the responsibility to develop new State Senate and Assembly districts based on the population figures from the 2010 Census. It is a very important and challenging endeavor that will have a lasting impact on our State and its citizens over the next decade.

The Elmhurst Neighborhood (ENA) opposes the Commission's proposal to separate Elmhurst, as well as several other neighborhoods within the City of [Sacramento](#), from the rest of the City by including it in a separate district linked to [Roseville](#), [El Dorado Hills](#), [Loomis](#), and other suburban and foothill communities.

The residents of Elmhurst are proud to be citizens of the City of Sacramento and share a wide variety of interests with the other communities in the City. We have only limited interests in common with outlying communities and do not feel that our interests could or would be effectively represented by elected officials from a newly created district composed primarily of suburban communities.

ENA believes that important community institutions such as Sacramento State University and the [UC Davis Medical Center](#) should also remain in a district that is truly a "City district". The proposal to divorce Elmhurst and other neighborhoods from the City would also divide school boundaries between districts unnecessarily.

The ENA and the citizens we represent recommend strongly that the Commission return Elmhurst and other City of Sacramento neighborhoods to Districts that respect the City's boundaries to the maximum degree possible and that minimize the placement of City neighborhoods in Districts that do not reflect either their character or their histories.

Sincerely,

Gordon R. Olson

President

Elmhurst Neighborhood Association

Subject: Public Comment: 9 - Sacramento

From: Joseph Sison <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 20:21:16 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Joseph Sison <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Sacramento City

Message Body:

Keep the city of Sacramento intact and part of one district as we all have a commonness that we share as a group.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission