

Subject: Public Comment: 1 - San Diego

From: Andrew Farrow <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 6 Jul 2011 17:05:23 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Andrew Farrow <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Region 1 Congressional Districts

Message Body:

Dear Commission,

I have written before, and am writing again, albeit late in the 2nd Draft Drawing, but I must show my complete disappointment in the 1st Draft maps that have been drawn for Region 1.

I am disappointed for three reasons. The First is that CA51 now occupies a larger swath of land in south San Diego County. Extending one district from the Ocean to the Colorado River shows complete disregard to the communities of interest. The only common factor the whole swath of land has is the US Border with Mexico. Chula Vista has nothing in common with the communities of Campo, Jacumba, Calexico, El Centro, Oglby, etc, in East San Diego County and Imperial County. Imperial County has much more in common with Eastern Riverside county than it will have with Western San Diego County. Imperial Has more in common with the furthest eastern parts of the San Diego County, and that is negotiable.

The Second reason is the splitting up of Chula Vista into two districts. Chula Vista Should be in a single district as it carries a large contiguous population, and represents a community of interest in whole.

The third reason is the under representation of the Border Areas. Having only a single representative for the border region is not a position of strength for our state. Having 2 or three representatives will better address the varying needs of the people on the border seeing as each area, Coastal San Diego County, Inland San Diego County, and Imperial County all have different border interests.

My Solutions are in concurrence with others that have been written (Terry Leimbach [2011-06-21], Edgar J. Bourquin [2011-06-28], Sandra McHale-Renk [2011-06-13], Bill Barcikowski [2011-06-21], Alfonso Valenzuela [2011-06-21]).

1: CA51 should be kept to Imperial County and Eastern Riverside County
2: CA45 should take on Chula Vista in Whole, Imperial Beach, San Ysidro, and Otay Mesa
3: CA52 should take the remainder of the area lost by CA51 in San Diego County.
These three solutions should allow for the best representation of the Border Region.

An alternate set would be to have CA52 cover west of State Route 79 to the Coast and Down to the Border and have CA51 pick up the area lost by CA52.

If either of these solutions are used, they will fulfill the mandate that communities of interest are kept together, are compact, and are contiguous.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 1 - San Diego

From: Clovis Honore <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 6 Jul 2011 23:30:15 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Clovis Honore <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Proposed Map Details

Message Body:

I am having difficulty finding maps with enough detail to determine what district I would be in. Is there a resource which details the specific streets and/or precincts would be in which districts?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 1 - San Diego

From: Andrew Farrow <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 6 Jul 2011 19:11:26 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Andrew Farrow <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Mistake in my earlier comment made today

Message Body:

I misstated the congressional districts in my previous message I made earlier today, I had confused CA45 with CA53. The changes to my message should be clear that I meant to say CA53 instead of CA45.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission