

Subject: San Diego North Central Mesa Communities

From: Valerie Sanfilippo <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 15:56:13 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

This letter from the Clairemont Town Council to the City San Diego Redistricting Commission also holds true for the State Redistricting.

So far you have put Linda Vista-Clairemont-Bay Park with North and South Coastal County for State, and over with La Mesa-El Cajon-East Chula Vista cities for Congress.

This letter explains how the North Central San Diego City Mesa Communities of Clairemont, Kearny Mesa, Serra Mesa, Linda Vista and Bay Park wish to be kept together, with boundaries of 5, 52, 15 and 8. Thank you.

July 21, 2011

From: Valerie Sanfilippo, 3246 Ashford St. Unit M, San Diego CA 92111

To: Redistricting Commissioners:

As a resident of the Clairemont neighborhood of San Diego, I would like to request that you keep our Clairemont community, which includes the sub-divided communities of Bay Park, Bay Ho, Clairemont Mesa, and North Clairemont, whole and contiguous through the redistricting process.

My desire to have Clairemont remain contiguous reflects upon this community's political diversity, and I feel that strengthens Clairemont's role as a bellwether for the rest of the City of San Diego. I respectfully ask that Clairemont not be divided up, and not grouped with communities I feel are of non-interest that we don't share commonalities with (Pacific Beach, Tierrasanta, La Jolla, et al.). To be grouped, and/or divided up as such, I feel would be detrimental, diminish, and disenfranchise Clairemont's interests – and our community voice – in City Hall.

Based on the 2010 Census data, our currently drawn sixth (6th) City Council District needs to lose only 12,000 residents to reach the Redistricting Commission's goal of 144,624. I feel the natural boundaries that are currently drawn within the 52, 15, 8, and 5 freeways – which include the communities of Linda Vista, Serra Mesa, and Kearny Mesa – would best constitute the shape of this district, and I ask that it remain as such.

I respectfully submit this request to the 2010 Redistricting Commission for your records.

Sincerely,

Valerie Sanfilippo,

Clairemont Resident P.S. I was not able to obtain a 2nd draft map from your website, they do not come up on public library computers, please send me one, thank you!

--

Regards, Val Sanfilippo,
Seiu, Sierra, Moveon.

Subject: Southern California Senate Maps

From: "Barbara Warner" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 00:19:01 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

To the California Redistricting Commission -

As a community resident, advocate and volunteer in Spring Valley for over three decades, I have followed the Redistricting Commission's recent efforts with great interest. I believe the Southern California Senate Maps 1 and 2 represent a balanced approach to redistricting. However, the recently proposed third version, (Senate Map 3) seems to me to be inconsistent with the goal of authentically representative, equitable district boundaries.

During thirty-five years as a volunteer on a broad range of local advisory councils and community initiatives, I have worked closely with my counterparts in Lemon Grove, La Mesa, El Cajon, and the neighborhoods that make up the eastern portion of the City of San Diego. We have long-standing relationships with the organizations and infrastructure of Lemon Grove, which is also home to the Sheriff's station command that provides law enforcement for our unincorporated area. Our area is also working closely with volunteers and interns from a spectrum of programs at San Diego State University, providing services and attempting to build community identity. The proposed SoCal Senate Map 3 splits us away from our neighbors and partners and fractures those community bonds. I sincerely urge your Commission to adopt the draft of SoCal Senate Maps 1 or 2, and allow our neighborhoods to continue benefiting from coherent, consistent representation.

Thank you,

Barbara Warner

[REDACTED]

Spring Valley, CA 91977



REGION I: SAN DIEGO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515LYNN SCHENK
40TH DISTRICT
CALIFORNIA*Former Member*Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154A
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax: (916) 651-5711

July 21, 2011

Re: Proposed 50th District

Dear Sir or Madam:

By way of introduction and background, I am the former Congresswoman who represented a large part of the proposed 50th district from 1993 to 1995. It was then labeled the 49th district, and was configured by the California Supreme Court in the redistricting of 1991.

I am not, nor will I be, a candidate for Congress so my comments are free of personal interest and based solely on in depth knowledge of the area.

I will get to the point:

The configuration being proposed is terrible! I know the areas well, not only as the Congresswoman who represented it, but having lived in the area for over 40 years.

San Diego is a county of many communities, some of which may be physically contiguous but have nothing in common with one another—they may as well be in different states!

The communities being knitted together in the proposed 50th don't even have physical proximity, much more common interests. Poway has no contiguous neighborhoods, community of interests or even transportation access with La Jolla, Point Loma or Coronado.

Moreover, significant parts of La Jolla are split from one another. For example, UCSD is the heart of the community, yet the proposal splits this incredibly important resource—important not only to the area but to the country. La Jolla has one of the nation's largest concentrations of Biotech companies on Torrey Pines Mesa. It, too, is split off from its natural alliances.

The primary "community of interest" in San Diego is coastal versus inland. Yet the proposal cobbles together an inland suburban/rural area with the coastal urban areas. They are so divided from one another that there are virtually no transportation or freeway corridors in connecting them.

Please look at the 49th district of the 1990's to see what a balanced district with a community of interests can look like without regard to political registration—the Supreme Court did a fine job back then—the defining community of interests have not changed much in the intervening years, even as the population has grown.

Please reconsider this ill advised proposal so that the people of the respective communities can have their "community of interests" truly represented.

Thank you

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lynn Schenk". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "L" and a long, sweeping underline.

Lynn Schenk
Former Member of Congress
(San Diego, CA)

Subject: Comments on San Diego County - 7/18/11 Senate SoCal Option 3

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 15:48:35 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

July 21, 2011

Via electronic mail

Commissioners of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Comments on San Diego County - 7/18/11 Senate SoCal Option 3

Dear Commissioners:

We want to thank you for considering our mapping suggestions which SCAPAL and APALC sent to you on July 15th regarding senate districts.

After reviewing the July 18th Senate options for Southern California and working within your mapping framework, it would appear that of the three options, Option 3 which includes Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos, Rancho Bernardo, Miramar, Sorrento Valley and Carmel Valley in CSAND is the most appropriate for our API community.

We would ask, however, that you make a couple of additional minor changes in CSAND. The Southeast Asian community in the City Heights area is split between ISAND and CSAND. By making the following minor changes, the Southeast community will be together.

Move from ISAND to CSAND:

1. El Cajon Blvd at Fwy 15 east to 54th Street
Fwy 15 south to Orange Ave and Orange Ave east to 54th Street
2. University Ave at 50th Street east to 54th Street
50th Street (at University Ave) south to Altadena
Altadena to Euclid Ave at Chollas Road

Move from CSAND to ISAND:

As much area from Emerald Hills located south of Fwy 94 for population equality

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these mapping suggestions. We appreciate very much the hard work and commitment you have demonstrated in performing your services as members of this Commission.

Sincerely,

Palma Hooper
President, Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law
Regional Partner, CAPAFR

Subject: from former Congresswoman Lynn Schenk

From: "Lynn Schenk" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 09:52:23 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

By way of introduction and background, I am the former Congresswoman who represented a large part of the proposed 50th district from 1993 to 1995. It was then labeled the 49th district and was configured by the California Supreme Court in the redistricting of 1991.

I am not, nor will I be, a candidate for Congress so my comments are free of personal interest and based solely on in depth knowledge of the area.

I will get to the point:

The configuration being proposed is terrible! I know the areas well not only as the Congresswoman who represented it, but having lived in the area for over 40 years.

San Diego is a county of many communities, some of which may be physically contiguous but have nothing in common with one another—they may as well be in different states!

The communities being knitted together in the proposed 50th don't even have physical proximity, much more common interests. Poway has no contiguous neighborhoods, community of interests or even transportation access with La Jolla, Point Loma or Coronado.

Moreover, significant parts of La Jolla are split from one another. For example, UCSD is the heart of the community, yet the proposal splits this incredibly important resource—important not only to the area but to the country. La Jolla has one of the nation's largest concentrations of Biotech companies on Torrey Pines Mesa. It, too, is split off from its natural alliances.

The primary "community of interest" in San Diego is coastal versus inland. Yet the proposal cobbles together an inland suburban/rural area with the coastal urban areas. They are so divided from one another that there are virtually no transportation or freeway corridors in common!

Please look at the 49th district of the 1990's to see what a balanced district with a community of interests can look like without regard to political registration—the Supreme Court did a fine job back then—the defining community of interests has not changed much in the intervening years even as the population has grown.

Please reconsider this ill advised proposal so that the people of the respective districts can have their community of interests truly represented.

Thank you

Lynn Schenk

Former Member of Congress

Subject: National City Assembly District Visualization

From: Salvador Flor <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 04:16:05 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioners,

The latest configuration of the Commission's Assembly and Senate maps dilutes and splits the Filipino Community in East National City; consequently, reducing our voting strengths over the next ten years of elected representatives of our choice.

The CAPAFR-MALDEF-AARC unity maps for East National City for both Assembly LMSAND and SENATE CSAND combine eastern and all of National City with API communiity members from Paradise Hills, Alta Vista Terrace, Bonita and east Chula Vista.

Within the Unity map, all three unique and divergent groups CAPAFR, MALDEF and AARC recognizes the strength and power of the concentration of Filipino American institutions that serve the community. This includes over 15 restaurants, 4 major churches, 8 majors stores, 4 newspapers, 6 community based organizations and one major hospital to name a few.

By adopting this configuration, there is no net loss of voting strengths for any of the major and larger voting constituents and you would be giving the Filipino and API Community a sense of accomplishment in recognizing its numbers and giving your API representatives on the Commission a recognition of their own sense of identity and community.

Finally, I proudly submit this statement as I have shared and sense a renewed interest from our community in the electoral process and all the Commissioners have an opportunity to maintain this momentum by adopting the CAPAFR-MALDEF-AARC Unity Map. This would set the foundation for inclusion and coalition building with the broader community and more importantly, increase community participation in future elections.

Please respect our community of interest in East National City by uniting the Filipino community in the South Bay. We acknowlege and respect the time and commitment you have demonstated as members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission. Please give us voice....

Respectfully,

Salvador B. Flor, MS
SDSU EOP Counselor (Retired)

Subject: Public Comment: 1 - San Diego

From: Donna Cleary [REDACTED]

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 07:33:19 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Donna Cleary <[REDACTED]>

Subject: BOE Maps

Message Body:

I think you need to look at the cost of an elected official staffing offices going up and down the state. COI must not be part of the BOE drawings. Why would a business near Oregon share same needs as a business adjacent to the Mexican border. I think you just wanted this to be done and not correctly. Additionally, to staff local offices would be extremely costly.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 1 - San Diego

From: Michelle Ogden <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 20:13:26 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Michelle Ogden <[REDACTED]>

Subject: House of Representatives

Message Body:

An odd geographical boundary has been drawn separating Golden Hill SW area from the rest of Greater Golden Hill.

HWY 94 & North of that fwy is more logical than slicing off maybe 5 blocks X a dozen blocks to the East.

Michelle Ogden

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 1 - San Diego

From: Racquel Vasquez <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 21:30:41 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Racquel Vasquez <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Lemon Grove Concerns

Message Body:

Thank you for your concept maps for the assembly social and congress social districts. I serve as a planning commissioner for the City of Lemon Grove and have lived here for more than 10 years. These maps link us with the City of San Diego as well as Spring Valley.

There is one map of concern, however, from my perspective. The senate social option 3 map changes my district, "CSAND". It places Lemon Grove in a district with Lakeside, Santee, Poway, and Escondido. This is a horrible idea. We do not share anything in common with those areas and would likely receive little attention from a Senator in that district.

At the same time, it seems that the other difference between the maps is the north San Diego City areas like Mira Mesa and Rancho Bernardo. I know those areas too from my full time work in public relations for the City of San Diego and must say they are distinctly "north county". They are very similar in community feel, have similar interests and demographics, and have strong economic interconnectedness to Poway and Escondido. To move those down to connect with central San Diego does not make any sense in and of itself. To shove Lemon Grove into a northeastern-county-centric district further makes less sense.

The senate social option 1 and 2 maps keep our area aligned correctly, and I strongly hope that you adopt one of these two maps and reject option 3.

Thank you for all of your hard work.

Sincerely,

Racquel Vasquez

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting in San Diego

From: "Christy Figueroa" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 09:47:48 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Redistricting in San Diego.pdf

July 21, 2011

Dear Redistricting Commissioners -

My name is Christy Figueroa and I previously wrote to you about the work being done in San Diego. I want to thank you for the maps you have drawn (yesterday) that correctly unite communities of interest. I have been highly engaged with the faith based communities in southeastern San Diego, Lemon Grove and Spring Valley and other surrounding areas through my work with the San Diego Organizing Project and it is critical that we remain united in these maps to send strong representation to Sacramento and Washington instead of diluting our voice. I grew up in this area and know the people well, and getting the map right is so important to us. We have a number of common issues and challenges. Socially, there are a high number of African American and Hispanic households, immigrant and refugee communities, and people of faith that live in southeastern San Diego, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley. We often bring our congregations together for united projects that will benefit the area at large. Your proposals for the Assembly and Congressional Map are correct, and as I was equally happy for the Senate map as drawn, I became concerned yesterday when I realized that there is a potential last minute change which could dramatically affect the economics, socialization and governing representation of our communities as a district and we simply cannot afford any further setbacks.

I see there are three options and options 1 or 2 for the SoCal Senate map are correct from our perspective. It connects eastern and southeastern San Diego neighborhoods with Lemon Grove and Spring Valley. Option 3 splits Lemon Grove and Spring Valley away from the city and places them with the east county. This option would be harmful to these residents from a perspective of Senate representation as it would split them from others they share values with. **PLEASE OMIT OPTION 3 FROM CONSIDERATION**, and instead adopt option 1 or 2 for your final map. Thank you for all of your hard work over the past few months. It certainly shows.

With sincere respect,

Christy Figueroa

Subject: Redistricting in San Diego

From: "Christy Figueroa" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 09:49:21 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Redistricting in San Diego.docx

July 21, 2011

Dear Redistricting Commissioners -

My name is Christy Figueroa and I previously wrote to you about the work being done in San Diego. I want to thank you for the maps you have drawn (yesterday) that correctly unite communities of interest. I have been highly engaged with the faith based communities in southeastern San Diego, Lemon Grove and Spring Valley and other surrounding areas through my work with the San Diego Organizing Project and it is critical that we remain united in these maps to send strong representation to Sacramento and Washington instead of diluting our voice. I grew up in this area and know the people well, and getting the map right is so important to us. We have a number of common issues and challenges. Socially, there are a high number of African American and Hispanic households, immigrant and refugee communities, and people of faith that live in southeastern San Diego, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley. We often bring our congregations together for united projects that will benefit the area at large. Your proposals for the Assembly and Congressional Map are correct, and as I was equally happy for the Senate map as drawn, I became concerned yesterday when I realized that there is a potential last minute change which could dramatically affect the economics, socialization and governing representation of our communities as a district and we simply cannot afford any further setbacks.

I see there are three options and options 1 or 2 for the SoCal Senate map are correct from our perspective. It connects eastern and southeastern San Diego neighborhoods with Lemon Grove and Spring Valley. Option 3 splits Lemon Grove and Spring Valley away from the city and places them with the east county. This option would be harmful to these residents from a perspective of Senate representation as it would split them from others they share values with. **PLEASE OMIT OPTION 3 FROM CONSIDERATION**, and instead adopt option 1 or 2 for your final map. Thank you for all of your hard work over the past few months. It certainly shows.

With sincere respect,

Christy Figueroa

Subject: Redrawing of District Lines

From: octavio aguilar <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 17:18:47 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

My name is Octavio Aguilar. I live in North San Diego County but I'm going to make general comments that apply to the entire state. I have reviewed your most recent visualizations of our state's Assembly, Senate and Congressional districts and I'm very concerned about the low number of Latino majority districts you have drawn, in apparent disregard of the Federal Voting Rights Act. Yes, it's good to finally have a Citizens Commission drawing districts without regard to political or partisan considerations, but the rights of Latinos under the Voting Rights Act is not something you can also ignore.

I'm writing to strongly urge you to carefully consider whether your visualizations of Assembly, Senate and Congressional districts sufficiently protect the rights of the Latino community under the Voting Rights Act. I can't believe that with such a high number of Latinos in our state you came up with so few majority Latino districts. Please review your work very carefully and make sure you draw every district's lines in a way that protects the voting rights of our Latino communities. Thank you.