Fwd: Response to July Visualization for Santa Clara County

July 7, 2011

Via electronic mail
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Comments About Visualizations for Santa Clara County Districts

We, the undersigned, submit these comments in response to the Commission’s July 1, 2011 Assembly and Senate visualizations for Santa Clara County districts. We make the following three comments about the Commission’s visualizations.

1. The Assembly visualization shows Mountain View and Sunnyvale split from Cupertino and Santa Clara. As indicated in testimony previously submitted to the Commission, we believe that the residents of Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Cupertino and Santa Clara constitute a community of interest that should be kept together for purposes of their fair and effective representation. These cities have overlapping school districts and share common transportation corridors such as the 101 highway, the 280 highway, and El Camino Real. Also, these cities share a common technology industry. The cities are home to a number of major technology companies, and many residents of these cities work for these companies. If all four cities cannot be combined in one district, then at least Sunnyvale should be joined with Cupertino and Santa Clara.

2. The visualization shows that Milpitas and Berryessa are joined with Newark and Fremont,
which we believe is appropriate given the commonalities among these areas. However, Fremont continues to be split and should instead be unified in the Milpitas/Berryessa/Newark district. Also, Alum Rock and East Foothills are in the Milpitas/Berryessa district, instead of with east San Jose and downtown Jose. We believe that Alum Rock and East Foothills should be kept in a district with east San Jose and downtown San Jose because of the socioeconomic commonalities among those areas. Lastly, we believe that more of Berryessa should be included in the Milpitas/Berryessa district, specifically the Alviso planning area and the North planning area.

3. It is difficult to tell in the visualizations, but in both Assembly and Senate visualizations, Little Saigon and Evergreen appear to be kept whole and with each other. We are encouraged by this and would only ask that the Commission continue to keep Little Saigon and Evergreen together at all levels of government, and to keep Little Saigon and Evergreen in a downtown and east San Jose-centered district.

Respectfully,

Jacquelyn Maruhashi, Asian Law Alliance
Asian Americans for Community Involvement (AACI)
Asian Pacific American Leadership Institute (APALI)
Sarah Gonzalez, *Filipino Youth Coalition & Community Development of Santa Clara County, (Resident of Berryessa neighborhood of San Jose)
International Children Assistance Network (ICAN)
Matthew Mo, Resident of the Evergreen neighborhood, San Jose
Wes Mukoyama, Resident of the City of Santa Clara
Organization of Chinese Americans – Silicon Valley Chapter (OCA-SV)
Edwin Torralba, Resident of San Jose

* “Organizational titles and affiliations of individuals listed for identification purposes only.”
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