From:	Steve-Carissa Luke
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting Request
Date:	Monday, November 15, 2021 11:47:49 AM

We are contacting you as two registered "Non-Party Affiliated" voters. We vote for the best person and the best policy, regardless of political affiliation.

As a resident of North Santa Barbara County, in what is now Joan Hartmann's district, I do not understand why we have been lumped together with a part of Goleta, 30 miles to our south?

Geographically, the Santa Ynez Valley, Lompoc, and Los Alamos areas have similar interests, similar needs, and need similar representation. To put our needs together with out of town college students, in Isla Vista, dilutes our votes and dilutes our representation in government.

I am sure this was done, once upon a time, in order to silence our voices, but it should be corrected and now is the time to do that. Please remove Isla Vista/Goleta from the North County district and give us back our voice.

Thank you very much.

-Carissa and Stephen Luke

From: Edward Fuller
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: County Redistricting Map Public Hearings
Date: Monday, November 15, 2021 4:45:22 PM

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer my opinion on the maps under consideration for the redrawing of Santa Barbara county Supervisorial Districts. While I do not see the maps I submitted on the website - ID Nos. 80223 and 80317 - I would like to suggest that they are not only extremely close in numbers represented but offer two districts with very high Hispanic residency giving that Community of Interest a great opportunity for two voices on the Board of Supervisors. The configuration of District 2 including both the Isla Vista area and SBCC area not only gives students their greatest opportunity to have a voice at the Supervisor level but it also has a very high level of Asian residents offering them the same opportunity. If these are not the chosen maps, or a very similar map yet to be considered, then I would support map 404 or 408B as the new boundaries for our Supervisorial districts.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Fuller

https://districtr.org/plan/80223

https://districtr.org/plan/80317

Ed Fuller, Broker, SRS, ABR, GRI, SRES, ePro, BPOR, GREEN
Selling Santa Barbara Real Estate Since 1979
SAN ROQUE REALTY
Cell 805.570.6988
SBMLS VCMLS CRMLS
Ed@SANROQUEREALTY.COM
CalDRE #00661695

From: GLENN BATTLES
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Zoom
Date: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:10:53 PM

Commissoners,
After watching the Zoom meeting Nov. 15 and listening to the many comments on different maps I looked at them and I would like to cast my vote for Map # 404. It seems to be a good representation in keeping like operations together.

Thank all of you for your time and effort in this task.

Glenn Battles
Santa Maria

From:	Lee Heller
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	district numbers
Date:	Monday, November 15, 2021 8:47:39 PM

Dear Chair Morris and Commissioners,

I am following up on my comment, along with others, about not disrupting the numbering protocol of the supervisorial districts. Our current protocol runs south to north. That is what people are used to, and how they have been enfranchised based on voting schedules (1, 3, and 4 during presidential years, 2 and 5 during gubernatorial years). It will be disruptive enough to some voters when district boundaries change, but those changes are necessary and with any luck, minimized. To also change voting schedules arbitrarily by changing the numbering protocol is needlessly disruptive.

I understand that Mr. Phillips has indicated that his system is just his approach, not as something that will necessarily be applied to final district numbers. I urge you NOT to apply them, and to switch to the traditional numbering when you get to the final focus maps.

Thank you,

Lee Heller
Santa Barbara CA

From:	J.M. Livingston
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Favor of MAP 404 -Santa Barbara County Redistricting
Date:	Tuesday, November 16, 2021 3:14:07 PM

RE: Favor Map 404

Greetings Commissioners,

My preference is Map 404, as a long time Santa Barbara resident since 1970's and former 20 year elected trustee of the Santa Barbara Community College District.

We also had to undertake this district apportioning challenge ourselves 10 years ago. At SBCC ten years ago, we also learned there is no one perfect map.

Paying attention to collective community needs helps create more robust participation in each district, rather than letting one disparate group dominate over others in a mismatched district.

By way of example, SBCC districting put Isla Vista together with Hope Ranch as an artificially hybrid community, which made no sense demographically. But this was the best compromise we could make, in order for the other districts to make sense under the CVRA guidelines. I appreciate the challenges you face.

Thank you for your volunteer time and committed service to this important task.

Best wishes,
Joan Livingston

From: Louise McKaig
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: redistricting input for Santa Barbara County
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 2:57:20 PM

November 16, 2021

Board of Supervisors:

We have been residents of Santa Barbara since birth in the 1950s. The student population of SBCC and UCSB has grown so large these past couple of decades that we have noticed their transient votes skew many elections.
Since some stay and most are only here for a few years and then leave, their short term stays have impacted long term decisions.

Although our property taxes have risen, every time the University buys/acquires another property for buildings & housing, it is pulled from our property tax rolls and pays our County nothing. For example, Francisco Torres & many other properties that used to pay property taxes have been acquired by the University & no longer pay, unless that has recently changed. Yet, these properties require significant public resources. The University keeps growing and demanding more from our community that benefit the short term population of students at UCSB & SBCC that compete for limited resources.

We believe they do need a say while they are here and creating 1 district where they can have a say in an election is good. We currently have a short term populace with a significant voice in 3 districts out of 5 that influences a majority of the district elections & of the longer term residents' lives after they are gone. This is not in the best interests of our community as a whole in the long term.

We would be in favor of the 400 series option, especially 404 or 408B, that allows the coastal area to have a say. It also better groups the other district areas so each area has a more united say in decisions that impact their areas.

Bruce & Louise McKaig
2nd District Residents

From: Denice Spangler Adams
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: select MAP 404 County Redistricting
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 1:09:55 PM

Commissioners,

Thank you for your volunteer service. Thus far, it's been a huge undertaking, a laborious analytical process requiring attention to details .

In the selection of the final five, Map 404 needs to be included.

WHY MAP 404:

- Goleta Speakers have no complaints with any subdivide stating past divisions work well and Goleta, Noleta, and distant Santa Ynez residents will be better served;
- Comparable interest groups of students at UCSB and SBCC and renters want to be kept together in one voting district to ensure they are not overshadowed.

I've been an active volunteer at SBCC since moving here in 2/1980. Before that in the 1970s I became quite familiar with Francisco Torres (built as a retirement community in the 1960s) which now houses many SBCC students. Students of the two campuses became even more blended with the first CA statewide automatic transfer agreement between the two schools in the 1980s.

Map 404 will best serve the electoral representation of both students and renters by keeping both campuses in one district.


1 of 2
1
Mission Canyon
Eastern Goleta Valley
Montecito
Toro Cany
Goleta
144
192
217
225
2
Summerland
Isla Vista
Santa Barbara



Santa Barbara County - Plan 404							
Category	Field	1	2	3	4	5	Total
2020 Census	Total Population	90,176	93,438	88,974	84,717	89,399	446,704
	Population Deviation	835	4,097	-367	-4,624	58	8,721
	Pct. Deviation	0.93%	4.59%	-0.41%	-5.18%	0.06%	9.76%
Total Pop.	Hispanic/Latino	35%	34%	40%	48%	78%	47%
	NH White	56%	47%	49%	40%	14%	41%
	NH Black	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%
	NH Asian/Pac.Isl.	6%	16%	6%	7%	5%	8%
	NH Native Amer.	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Citizen Voting Age Pop	Total	67,210	66,912	55,916	52,309	37,177	279,525
	Hisp	22%	24%	27%	32%	58%	30%
	NH White	71%	62%	64%	57%	32%	60%
	NH Black	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%
	Asian/Pac.Isl.	5%	10%	6%	7%	8%	7%
	Native Amer.	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Voter Registration (Nov 2020)	Total	58,775	50,315	52,712	45,535	30,882	238,219
	Latino est.	22%	24%	25%	35%	64%	31%
	Spanish-Surnamed	20%	22%	24%	32%	59%	29%
	Asian-Surnamed	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	2%
	Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%
	NH White est.	76%	71%	72%	64%	38%	68%
	NH Black	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2020)	Total	52,345	43,011	45,298	38,275	23,130	202,059
	Latino est.	20%	22%	22%	31%	58%	28%
	Spanish-Surnamed	18%	21%	21%	29%	54%	26%
	Asian-Surnamed	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	2%
	Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%
	NH White est.	76%	71%	72%	64%	38%	68%
	NH Black	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
	Total	40,857	35,396	34,113	27,365	14,496	152,207
	Latino est.	16%	20%	17%	25%	47%	22%

Lastly, for the public record: I have followed this process both in person at South County Adm Bldg and on Zoom. I'm a District 1 resident since 1980, 41 years.

Special interest groups (funded via government grants or dues from government tax payer work) are not to control SB County Redistricting process. By mandate, this is suppose to be non-partisan, a citizen input process, and not to be unduly influenced by those NGOs and NPOs funded,

supported by the government.

Too many speakers are on payroll from a NGO or NPO as per my observation and personal knowledge (CAUSE, SBCAN, SEIU). What a shameful, unfair partisan political advantage!

From the second meeting on, I've found to be egregious the local Commissioner selection to mapping process. It's been impossible for elders, ADA persons like me, to make public comment even after physically showing up. There's no one assigned to assist with public participation.

As emailed previously to the Commission, the male staffer at the table has provided Commissioners with suggested information **intended to influence** outside the Authority of the Redistricting mandate. If map 801 is selected, ensure the public benefits from a list of the organizations and persons pushing it. As the former vice-president of Afro-American Community Services serving with Anita Mackey, unbiased objectivity is expected from staff.

With that said, I request as a sole independent citizen selection of Map 404 as one on the five maps for final consideration. It best incorporates all the elements of the Commission's guidelines within the Commission's Constitutional Authority to ensure equity of representation to all residents.

Denice Spangler Adams
CallDSA@gmail.com
805-680-3939
Gerontologist/ 41 year civic and public school donor activist: SBCC, SBUnified, Cold Spring School Districts

From:	John Duncan
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Cc:	John Duncan
Subject:	Map 816 and Map 816B
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:01:03 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I hope you got some sleep Monday night.

When I spoke to you in support of Map 816 Monday evening, I also referenced Map 830 because I had been told that would be the number of the Final Version of Map 816. Subsequently I was informed that the Final Version of Map 816 would be called Map 816B, not Map 830.

Keeping all these changing numbers straight is challenging. One is reminded of "Who's on first…?"

I have sent to your commission comments designed to accompany the map and I hope members of the public and yourselves can easily access and read them.

816B incorporates minor revisions to 816. 816B includes an unassigned location on Santa Cruz Island and designates Santa Barbara Island as part of the Second District. It includes minor adjustments to the boundaries between the districts.

Current analysis indicates 6 split places but this could easily be reduced to 5 or 4 split places. A very small adjustment to the boundary of the First and Second Districts would eliminate a very minor "splitting" of Eastern Goleta Valley due to the irregular city limits of the City of Santa Barbara in the foothills above San Roque. This amendment has been requested.

Currently the low density part of the City of Lompoc that lies north of the Santa Ynez River is in the Third District. Adjusting that boundary could place all of the city within the Fourth District. With those adjustments Map 816B would split only 4 places.

Thank you for your all your work on a very challenging task.

J. L. Duncan
Solvang

From: Jerry Rounds
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting map options
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:33:02 AM

Please vote for map 404 or 408B. This will create a fairer distribution of representation. UCSB students and the SBCC students resident in IV don't care about Lompoc or the Santa Ynez Valley.
Jerry Rounds
Santa Ynez. Resident here for 30 years. Formerly from the Santa Barbara area, beginning in 1968. UCSB graduate, 1972.

From: Ellen Thermos
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Issue with Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:14:47 AM

Dear Commission,
I am so very disappointed that you are all considering splitting Lompoc up. Santa Barbara treats Lompoc so badly giving us an ugly wind farm that will only benefit Santa Barbara. Lompoc has no choice but to endure being disrespected. Being verbally abused by being called the ArmPit of Santa Barbara County. However, SB is using us all the while you flood the city with your section 8's and homeless. Lompoc had to pay for the riverbed cleanup with no assistance from Santa Barbara. Our beaches are closed a lot, hurting our tourist trade. Lompoc has nothing in common with the students of UCSB and Lompoc doesn't reap the benefit of having UCSB students in their community as they do in SB with all their purchasing power and revenue. They have no idea what ranchers or business owners of Lompoc need. The fact is UCSB needs to be alone and not a part of any city. I strongly believe they should be voting from where their permanent residency is located. They are temporarily in SB county. Please do not place UCSB in the same supervisor district as Lompoc or IV because it makes no sense. Please do not break up Lompoc because once again you will all be seen as picking on the poor citizens of Lompoc. This move has the makings of ruining their economy and making policies that will in the long run hurt the future of Lompoc.

Ellen Thermos, REALTOR®, Ca DRE License # 01920948
Keller Williams Realty, Santa Barbara/Lompoc
1511 Chapala Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
1512 N H Street, Suite C, Lompoc CA 93436
Cell: 805-717-7910
ellenthermos10@gmail.com
https://www.kwsantabarbaraluxury.com/meet-the-team
https://ellenthermosrealtor.kw.com/
https://probatehelp4free.com/

sender by telephone at the number set forth above and email; we also request that you immediately destroy this message and its attachments. Confidentiality Notice: The contents of this transmission and its attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) hereof

From: JOHN THERMOS
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Keep the Lompoc Valley separate and whole!
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:09:00 AM

Hello Redistricting Staff,
As you know, the vast majority of short term residents in Isla Vista and UCSB, including all professors and staff, tend to have an extreme left wing political philosophy. However, most long term residents in the Lompoc Valley, located about 50 miles north of UCSB, tend to have a more conservative political philosophy. These 2 very distinct areas have virtually nothing in common and should never be placed in a single supervisor district. UCSB and Isla Vista liberal residents almost unanimously approve of all types of taxes that they know they will never have to pay, since they will have moved out of the area within a few short years, forcing long term residents to forever pay these unnecessary taxes. Many years ago, when I was a student at UCSB, I thought that I was the only conservative on the entire campus. As a result, I kept my beliefs to myself.

Also, and this is very critical, please keep the Lompoc Valley whole, within a single district. This includes the City of Lompoc, Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills. since we are all ONE COMMUNITY!

Thank you,
John P Thermos (VA #5003516)
California State Certified Residential Appraiser
License #: CA AR014791

JOHN THERMOS & ASSOCIATES
Real Estate Appraiser and Consultant
1305 N. H St - Suite A313
Lompoc, CA 93436
E-mail: jpthermos@gmail.com
Office: 805-735-7211
Mobile: 805-680-4823

From: George Bedford
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:14:40 AM

Redistricting, please keep north county away from IV we need our own supervisors. I do not want IV to have more control.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get Outlook for Android

From: Robert Niehaus
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Cc: Caldwell, Andy
Subject: Time to put fair district maps in place!
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:14:09 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept as whole as possible and we do not want Isla Vista and UC Santa Barbara placed into a North County district. USCB and the airport are in fact in the city limits of Santa Barbara, so it makes no sense to place them in a North County district.

Sincerely,

Bob Niehaus
Santa Barbara County resident

From:	Chris Chirgwin
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	do NOT want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:03:28 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Chris Chirgwin
Buellton, CA

From: Harold Crawford
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Please support maps 404 or 408B
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:37:13 AM

We live in Santa Barbara County foothills north of 101
I want to call attention today to District 3. It is the least cohesive district in our county and the Commission needs to take this opportunity to remedy this obvious disparity, not to mention an inconsistent boundary. I don't think anyone would be able to deny that the SY Valley
community differs drastically from Isla Vista. Please look at the 404 or 408B maps. These maps included IV and UCSB with the communities along the coastline. Approximately 3000 SBCC college students live in IV. Students, live and work and play along the coastal region. They influence business and housing drastically in the Santa Barbara area. By uniting this district into one, the 400 series maps also unite the Goleta and Santa Barbara foothill region. This community is alike as the agricultural region of Goleta and Santa Barbara as well as the high fire areas that are impacted by forest management. The proposed district 2 provides a voice for the people who are impacted by our high risk fire area.
Please unite the coastal region as well as the Foothill region for fair representation on the County Board of Supervisors. Please support the 404 or 408B maps.

Thank you for the consideration,
Rosanne and Harold Crawford
2726 Ben Lomond Dr
Santa Barbara Ca. 93105

From:	Mark Oliver
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting Map Comments for 11.18.21 Meeting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:37:12 AM
Attachments:	Mark Oliver Redistricting Comments 11.17.21.pdf

Dear Commissioners,

Please find the attached PDF letter with my comments for the meeting Thursday. If possible please acknowledge receipt.

Thank you.

Mark Oliver

606 Alamo Pintado Rd, Ste 3-256
Solvang, CA 93463
805 686 5166 xt 160

November 17, 2021

Citizens Independent Redistricting Commission

RE: Comments in support of Map 816B

Dear Commissioners,

I have lived in the Santa Ynez Valley for nearly 30 years and more than 50 in the County. Map 816B maintains Santa Barbara County's supervisorial districts without injecting confusion in the minds of residents and fomenting divisive community relationships.

It keeps the delicate balance necessary for the many diverse voices of the county to be equally heard—regardless of race, social class, income, religion, political affiliation and so on—and rejects the packing of residents into cliques of like-minded special interest groups, the primary goals of the United Communities and VRA/Communities of Interest maps.

The drawing up of new district boundaries is not supposed to be like when you were in grade school choosing your best friends for your team. The goal must be the balanced representation of all, not the exclusion of "others."

The balance between the urban north and urban south county is buffered by the third district. With Map 816B the current third district will continue to be unified and represented by the largest number of citizens in unincorporated county areas, providing them with much needed representation in county government.

The contentious issue of where to place Isla Vista & UCSB has left them as the unappreciated step-children in this process. Unfortunately, there will always be some who object to their inclusion within their district, no matter what district may be. Historically, the third district has successfully represented them and it should remain as such.

Map 816B is a natural and "evolutionary" change, not a radical one that will lead to the disenfranchisement of the citizens of unincorporated county areas. Please take the time to review the precise alterations this map proposes. It makes the fewest revisions required to balance the county's five districts.

With these minor adjustments, the commission can maintain the stable, non-disruptive existing relationships that will allow citizens of all areas of the county to continue to benefit equally.

Thank you for consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Mark Oliver
Solvang

From:	Kari Campbell-Bohard
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Lompoc
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:37:36 AM

Good morning,

I am writing you this morning to voice my opposition to any redistricting proposal that splits the City of Lompoc between districts and/or combines Lompoc with Isla Vista/UCSB.

The Lompoc Valley is different from Isla Vista in many ways, with a significant geographical distance between the two areas.

Our community, which includes Mission Hills and Vandenberg Village, has little to nothing in common with the residents of Isla Vista. We are an area comprised of more long-term residents compared to the temporary status of the students. We are more "working class', with concerns about jobs, home ownership, road improvements, Surf Beach access, and crime.
We have different industries, different community needs and interests, completely different demographics, and different political views.

Any plan that splits Lompoc between districts, separates us from Vandenberg Village and/or Mission Hills, or combines us with communities that are far to South of us lessens our voice in County Government.

There are many options for completing this redistricting in a manner that is fair and equitable to all of the communities in this County. One of the maps submitted, Public #103, looks like one such option and should be seriously considered.

Sincerely,
Kari Campbell-Bohard
Lompoc Resident

From: JOHN ZEMANOVIC
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: New District Maps
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:46:04 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I believe cities should be kept whole wherever possible and I do not want believe it is appropriate, pursuant to current legal redistricting guidelines, to give any consideration for placing IV and UCSB into a North County District. Should that decision be made I believe it is highly likely that legal action will be taken to challenge the newly drawn supervisory districts.

Do what you know redistricting guidelines require and place IV and UCSB in a south county supervisorial district.

Sincerely,

John Zemanovic, Lompoc

From:	John W. Jones
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting Map
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:58:33 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Jones

From:	Ralph Nobbe
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	proposed redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:09:41 PM

Dear Commissioners,
I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.
I believe cities should be kept whole wherever possible and I do not believe it is appropriate, pursuant to current legal redistricting guidelines, to give any consideration for placing IV and UCSB into a North County District. There is very little in common between those districts.
This is gerrymandering without comparison.

Sincerely,
Ralph W. Nobbe
(805) 689-2826c
ralphnobbe59@gmail.com

From:	Janet Rowse
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting - Do not put IV and/or UCSB into North County
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:31:16 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I believe cities should be kept whole wherever possible and I do not believe it is appropriate -pursuant to current legal redistricting guidelines- to give any consideration for placing IV and UCSB into a North County District. Should that decision be made I believe it is highly likely that legal action will be taken to challenge the newly drawn supervisory districts.

Do what you know redistricting guidelines require and place IV and UCSB in a south county supervisorial district.

Sincerely,
Janet Rowse
Santa Barbara, CA

From: EDITH ROBINSON
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Re4distgrticting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:42:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.
Sincerely,

Edith Robinson
Buellton, CA

From: ROSALEA GREENWOOD
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:02:55 AM

Redistricting Commission

Lompoc has nothing in common with Isla Vista and UCSB and therefore should not be placed in the same supervisor district.

Please keep The city of Lompoc whole, including Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills. We are one community.

Thank you for your attention.

Rosalea Greenwood
265 Oakwood Circle
Lompoc, ca.93436-1348

Life is good.
Be happy.

From:	Jeff Koligian
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:44:50 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,
Jeff Koligian

Sent from my iPhone

From: avelazquez91@charter.net
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:53:47 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Best regards,

Alfonso Velazquez

From:	Connie Velazquez
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	In support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:56:11 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.
We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

With gratitude,

Connie Velázquez

From:	Susan Anderson
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Cc:	susan anderson
Subject:	Redistricting Comment
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:58:18 PM

Dear All,

I've lived in SB for a long time and I urge you to consider one of the maps in the 400 series. Give the people, especially the students, an opportunity to be united. The interests of the coastline are particularly improved by doing this.

Sincerely,
Susan Anderson

From: Chuck Musselwhite
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting SB County
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:59:25 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Chuck Musselwhite
https://linktr.ee/ChuckMusselwhite

From:	Lorin Bronson
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Cc:	Lorin Bronson
Subject:	Keep Communities of Interest Whole: Support Maps 103, 106, 404 and 804
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:08:18 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I believe that one of the following maps should be considered for final adoption number: 804, 404, 103, or 106.

For the boundary to be legal, each city should be kept entirely within its respective supervisorial district, that is, represented by a single supervisor.

To be legally compact, the district that includes Isla Vista and UCSB, which are on the south coast and constitute a community of interest, should not be part of more than one North County district. The reason is that the districts would not be sufficiently compact to meet the legal requirement of using only the most compact areas as districts.

Sincerely,
Lorin Bronson

From: aiaspecs@aol.com
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: 400 hunderd series map.
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:14:15 PM

As a long-time resident of Santa Barbara, I can attest to the fact that District 3 currently includes dissimilar communities with little in common. Many of the residents of the Santa Ynez Valley include older residents, retirees, farmers, and ranchers, and those seeking a quiet place to live, while Isla Vista is a fast-paced urban environment with a young population. These communities, given their inherent and obvious differences, often have diverging interests, creating a divided district. By following the 400 series maps it creates a coastal district whereby SBCC and UCSB are in the same district gives them a unified voice. Did you know that 3000 SBCC students live in Isla Vista? The student's concern for the shoreline and interest in the ocean is consistent with the people who live next to the ocean all along the coastline south of Highway 101. Please consider one of the maps in the 400 series. Unite the students and give representation to the people who live along the coast.

Thank You,
Richard N McKenzie

From:	Rob Mangus
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Re Redistricting, Map request
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:15:40 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept as whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Rob Mangus
(831) 236-5810 (cell)

From:	Tonya Baird
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Do NOT redistrict Lompoc
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:29:12 PM

Good morning,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any redistricting proposal that splits the City of Lompoc between districts and/or combines Lompoc with Isla Vista, UCSB and/or any Santa Barbara area.

The Lompoc Valley is different from Isla Vista and all Santa Barbara areas in many ways, with a significant geographical distance between the two areas.

Our community, which includes Mission Hills and Vandenberg Village, has little to nothing in common with the residents of Isla Vista. We are an area comprised of more long-term residents compared to the temporary status of the students. We are a "working class', with concerns about jobs, home ownership, road improvements, Surf Beach access, and crime.

We have different industries, different community needs and interests, completely different demographics/social-economics, and different political views.

Any plan that splits Lompoc between districts, separates us from Vandenberg Village and/or Mission Hills, or combines us with communities that are far to South of us lessens our voice in County Government. We need to have a voice and we would have no voice if we were combined with Isla Vista or any Santa Barbara area. We do NOT have the same issues/concerns. Please don't forget some of the current Santa Barbara Government officials think of Lompoc as the "armpit of Santa Barbara county", clearly we as a community would suffer.

There are many options for completing this redistricting in a manner that is fair and equitable to all of the communities in this County. One of the maps submitted, Public #103, looks like one such option and should be seriously considered.

Thank you for your time,

Ron & Tonya Baird
Lompoc Residents

From:	Katina Zaninovich
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	follow up on the map process
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:47:15 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept as whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District. This would not be in keeping with compatibility of interests.

Sincerely,

Katina Zaninovich RN
Former CEO VNA Health

From:	Rick Soto
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	please keep IV and UCSB out of North County
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:01:14 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District. Local means keeping local cities as their own entities, and with representation that fits their needs, this does not.

I and many others moved away from IV UCSB in order to get away from this drama.

Please keep IV and UCSB out of North County.

Sincerely,

Rick Soto

From:	Marjorie Popper
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Support for redistricting plan 816B
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:06:25 PM

To the members of the Redistricting Commission:

There have been many plans submitted for your review, some which represent major revisions to current district boundaries. I would like to voice my support for plan 816B because it successfully retains communities of interest within each of the 5 districts and deviates from the current individual district population counts by only 3.8%.

The Third District, where I have lived for 37 years, contains the highest number of residents who live in unincorporated areas of the County. This aggregation helps us retain a strong voice within County government. As configured in Map 816B, Santa Ynez Valley residents who have long shared many common economic and social bonds remain within a single district.

Thank you for considering my comments and for your work on this important adjustment to district lines.

Marjorie Popper
1875 Still Meadows Road
Solvang, CA 93463

From:	John Gustafsson
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	County redistricting.
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:15:04 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.
We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

John Gustafsson
Lompoc, CA

From:	Lauretta Griffin
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	redeistricing
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:17:56 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Lauretta Griffin

From:	John & Suzanne Petersen
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting Maps of Santa Barbara County
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:29:06 PM

Dear Commissioners:

Regarding the upcoming Redistricting of the County of Santa Barbara, I am writing to support maps #804, 404, 103 and 106.
Santa Barbara County does not need a repeat of the 2010 redistricting. Congressman Salud Carbajal was responsible for the Frankenstein Third District boundaries, when he was a Supervisor. Our Third District looked like a gerrymandered nightmare with elephantiasis! His map was created to ensure the UCSB and Isla Vista Socialists continued to block any conservative or agricultural thought or desire from becoming law in the Third.

UCSB and Isla Vista should be in the Second District. It is after all, The University of California at SANTA BARBARA! We in the Third District and the North County do not understand why students should be the deciding factor in our destiny. Twenty thousand votes usually go to liberal government representatives. Don't let this happen again. Please consider maps #804, 404, 103 and 106.

Suzanne & John Petersen
Solvang, CA 93463

From:	James D. Glines
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting final adoption
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:32:54 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Jim Glines
Banker and Concerned Citizen

From:	Allison McAdams
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Third Supervisorial District Map Comments - Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:41:03 PM
Attachments:	image001.png Redistricting - 2021-11.17_Third District Support Letter.pdf

To Whom it May Concern,

Please find a comment letter from the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians regarding the Third Supervisorial District redistricting attached.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Allison McAdams
Executive Assistant | Legal Department
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians
P.O. Box 517, Santa Ynez, CA
Office: (805) 688-7997
Fax: (805) 686-9578

SANTA YNEZ BAND OF CHUMASH INDIANS

P.O. BOX 517 · SANTA YNEZ · CA · 93460

Tel: 805.688.7997 · Fax: 805.686.9578

www.santaynezchumash.org

November 16, 2021

redistricting@countyofsb.org

The Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians ("Tribe") makes these comments in support of the current map for the Third Supervisorial District.

The existing Third District map has been in place for a significant period of time and therefore any revisions should be carefully reviewed.

For the Tribe, there is a cultural connection between the Santa Ynez Valley where the Tribe currently has its Reservation and the coastal areas near Gaviota and Isla Vista from where the Tribe traces its lineage. From the Goleta Slough and west to Point Conception is a series of Chumash villages. Point Conception itself has a major place in Chumash spiritual beliefs.

Please kindly consider this request to leave the boundaries of the Third District unchanged as much as possible.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Kahn
Tribal Chairman

From:	Suzanne Petrie
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistributing
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:01:37 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Petrie

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Mark Jackson
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting input
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:43:40 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

The reasons include:

1) communities are best represented when they are kept as whole as possible;

2) IV and UCSB are not ideologically-alingned with North County & should not be placed into a North County District.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark Jackson
715 Miles Ave
SM, CA. 93455

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Loren Hiltner
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:24:34 AM
Attachments:	image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Loren Hiltner
800-648-6772 toll free
805-925-4144 phone
805-714-3397 cell
loren@babefarms.com

From: MikeStoker
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:31:35 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I believe cities should be kept whole wherever possible and I do not want believe it is appropriate, pursuant to current legal redistricting guidelines, to give any consideration for placing IV and UCSB into a North County District. Should that decision be made I can assure you legal action will be taken to challenge the newly drawn supervisory districts.

Please feel free to call me should you have any questions.

Best regards,
Mike Stoker
805-708-9100

Sent from my iPhone

From: Richard Souza
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:11:21 AM

Dear Commissioners

I am writing in support of maps #808, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for the final adoption.
We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,
Richard J Souza
4477 Kris Dr, Santa Maria, CA 93455
805-680-8856

From: Jessie Tobin
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:26:35 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Jessica Tobin and I am a Lompoc resident and homeowner. It is my understanding that the redistricting committee would like to combine Lompoc in with the district for Isla Vista and UCSB. This is not a good plan, the demographic between Lompoc, Isla Vista and UCSB is vastly different. Our needs are not shared with the needs of Isla Vista and UCSB. It only takes a quick drive through both areas to see the community is vastly different and is in need of assistance in different ways. Lompoc is full of working class families and commuters to Santa Barbara, we want to see our city grow and develop and it requires a lot more social services support in our area. Isla Vista/UCSB is full of students, professors and working professionals that need different things in their community.

Please do not include Lompoc with Isla Vista and UCSB. It is not sensible for either area and would not best reflect the needs of my home city.

Please note I would like to make an additional request, please stop dividing Lompoc into different areas, Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills and Lompoc are all one community there is no need to separate us.

Thank you for your time,
Jessica Tobin

From:	ANITA Dwyer
To:	CEO Redistricting RES; ANITA Dwyer
Subject:	REDISTRICTING
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:49:16 AM

Redistricting map that is being considered:
Please DO NOT divide cities, keep them whole AND

DO NOT INCLUDE I.V. AND UCSB IN NORTH DISTRICT.

Let's leave politics out of redistricting and let the citizens get back their real

right to vote for the north district.

Anita Dwyer
1014 E. Walnut Ave
Lompoc, Ca. 93436

From:	Loren McFarland
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:44:24 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I believe cities should be kept whole wherever possible and I do not believe it is appropriate, pursuant to current legal redistricting guidelines, to give any consideration for placing IV and UCSB into a North County District. Should that decision be made I believe it is highly likely that legal action will be taken to challenge the newly drawn supervisory districts.

Do what you know redistricting guidelines require and place IV and UCSB in a south county supervisorial district.

Sincerely,

--
Best regards,
Loren McFarland

From:	Mark Evans
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:12:26 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Mark Evans

Mark Evans, CA OB05562

Please note that we are worklng remotely, therefore replies may be delayed

Leavitt Group

Leavitt Coastal Valley Insurance Services

204 B East Enos | Santa Maria, CA 93454

Office: 805.925.8607 | www.leavitt.com/santamaria

From:	Mike Nicassio
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:12:38 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,
Michael Nicassio

From:	evansmarkcolette@aol.com
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:13:59 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Colette Evans

From:	kadriandassoc@aol.com
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	REDISTRICTING
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:36:08 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,
TARIQ KADRI
Solvang

From:	Sid Abma
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:46:21 PM

Dear Commissioners

I am writing in support of the produced maps numbers 103 and 106 and 404 and 804 to be considered for final adoption.
We want cities to be kept as whole as possible.We do not want IV and UCSB placed into our North County District.

Respectfully,
Sid Abma
12500 El Camino Real
Atascadero, CA
(805) 462-1250

From:	Gwen Bullard
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:54:08 PM

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103 and 106 to be to considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed in a North County District.

Sincerely,

Gwen Bullard (resident sense 1976 and business owner)

From:	John Schumacher
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:56:16 PM

Placing Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district is a blatant abuse of power, and an egregious attempt at diluting North Santa Barbara county voters' concerns. Maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 are much better options, and they, not gerrymandering using IV and UCSB, should be considered for final adoption.

Sincerely,
John and **Joan** Schumacher

From: Jeff Lundberg
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:35:14 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

I have had family members that attended UCSB and have seen and heard first hand how that area can influence North County issues with no understanding of the area!

Sincerely,

Thank you

Jeff Lundberg
President / CEO
Babe' Farms Inc.
(805) 925-4144 Office
(805) 922-3950 Fax
jeff@babefarms.com

From: Mike Harman
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:30:45 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to voice my support for consideration of districting maps numbers 804, 404,103, and 106 for final adoption.

Cities should be kept as whole as possible. Isla Vista and UCSB should not be placed into a North County District.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mike Harman

Santa Maria

From:	mark williams
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	REDISTRICTING
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:07:24 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-ixzlec0s.png

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Respectfully
Mark Williams
President
M.K. WILLIAMS PLUMBING
&
FIRE SPRINKLERS INC
CA LIC # 449147 C-16 C-36
CEL 805-310-6277 FAX 805-934-4527
ESTABLISHED 1983

From:	Colleen Griffiths Estrada
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting; a citizen"s viewpoint
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:09:46 PM

Hello and thank you for your work on behalf of the residents/citizens of Santa Barbara County.

My husband, two kids and I have been residents of the county since late 2017; property owners since late 2014. We moved here from Bellevue, WA where we were (husband still is; I am on hiatus) both engaged in the high tech industry. We were attracted to the valley for so many reasons; chief among them the rural beauty and access to many things we love, vineyards, equestrian sports, golf and many wonderful small businesses making this rural community sublime; complete with lovely long term residents who have been warm and welcoming to us. We appreciate the help we've received from farmers and winemakers; horsemen and gardeners; golfers and church goers as we've made this our forever home.

When we learned of the redistricting effort, we were surprised to learn that Isla Vista was even part of "our" district. It is so clearly geographically, and culturally from the Valley (ask our kids; one of whom now attends SBCC and lives near State Street the other an avid surfer and recent graduate of Cal Berkeley - Isla Vista and surrounding seems like a whole other place to them and to us.) The concerns of folks in Isla Vista (one of whom is our son) are radically different from those of district 3. We would love to see a new district approach that provides better affinity for both constituencies.

The maps in the 400 group seem like a great step in giving voice to the engaged communities in both areas - urban dwellers, students, business owners - coastal residents including boaters, boarders, surfers, fishermen and passionate patrons of the beautiful coastline <Isla Vista et al>; AND rural farm and ranch dwellers - small and large - retirees, and equestrians like we are, here in the Valley.

Please consider one of the maps in the 400 series. Unite the students and give representation to the people who live along the coast and give clarity of purpose to the community in the Valley; both groups deserve more focused representation.

Thank you for hearing my thoughts as a concerned Citizen and resident of the Santa Ynez Valley.

Colleen Griffiths Estrada
Edgehill Lane
Santa Ynez, CA 93460

From:	Greg Hammel
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Cc:	Margaret L. Hammel
Subject:	Redistricting Map Discussion
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:50:10 PM
Attachments:	miki H County Districts.docx

Hello, Please review the attachment which is my reasoning for endorsement of maps 404 and 408B.

Best,

Margaret Hammel

Dear Redistricting Committee,

I am a resident of Goleta north of the freeway. The Santa Ynez valley and Guadalupe do not have any common cultural or geographic commonalities with Isla Vista which are all currently located in district 3. Isla Vista is an urban area with students who are mostly from other areas of California. They have little or no common interests with the agricultural areas of the Santa Ynez valley and Guadalupe.

Also, district 3 as it currently exists isolates western Goleta and Isla Vista from the important common intersectional areas of eastern Goleta, Santa Barbara and SBCC. The district 2 and 3 boundaries are not equitable and do a great disservice to the residence of Santa Barbara, the Goleta Valley, Isla Vista, and City College. We citizens of Goleta have been frustrated by the lack of cohesiveness of the district maps. They currently are not serving the needs of our citizens across the south county.

We have the opportunity to eliminate these inequities. Please look at the 404 or 408B maps. These maps provide much needed equity to Isla Vista, SBCC, Guadalupe, Goleta, Santa Barbara and the Santa Ynez valley.

The strength of maps 404 and 408B include:

1) District 2 captures the mutual interests of Goleta, Isla Vista, Santa Barbara, and SBCC. Please review the district 2 boundaries. There is coherence with these citizens as they share similar geographical, growth, educational (college: higher learning), housing and cultural issues.
2) UCSB and SBBC share common interests.
    a. Thousands of SBCC college students live in Isla Vista and share mutual housing, cultural, and educational interests.
    b. UCSB students work, live, visit, and spend time in Santa Barbara City. They seldom travel to Lompoc, Santa Ynez or Santa Maria.
    c. SBCC is a strong feeder school for UCSB.
3) Unite the Goleta and Santa Barbara foothill region. This community is alike as the agricultural region of Goleta and Santa Barbara as well as the high fire areas that are impacted by forest management. The proposed district 2 provides a voice for the people who are impacted by the fire.

Citizens of Goleta request that we unite the Goleta Valley, Santa Barbara, Isla Vista and SBCC into one district. Our common interests are at stake. Please support maps 404 or 408B.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,

Margaret Hammel

From:	Margaret L. Hammel
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Fwd: Redistricting Map Discussion
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:10:50 PM
Attachments:	miki_H_County_Districts.docx

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Greg Hammel <greg_s_hammel@raytheon.com>
Date: November 17, 2021 at 2:48:58 PM PST
To: redistricting@countyofsb.org
Cc: "Margaret L. Hammel" <miki.hammel@icloud.com>
Subject: Redistricting Map Discussion

Hello, Please review the attachment which is my reasoning for endorsement of maps 404 and 408B.

Best,

Margaret Hammel

Dear Redistricting Committee,

I am a resident of Goleta north of the freeway. The Santa Ynez valley and Guadalupe do not have any common cultural or geographic commonalities with Isla Vista which are all currently located in district 3. Isla Vista is an urban area with students who are mostly from other areas of California. They have little or no common interests with the agricultural areas of the Santa Ynez valley and Guadalupe.

Also, district 3 as it currently exists isolates western Goleta and Isla Vista from the important common intersectional areas of eastern Goleta, Santa Barbara and SBCC. The district 2 and 3 boundaries are not equitable and do a great disservice to the residence of Santa Barbara, the Goleta Valley, Isla Vista, and City College. We citizens of Goleta have been frustrated by the lack of cohesiveness of the district maps. They currently are not serving the needs of our citizens across the south county.

We have the opportunity to eliminate these inequities. Please look at the 404 or 408B maps. These maps provide much needed equity to Isla Vista, SBCC, Guadalupe, Goleta, Santa Barbara and the Santa Ynez valley.

The strength of maps 404 and 408B include:

1) District 2 captures the mutual interests of Goleta, Isla Vista, Santa Barbara, and SBCC. Please review the district 2 boundaries. There is coherence with these citizens as they share similar geographical, growth, educational (college: higher learning), housing and cultural issues.
2) UCSB and SBBC share common interests.
    a. Thousands of SBCC college students live in Isla Vista and share mutual housing, cultural, and educational interests.
    b. UCSB students work, live, visit, and spend time in Santa Barbara City. They seldom travel to Lompoc, Santa Ynez or Santa Maria.
    c. SBCC is a strong feeder school for UCSB.
3) Unite the Goleta and Santa Barbara foothill region. This community is alike as the agricultural region of Goleta and Santa Barbara as well as the high fire areas that are impacted by forest management. The proposed district 2 provides a voice for the people who are impacted by the fire.

Citizens of Goleta request that we unite the Goleta Valley, Santa Barbara, Isla Vista and SBCC into one district. Our common interests are at stake. Please support maps 404 or 408B.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,

Margaret Hammel

From: Tremblay, Marcia
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Maps
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:09:36 PM

Dear Commissioners:

This letter is in support of MAP #s 804, 404, 103 and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want Isla Vista and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Marcia Tremblay

Marcia Tremblay
Office Manager
marcia@tremblayfinancial.com

TREMBLAY
FINANCIAL SERVICES
3902 State Street, Suite 101 |Santa Barbara, CA 93105
T: (805)569-1982 ext. 14 |F: (805) 569-5767
http://www.tremblayfinancial.com

From:	Jim Thomas
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Maps
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:11:47 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept as whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Jim Thomas
Solvang City Councilmember

From: gough.JC@comcast.net
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting Maps
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:13:20 PM

To the Redistricting Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I want our cities kept whole as possible and I do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Cindy Gough
Santa Maria

From:	Carol Redhead
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	redistricting Santa BArbara County
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:22:00 PM

PLease use one of the following redistricting maps: #404, 804, 103, 106. Do not put Isla Vista and Goleta with Lompoc. These communities' interests are very different from one another.
Air Force BAse, Farmers, ranchers, businesses, homeowners, versus single renter- students and wealthy citizens.
Carol Redhead in Lompoc

From:	Justin Shores
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting Maps
Date:	Tuesday, November 16, 2021 12:24:29 PM

Greetings,

Please choose map 404 for the new districts. Our students need better representation and that will not happen if they are lumped in with non students.

Best Regards,
Justin Shores
805-704-7774

From: tstrickin@aol.com
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting Maps
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:11:39 AM

Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #103, 106, 404 and 804 for final adoption.

I believe we must keep cities whole as possible. Placing IV and UCSB into a North County District makes absolutely no sense to residents and businesses in the North County.

Sincerely,

Terri Stricklin

From: Mary Arnold
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting maps
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:21:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept as whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,
Mary Arnold
--
Mary Arnold, RE Broker
Cell 805.748.9758
MaryArnoldRE@gmail.com
10095 Santa Ana Rd, Atascadero, CA 93422
Fax 805.466.0474
Dir. 805.466.8747
DRE Lic 00641507

From:	Greg Hammel
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	redistricting maps
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:45:39 PM
Attachments:	Greg H_County_Districts.docx

Hello, Attached is my input with regards to the SB County redistricting maps.
Please review and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,

Greg Hammel

I live in Goleta north of the 101. We can improve our representation here in Goleta, Santa Barbara, Isla Vista and Santa Ynez Valley by upgrading the boundaries of districts 2 and 3. District 3 as it now exists is a mish mash of differing interests including the agricultural venues of the Santa Ynez valley, the student urban areas of Isla Vista, the vast coastline encompassing the county, the high tech area of Vandenberg, and the farming areas of Guadalupe. The current district boundaries eliminate the important relationships and mutual interest Isla Vista has with Goleta, Santa Barbara, and Santa Barbara City College. The current district map divides western Goleta and Isla Vista from eastern Goleta which is a disservice to the citizens of Goleta, Santa Barbara and Isla Vista.

We have the opportunity to eliminate these inequities with our current boundaries. Please look at the 404 or 408B maps. These maps provide much needed equity to Isla Vista, SBCC, Guadalupe, Goleta, Santa Barbara and the Santa Ynez valley.

The strength of maps 404 and 408B include:

1) District 2 captures the mutual interests of Goleta, Isla Vista, Santa Barbara, and SBCC. Please review the district 2 boundaries. There is coherence with these citizens as they share similar geographical, growth, educational (college: higher learning), housing and cultural issues.
2) UCSB and SBBC share common interests.
    a. Thousands of SBCC college students live in Isla Vista and share mutual housing, cultural, and educational interests.
    b. UCSB students work, live, visit, and spend time in Santa Barbara City. They seldom travel to Lompoc, Santa Ynez or Santa Maria.
    c. SBCC is a strong feeder school for UCSB.
3) the 400 series maps also unite the Goleta and Santa Barbara foothill region. This community is alike as the agricultural region of Goleta and Santa Barbara as well as the high fire areas that are impacted by forest management. The proposed district 2 provides a voice for the people who are impacted by the fire.

We need to unite the coastal region as well as the Foothill region for equitable representation on the County Board of Supervisors. Please support maps 404 or 408B.

From: Jim Stollberg
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting maps
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:24:08 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

I appreciate your time and effort on this process and thank you for considering my important points on the matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Stollberg

****

Jim Stollberg
Hampton Farming Co.
Maverick Farming Co.
Growers Ag Labor
2515-C Professional Parkway
Santa Maria, CA 93455
(805) 310-9322

****

From: George Bedford
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:14:40 AM

Redistricting, please keep north county away from IV we need our own supervisors. I do not want IV to have more control.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get Outlook for Android

From: Walter Guthrie
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:45:10 PM

Dear Commissioners, I am writing in support of maps 804,404,103,and 106 to be considered for the final adoption. We want cities to be as whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed in the North County. Walter Guthrie, resident of Nipomo.

From: Becky Grant
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: SBC Redistricting Process
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:54:15 PM

Dear Commissioners, I am writing to register my support for Maps
404, 804, 103, and 106 for consideration of adoption.

I want cities kept whole as much as possible and do not want IV and UCSB placed into a north Santa Barbara County district.

I am a resident of Lompoc and believe Orcutt & Lompoc areas should remain together.

Thank you. Kind Regards, Rebecca Grant

From:	Renee Grubb
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Maps for Final redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:58:16 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I support maps # 804, 404, 103 and 106. I am writing to support these maps and am requesting them be considered for final adoption.

Cities should be kept whole as possible and do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

--

Warm Wishes,
Renee

Renee Grubb
Broker/Owner
Village Properties
Exclusive affiliate of
Leading Real Estate Companies of the World.
Luxury Portfolio International
70 countries. 4,300 offices.
Mayfair International Realty
DRE#00861534
(805) 565-8868
renee@villagesite.com
www.villagesite.com

A person wrapped up in himself makes a very small bundle.
Benjamin Franklin

Village Properties - Member, Forbes Global Properties

From:	Jeff Havlik
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	IV out of North County
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:02:46 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I want cities kept whole as possible and do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Jeff Havlik

From:	Lata Murti
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	written public comment for Thurs., Nov. 18 CIRC meeting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:12:24 PM

Dear Chair Morris and Commissioners,

It was good to be able to address you in person at the Monday, November 15 meeting in Santa Maria; and I am sorry I am unable to make this public comment in real time, during the Thursday, November 18 CIRC meeting.

At Monday's meeting, I heard several comments against maps that have Guadalupe join Western Santa Maria, in the 5th District, to form a Latinx supermajority voting district. The argument was that doing so would dilute the Latinx vote in other districts, outside of District 5.

These comments perplex me because it is actually not having a Latinx supermajority district that dilutes the Latinx vote. The CVAP of Latinx residents in Santa Barbara County have less of a voice when they are not the clear majority of a district's population. Their voice is diluted by the rest of the district's CVAP who are not Latinx.

The only way to ensure Latinx representation on Santa Barbara County's Board of Supervisors is to have a Latinx supermajority district, where the CVAP of Latinx residents far exceeds the CVAP who are not Latinx. Having Guadalupe join Western Santa Maria in the 5th District achieves this. And both Maps 801, The United Communities Map, and 818, The Fair and Equal Representation Map, have Western Santa Maria and Guadalupe together to form a Latinx supermajority 5th District, where the Latinx vote and voice will be strong for the next ten years.

I hope you will include both Maps 801 and 818 in your final group of maps today. These maps represent the interests of not just North Santa Barbara County, but also South County and Mid-County as well.

Thank you very much.

Warmly,
Dr. Lata Murti

From:	Dulcie Sinn
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Writing in support of map 801 or 818
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:47:25 PM

As a long-time Lompoc resident, I am writing in support of the plans that shows the Lompoc Valley being split. It is important for our community to keep at least 2 County Board of Supervisors speaking on our behalf.
Thank you

Dulcie Sinn, Ph.D.
805.735.1002 / 805.451.3414

From: lisaostend
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Public Comment on redistricting maps
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:50:48 PM

Dear Commission:

It's come to my attention that special interest groups are influencing and controlling
the Redistricting process. By mandate, this is supposed to be a citizen input
process and not unduly influenced by the NGO's and NPO's who are funded
and supported by government supported special interest groups. We need to also
have unbiased objectivity from the staff who are involved in this process.

As an independent Santa Barbara citizen of 37 years, with an important local voice,
I request that Map 404 be chosen as one of the 5 maps for final consideration. It best
incorporates all of the elements of the Commission's guidelines within the commission's
Constitutional Authority to ensure equal representation for all residents. Here there are
comparable interest groups of students at UCSB and SBCC being kept together in one
voting district, so as to not dilute areas of local citizens and home owners. UCSB
also should be kept out of any voting block incorporating either Lompoc or Buellton.

The next best map that should be included in the final 5 is Map 407 because the
citizens of this county deserve more fairly parceled out voting districts that Make
Sense.

In closing, I want to advocate for Map 404 as the final choice because of it's superior

ability to give equal access to All voices, by keeping like-minded groups together as
a stronger voting block, with better representation by their chosen supervisor.

Thank you for considering my input.

Sincerely,

Lisa Ostendorf - District 2
Community Activist

From: Michael Sewall
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Keep Cities Whole
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:51:26 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Keep Lompoc whole, thank you.

Mike Sewall, Lompoc resident

From: John Duncan
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Map 816B
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:51:47 PM

Dear Commissioners,

In my previous e-mail to you and the Comments sent to accompany Map 816B, I described two minor modifications to Map 816B that would improve the Map and reduce the number of "Split Cities or Places."

I have drawn these revisions to Map 816B in District R separately so you can see how minor the changes are and how little they affect the deviation.

To see how the Map looks after the very minor adjustment to the First and Second District Boundary in Santa Barbara necessary to avoid "splitting" the Eastern Goleta Valley see District R Map 82621.

https://districtr.org/edit/82621?event=sbcounty

To see how the Map looks after moving the lower density part of the City of Lompoc that lies north of the Santa Ynez River that is now in the Third District to the Fourth District, thus putting the entire City in the Fourth, see District R Map 80602.

https://districtr.org/edit/80602?event=sbcounty

Thank You for your consideration and your continuing efforts to get the best map possible.

J. L. Duncan

From: Justin Ruhge
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Lompoc in 4th
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:54:39 PM

As a resident of Lompoc for 27 years and activist and members of the city council I urge you at the Redistricting Commission to place Lompoc in the 4th district where it is today, and please do not divide it with Goleta or IV. IV and UCSB must be placed in district 2 where it fits with that agenda. Please include Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills with Lompoc, because they act as one today. Lompoc is 45 miles from IV and is an agricultural , aerospace, mining and commuter town and as a whole provides our sense of identity. We have our own green energy and will be the home of one of the largest wind energy farms in the State of California. We have nothing in common with IV or UCSB and should not be incorporated in their areas. Lompoc was founded in 1787 as one of the ancient towns in California and was the second city formed in Santa Barbara County in 1888 so we have a long and rich tradition which we do not want diluted by redistricting plans. We support the proposed maps 804,404, 103 and 106. Keep Lompoc Valley undivided, and in the north County district 4, and move IV and UCSB to District 2 where they fit.
Thank you for your consideration.
Justin M. Ruhge, Lompoc, CA 805-7379536,County resident for 40 years.

From:	Mary Ellen Brooks
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	CPA Comments in support of 816B
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:54:57 PM

Dear Committee Members: Thank you for the opportunity to comment once again on submitted maps. Citizens Planning Association supports the map 816B for many of the reasons given in the Accompanying Comments. CPA supports the least disruptive map which might have minor adjustments to satisfy the growth that has occurred in the North County (4th/5th district). CPA supports the 3rd district including the population 'center' of IV/UCSB which has existed for several decades. Mr. Duncan's comments reflect the history of the area and Map 816B reflects a moderate approach we hope the committee members will take.

Respectfully submitted.

Marell Brooks
President
Citizens Planning Association

From:	Barbara Anne
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Cc:	Barbara Anne
Subject:	Re-Districitng Committee/ Maps for a strong community
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:58:14 PM

Dear Re-Districting Committee,

It is very exciting that we have an opportunity as a community to impact the re-districting of our Board of Supervisor boundary lines.
As a 5 generation family from Santa Barbara and a student from Wilson grammar school, Vieja Valley, Hope, La Colina, San Marcos, SBCC and even UCSB it brings me great pleasure to contribute my opinion for this beautiful SB County.

I have looked over many of the maps and conclude that the most reasonable and fair map with great representation of our community's diversity would be map 404 or 408 B. I love the idea that we will have a shoreline district that can focus on the special needs of our coast.

As a SBCC student and knowing that many of us went onto UCSB, I believe this will also increase the student involvement and give them a unified voice.

Secondly , I believe after spending much time in Isla Vista i am aware that our SBCC students live there too. This of course is a very active student population that works and lives often between SBCC and UCSB .

This makes for a stronger community , while giving the North district their own voice.

I am all about fairness and balance and exhort you to please consider one of these two maps.

Sincerely,

Barbara Batastini
407 Northridge Rd
Santa Barbara, Ca.

From:	tito lara
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:54:43 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Baudelio Lara

From:	Meg DiNapoli
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 3:55:54 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

--
Meg DiNapoli

From:	Carmen Kershaw
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:03:24 PM

Dear Commissioners,

Lompoc has nothing in common with Isla Vista and UCSB. Lompoc should not be placed in the same supervisor district as Isla Vista and UCSB.

Please do not divide cities, keep the city of Lompoc whole in one district and do not divide from Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills. Do not include Isla Vista and UCSB in North District. Leave politics out of redistricting and let the citizens get back their real right to vote for the north district.

We are one community.

Thank you,

Carmen Kershaw

From: Natalie Grubb
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:06:58 PM

To County of SB:
I am a long time resident of Santa Barbara and attended SBCC and then UCSB.
I wanted to explain why I support map 404 or 408B that unites these two campuses.
In a shoreline district -
1. SBCC is a "feeder "school to UCSB. On SBCC's University Transfer page, the website states "The University Transfer Academy (UTA) assures you of transfer in a timely manner to the prestigious University of California System, ranked among the top teaching and research institutions in the United States. UC Santa Barbara leads all campuses with the most SBCC transfer students, who make up about 1/3 of their transfer pool. "
2. There are roughly 3,000 SBCC students living in Isla Vista.
3. UCSB is currently in the SBCC Trustee District, and votes in SBCC elections. UCSB elected Johnathan Abboud to the city college Board of Trustees, the same individual who works as the Isla Vista's Community Service District General Manager.
4. UCSB students vote on SBCC elected officials and on SBCC school bonds - they do not have ANY relationship with Allen Hancock College. That is why they should be grouped into a district with SBCC students and not with Allen Hancock students.
6. UCSB students work, live, visit, and spend time in Santa Barbara City. They seldom travel to Lompoc, Santa Ynez or Santa Maria.
7. Most students at Allen Hancock are not renters, they are communicating from home. The only argument for putting UCSB into a district with Lompoc is that they share interest as renters - but Santa Barbara City College students rent at a higher rate than UCSB - because nearly half of UCSB students live on campus. UCSB and SBCC are more similar to each other than almost any other group in the county.
Thank you,
Natalie

--
Natalie Grubb-Campbell
GRUBB CAMPBELL REAL ESTATE GROUP
cell: 805.895.6226 | *office:* 805.565.8879 | DRE#01236143
1250 Coast Village Road, Montecito CA 93108 | **www.GrubbCampbell.com**

From:	Chuck Eras
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Support for 804,404,106,103
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:12:49 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely, Chuck Eras

From:	Pat Sullivan
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Cc:	highmeadow1@verizon.net
Subject:	redistrict
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:27:46 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Each district should reflect the personalities of its citizens

Sincerely,

Patricia Sullivan
solvang

From:	BRETT MARYMEE
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Santa Barbara County Map Redistricting Commission - Recommend Map Plan 404
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:33:29 PM

I am writing to express my support for the new redistricting Map Plan 404 to be included for consideration in the final five maps down-selected.
I serve on a water board as a Director, representing the cities in the eastern Santa Ynez Valley. My SYRWCD water board district covers most of this same geographical area in Santa Barbara County noted as #3 on Map 404. There has been much outreach to constituents from Lompoc to Santa Ynez to bring about compliance to SGMA over the last five years. These communities should not be split up as evident in many other maps submitted for consideration. This 404 map is excellent and keeps cities intact and ensures travel time is minimized for the district supervisors in all 5 districts. That is not the case with the current 3rd district, that stretches from UCSB to Guadalupe, and includes the SY Valley. The goal of like communities of interest is not served well by the current 3rd district but I believe the 3rd district in Map 404 does accomplish this goal going forward.

Best Regards,

J Brett Marymee, SYRWCD Director
Santa Ynez
(805) 688-5842

From: bscollin@cox.net
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: County Redistricting Effort
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:55:34 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,
Barbara Rogers Scollin

333 Old Mill Rd SPC 299
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

From: brsbws@cox.net
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: County Redistricting Effort
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:56:28 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,
Bruce Scollin

333 Old Mill Rd SPC 299
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

From: Dena Snedden
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Keep cities whole
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:29:41 PM

Dena

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely Dena Snedden

From:	Mary Jo Wallace
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	PLEASE give CAREFUL & FAIR consideration to these IMPORTANT RECOMMENDATIONS.
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:57:29 PM

I'm writing to encourage your consideration--& support--for the adoption of numbers 804, 404, 103 and 106 in your final redistricting efforts.

I--& MANY of us---hope you will be FAIR in helping local communities become represented within districts in which a large percentage of their residents would have similar backgrounds, interests & incomes. We definitely desire that towns & cities be kept as whole as possible within each district! And we do not want IV & UCSB placed together within a North County District!

Your thoughtful & FAIR attention to these VERY IMPORTANT RECOMMENDATIONS would be greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Mary Joan Wallace
10025 El Camino Real, #32
Atascadero, CA 93422

From:	Pat Richmond
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Map consideration
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:09:29 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Yours truly,
Patrick W. Richmond

From:	Patrick Richmond
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Map consideration
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:11:12 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Yours truly,
Muriel Richmond

From: Richard Williams
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: redistrricting@sbco.org. I"m favor 0f 804, 404, 103 and 106
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:15:31 PM

From: David Perry
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Bills
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:57:16 PM

103,106,404,804. Please support these bills.

From:	Mike Lovell
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:42:17 PM

Please use map 404 or 408B

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Glenn Avolio
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	redistricting
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:19:10 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept as whole as possible. IV and UCSB do not belong with North County District.

Sincerely,

Glenn Avolio
glennavolio@gmail.com

From: MARSHALLTOSTATE
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:21:56 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

I believe cities should be kept whole wherever possible and I do not want believe it is appropriate, pursuant to current legal redistricting guidelines, to give any consideration for placing IV and UCSB into a North County District. Should that decision be made I believe it is highly likely that legal action will be taken to challenge the newly drawn supervisory districts.

Do what you know redistricting guidelines require and place IV and UCSB in a south county supervisorial district.

Sincerely,

Bob Lynn
340 Rutherford Street
Goleta, California

From: Shiloh Flagg
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:02:07 PM

Good evening,

I am emailing in regards to the redistricting. I do not feel that Isla Vista should be with Santa Ynez district.

--

Kind regards,

01996245 DRE | 805-315-7160 MOBILE
shiloh.flagg.realtor@gmail.com EMAIL
shilohflagg.com WEB

NOTE: ON ALL CORRESPONDENCE, PLEASE "CC" MY:
Transaction Coordinator: ksheridan.re@gmail.com
Administrative Assistant: ksheridan.re@gmail.com

- Please rate your experience with my team on Yelp, Google, Facebook & Zillow
- Please follow my business on social media and tag me on any work performed!

From: barbara lyon
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: No IV/UCSB in North County
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:59:29 PM

I urge you to support Map #s 804, 404, 103 and 106. IV and UCSB do NOT belong with Orcutt or North County, that's ridiculous. Keep them close to Santa Barbara where they properly lie. It would be good to keep them together and not with other possible districts, as they are largely transient and will not reflect the ways others think.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lyon
3rd Gen Californian
Long time SB resident

From:	Dick Graham
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting Maps
Date:	Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:49:32 PM

Please refer to Maps 103, 106, 404 and 804. I believe that these boundaries will provide fair and logical districts. Why should northern Santa Barbara County's interests and preferences be diluted by UCSB and Isla Vista, which have neither geographic nor demographic commonalities with North County.

Thank you for applying impartial judgment and common sense in your decision-making.

Respectfully,

Richard "Dick" Graham
Santa Maria, CA

From:	D&LWhite
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Redistricting Maps
Date:	Thursday, November 18, 2021 7:46:08 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maps #804, 404, 103, and 106 to be considered for final adoption.

We want cities kept whole as possible and we do not want IV and UCSB placed into a North County District.

Sincerely,

Dallas White
SB County Resident since 1960

From: Judith M. Stauffer
To: CEO Redistricting RES
Subject: In support of Redistricting Map 816B
Date: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:10:43 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing today in support of Redistricting Map **816B** because it requires minimal modifications to our current districts within Santa Barbara County. As a 32 year resident in the unincorporated area within the Santa Ynez Valley, I believe it is imperative that the Santa Ynez Valley remain intact within the Third District as it has historically been so.

Sincerely,

Judi Stauffer

1610 Cougar Ridge Road
Buellton, CA 93427
rjshow@me.com

From:	Clayton Turner
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	maps #804, 404, 103, and 106
Date:	Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:17:30 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in **support** of maps **#804, 404, 103, and 106** to be considered for final adoption.

I believe that it's vital for Santa Barbara County Cities to be kept as whole as possible for County level representation.

I also think that the wildly manipulated **TRANSIENT RESIDENT** youth voters of IV and UCSB being placed into a North County District **DISENFRANCHISES** both camp's votes and enhances County government dysfunction.

The **Permanent Residents** of the North County, have very little, if ANY common community interests from the vastly different life stage and ideological **TRANSIENT** populations of IV and UCSB.

I implore you ensure future greater, harmonious local county governmental representation, by keeping IV/UCSB out of ANY North County District.

Sincerely,

Clayton Turner
4462 Titan Ave.
Lompoc, Ca.
93436

From:	Dianne Johnson
To:	CEO Redistricting RES
Subject:	Please adopt map 404 or 408B
Date:	Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:01:19 AM

I urge you to please adopt either map 404 or 408B to give citizens proper representation within our County government.

It seems to make the most sense to have the separate rural and agricultural area of the Santa Ynez Valley be it's own district.

It also makes sense to have the UCSB, SBCC and Isla Vista area united as those areas have interests in common.

I'm a UCSB graduate (Class of 1983) who lived in Isla Vista and understand how vastly different the needs of IV differ from the rural Santa Ynez Valley.

Thank you for considering the redistricting maps. Please adopt either map 404 or 408B.

Respectfully,
Dianne Johnson