



County of Santa Barbara
**Citizens Independent
Redistricting Commission**

Commissioner Cheryl Trosky, First District
Commissioner Karen Twibell, First District
Commissioner William McClintock, Second District
Commissioner Megan Turley, Second District, Vice Chair
Commissioner Norman "Doug" Bradley, Third District
Commissioner Kevin Kaseff, Third District
Commissioner James Bray, Fourth District
Commissioner Amanda Ochoa, Fourth District
Commissioner Glenn Morris, Fifth District, Chair
Commissioner Michael Hartman, Fifth District
Commissioner Jannet Rios, Member-At-Large

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA CITIZENS INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA**

**December 4, 2021, 10 a.m. In-Person and Virtual
Planning Commission Room, 123 East Anapamu St, Santa Barbara, CA**

Zoom: <https://zoom.us/j/96627818457> or call (669) 900-6833 or (346) 248-7799 ID: 966 2781 8457

Submit written comment by 5 p.m. one day prior to the meeting to redistricting@countyofsb.org.

Language interpretation and requests for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or devices, may be arranged by emailing a request to redistricting@countyofsb.org at least 24 hours prior to the Commission meeting.

Para solicitar traducción del idioma o una modificación por discapacidad, incluso los soportes auxiliares y los dispositivos, se puede mandar un correo electrónico a redistricting@countyofsb.org al menos 24 horas antes de la reunión de la Comisión.

Call to Order – Roll Call

Public Comments

Public comment will be allowed on items on this agenda at the time each item is considered. At the end of the agenda under General Public Comments the public may speak on items not on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of the Commission, provided that no action may be taken on off agenda items except as authorized by law.

To allow enough time for the Commission to fully deliberate on map selection, public comments will be limited to no more than one minute each. The Chair will establish a cut-off time for submitting requests to speak, which will be shortly after the staff report. Those participating in-person must submit a speaker slip and those participating via Zoom must raise their hands before the announced cut-off time.

Informational Items (Items 1-2)

1. Commissioner disclosure of [ex parte communications](#) pursuant to County Ordinance Code Sec. 2-10.9A(5)(h) are posted on the commission website at www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org.

c/o County Executive Office: 105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 406 Santa Barbara, CA 93101

- Email: redistricting@countyofsb.org
- Website: www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org
- Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/sbcredistrictingcommission>
- Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/sbcredistricting/>

Recess for Closed Session (Item 2)

2. Conference with Legal Counsel—Anticipated Litigation
Pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9

A point has been reached where, in the opinion of the legislative body of the local agency on the advice of its legal counsel, based on existing facts and circumstances, there is a significant exposure to litigation against the local agency.

Discussion Items (Items 3-4)

3. Approval of Minutes of November 18, 2021, and November 22, 2021.
4. Presentation of draft maps to Commissioners, and discussion of draft maps by Commissioners and legal counsel regarding issues of voting rights compliance. Possible action to identify a preferred map.

Notice for those speaking regarding Item 4: To allow enough time for the Commission to fully deliberate on map selection, public comments will be limited to no more than one minute each. The Chair will establish a cut-off time for submitting requests to speak, which will be shortly after the staff report. Those participating in-person must submit a speaker slip and those participating via Zoom must raise their hands before the announced cut-off time.

General Public Comments

The General Public Comment period is reserved for comments on items not on this Agenda and for matters within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Citizens Independent Redistricting Commission. The Commission may adopt reasonable regulations, including time limits, on public comments. The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during the public comment section, except to decide whether to place a matter on the agenda of a future meeting. Written public comments are posted at <https://DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org/calendar-agenda/>

Reports from Legal Counsel, Demographer and Communications Consultant

Commissioner Comments

Adjournment

Attachments

1. Minutes of November 18, 2021, and November 22, 2021



County of Santa Barbara
**Citizens Independent
Redistricting Commission**

Commissioner Cheryl Trosky, First District
Commissioner Karen Twibell, First District
Commissioner William McClintock, Second District
Commissioner Megan Turley, Second District, Vice Chair
Commissioner Norman "Doug" Bradley, Third District
Commissioner Kevin Kaseff, Third District
Commissioner James Bray, Fourth District
Commissioner Amanda Ochoa, Fourth District
Commissioner Glenn Morris, Fifth District, Chair
Commissioner Michael Hartman, Fifth District
Jannet Rios, Member-At-Large

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA CITIZENS INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

Date: November 18, 2021, 12 p. m.
Place: Virtual only via Zoom

Carlos Cerecedo, Interpreter, explained the process for Spanish interpretation services for this meeting.

Call to Order – Roll Call

Commission Convened at 12:00 p. m.

Commissioners Present: Bradley, Bray, Hartman, Kaseff, McClintock, Morris, Ochoa, Rios, Trosky, Turley, Twibell

Commissioners Absent: None

Informational Items (Items 1-2)

1. Commissioner disclosure of [ex parte communications](#) pursuant to County Ordinance Code Sec. 2-10.9A(5)(h) are posted on the commission website at www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org.
2. Community-Based Organizations for Outreach Information.

To submit the name of a community-based organization that the Commission should consider contacting with outreach information, visit www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org. Please review the existing the "suggest outreach" list; and, if the organization is not already listed, submit public contact information for the organization using the outreach form. Questions, suggestions, or other information can be emailed to redistricting@countyofsb.org.

Consent Calendar (Item 3)

All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered routine and may be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless an item is removed by a Commissioner for separate consideration.

3. Approval of Minutes of November 12, 2021.

Chair Morris announced a correction to the Minutes of November 12, 2021, to reflect Dr. Gall's presentation.

c/o County Executive Office: 105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 406 Santa Barbara, CA 93101

- Email: redistricting@countyofsb.org
- Website: www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org
- Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/sbcredistrictingcommission>
- Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/sbcredistricting/>

Motion to approve a correction to the Minutes of November 12, 2021, adding information reflecting Dr. Gall's presentation.

Motion Carried: 11 Ayes 0 Noes 0 Absent

Discussion Items (Items 4)

4. Presentation of draft maps to Commissioners, and discussion of draft maps by Commissioners and legal counsel regarding issues of voting rights compliance.

Dr. Phillips presented the following:

- Rules for Drawing the Lines
- A Note about District Numbering
- What Key Stats are Shown on the Map of Each Plan?
- Nonviable Plans:
 - 1 Partial Plan – #202
 - 1 Not Close to Population Balanced – #829
- Viable Plans Grouped as so:
 - Group A: Join Guadalupe with Santa Maria (45 plans)
 - Group B: Join Guadalupe with Santa Maria and Orcutt (7 plans)
 - Group C: Join Guadalupe with Orcutt (27 plans)
 - Group D: Join Guadalupe with Lompoc (10 plans)
 - Group E: Join Guadalupe with Goleta (3 plans)
 - Group F: Join Guadalupe with Isla Vista (3 plans)
 - Total: 100 viable plans
 - Subgroup 1: Join Isla Vista with Carpinteria (6 plans total)
 - Subgroup 2: Join Isla Vista with Santa Barbara (36 plans total)
 - Subgroup 3: Join Isla Vista with Goleta (7 plans total)
 - Subgroup 4: Joint Isla Vista with Lompoc (38 plans total)
 - Subgroup 5: Join Isla Vista with Guadalupe (8 plans total)
 - Subgroup 6: Split Isla Vista Between Two Districts (5 plans total)
 - Total: 100 viable plans
- At Today's Meeting:
 - Group A: Join Guadalupe with Santa Maria (6 plans): 501B, 818B, 820, 821, 821B, 825
 - Group B: Join Guadalupe with both Santa Maria and Orcutt (3 plans): 802B, 804B, 826
 - Group C: Join Guadalupe with Orcutt (3 plans): 822, 823, 827
 - Group D: Join Guadalupe with Lompoc (2 plans): 824, 828
 - Group E: Join Guadalupe with Goleta (0 plans)
 - Group F: Join Guadalupe with Isla Vista (2 plans): 503, 816B

Attorney Ordin gave an overview of the criteria (i.e., equal population, race, Voting Rights Act, etc.), prioritization, and communities of interest.

Chair Morris explained the process to narrow down the maps, and asked the speakers to identify the map number so it can be shown simultaneously during comments.

Public Comments (Limited to two minutes per speaker)

- Speaker 1, Frances Romero: Commented about the recent Guadalupe City Council meeting, and concerns about Guadalupe and Santa Maria in District 5.
- Speaker 2, Roy Reed: Commented about his submission map 404, that includes 2 majority districts, and a new District 2.
- Speaker 3, JL Duncan: Commented about his submission map 816B, Isla Vista, UCSB, and Chumash villages.
- Speaker 4, George Relles: Concerns about possible change in the voting cycle, opposed to moving UCSB or Isla Vista to another district, and in support of map 816B.
- Speaker 5, Andy Caldwell: No support shown for his submission map 817, and DistrictR errors.
- Speaker 6, Ian Baucke: In support of map 801, 818, and prefers map 821B.
- Speaker 7, Lee Heller: In support of map 818, 816B, 821B, against changing district numbering, and opposed to map 815, 828, and maps drawn by NDC.
- Speaker 8, Roseanne Crawford: Commented about District 3, fair representation for coastal and foothill communities, and in support of map 404, and 408B.
- Speaker 9, Rebecca Gowing: In support of map 404, 407 and 408B.
- Speaker 10, Carol Gregor: In support of map 404 and 408B.
- Speaker 11, Lawanda Lyons-Pruitt: In support of map 801, 816B, 818 and 821.
- Speaker 12, Michelle De Werd: In support of map 401 and 408B.
- Speaker 13, Lupe Aldecoa: In support of map 404, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 14, Nelda Martin: In support of map 401, 404 and 408B.
- Speaker 15, Catherine Flaherty: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 16, Spencer Brandt: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 17, Juan Garcia: In support of map 408B, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 18, Greg Hammel: In support of map 404.
- Speaker 19, Jorge Sanchez: In support of map 404, 408B, and opposes map 801.
- Speaker 20, Carlos Santos: In support of map 404, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 21, Maria Lopez: In support of map 404, 408B, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 22, Alan Ebenstein: Consider map 822.
- Speaker 23, Roberta Jaffe: Consider maps that keep Cuyama Valley in District 1 and 5.
- Speaker 24, Yolanda Rodriguez: In support of map 404, 408B, and the letter opposing the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 25, Antonio Ramirez: Commented about the resolution passed at the Guadalupe City Council meeting last night in support of map 801.
- Speaker 26, Lorena Gonzalez: In support of map 404, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 27, Teri Doutney: Commented about Isla Vista, some coastal access for all districts, supports the Chumash areas, and in support of map 818.
- Speaker 28, BL Borovay: In support of map 816B, 818 and 821.
- Speaker 29, Tom Martinez: In support of map 408B, and map 401, 404, 407, and 804 deserve consideration.

- Speaker 30, Leah Braitman: Favors a map where the oil and gas industry, and special interests don't influence or control the decisions, and Lompoc is more closely aligned with Isla Vista.
- Speaker 31, Claire Wineman: The Grower-Shipper Association of Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties Board of Directors met and support map 404.
- Speaker 32, Tania Lucero: In support of map 404, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 33, John Kershaw: In support of map 404 and 804.
- Speaker 34, Barbara Batastini: Concerns about District 3 (current), and in support of map 404 or 408B.
- Speaker 35, Nik Schiffmann: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 36, Colleen Estrada: In support of map 401, 404 and 408B.
- Speaker 37, Janet Flores: In support of map 404, 408B, and opposes the CAUSE map.

Recessed the meeting at 2:11 p.m., and reconvened the meeting at 2:21 p.m.

Chair Morris explained that each commissioner will present up to 5 map preferences for further discussion to move forward.

Commissioner Selections:

- Commissioner Bradley (in reverse order, least to most preferred): 816B with pending modifications, 818 (an improvement on map 816B), 810, and top choices are map 815 and 821B.
 - Cuyama Valley should be connected with North County and should not be in District 1.
 - The need for a district to fairly represent the Latinx community, merge Guadalupe with North or Northwest Santa Maria, and not exclusively Southwest Santa Maria.
 - Merge renters for fair representation.
 - Should not divide unincorporated areas.
- Commissioner Bray: 401, 404, 408B, 804 and 822 (with minor modifications).
- Commissioner Hartman: 801, 810 and 821B.
 - All districts should have some coastal access.
- Commissioner Kaseff (in reverse order, least to most preferred): 408B, 821B, and 404.
- Commissioner McClintock (no particular order): 809, 815, 818, 821B, 822, also map 816B is a great map for a no change option, and emphasized map 821B.
 - All districts touch the ocean.
- Chair Morris (in no particular order): 104 (concerns about the number of split communities), 112, 119 (move Cuyama Valley to one of the northern districts), 408B (reduce deviations and CVAP potentially improvable), and 822 (move Cuyama Valley and improve CVAP).
- Commissioner Ochoa (no particular order): 816B, 128, 810 and 407.
- Commissioner Rios (in reverse order, least to most preferred): 104, 809, 821B, 801C, and prefers 801.
- Commissioner Trosky: Prefers 404 (it answers public comment concerns), 408B, 823 and 822. Map 401 and 407 are great maps, and least favorite is 103 (and later removed 106).
- Vice Chair Turley (no particular order): 104, 801C, 818, 821B, 809 (personal preference), and 816B should be an alternate.
- Commissioner Twibell (no particular order): 401, 404, 408B, 801C (least favorite), 804B, 815, 821B, 822.

Map Selection Tally:

- 7 mentions: 821B
- 5 mentions: 822, 408B
- 4 mentions: 404, 816B
- 3 mentions: 401, 407, 809, 810, 815, 818, 801C
- 2 mentions: 104, 801
- 1 mention: 103, 119, 128, 804, 823, 804B, 806B

Grand total = 57

Commissioner Discussion:

- Drop the maps with one or two votes, and combine the 400 series.
- 400 series maps: Combine votes for map 401, 404, 407 and 408B, drop map 401, 404, 407, and keep 408B.
- 800 series maps: Combine votes for map 801 and 801C, drop map 801, and use map 801C.
- Reconsider map 404, as it initially received 4 votes.

Maps moving forward for consideration: 104, 408B, 801C, 809, 810, 815, 816B, 818, 821B, 822

Dr. Phillips explained the map numbering.

Dr. Johnson suggested each commissioner provide 2 (or 3 maximum) maps by Monday.

Motion to further consider map 104, 408B, 801C, 809, 810, 815, 816B, 818, 821B, 822, and Commissioners come prepared to offer their top 2 (or 3 maximum) map choices at the meeting on Monday, November 22, 2021.

Motion passed: 11 Ayes, 0 Noes 0 Absent

Commissioners discussed updating the website now to show the maps moving forward, giving the public time to review the maps, and modifications to those maps (as needed) to follow.

General Public Comments

The General Public Comment period is reserved for comments on items not on this Agenda and for matters within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Citizens Independent Redistricting Commission. The Commission may adopt reasonable regulations, including time limits, on public comments. The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during the public comment section, except to decide whether to place a matter on the agenda of a future meeting.

General Public Comments (Limited to two minutes per speaker)

- Speaker 1, Lee Heller: Indicate how many people would be moved by any final map, and possibly add to the assessment and analysis.
- Speaker 2, Ian Baucke: Keep in mind voter turnout and registration data when looking at minority/majority districts.

- Speaker 3, Colleen Estrada: Concerns about process used to narrow down the maps, and how the maps were ranked.
- Speaker 4, Frances Romero: Cautioned about diluting commissioner participation during map selection, and the community participation process.

Written Public Comments

- Carissa and Stephen Luke: Remove Isla Vista and Goleta from the North County district.
- Ed Fuller: Advocated for his submission map 80223 and 80317, and if not selected, will support map 404 or 408B.
- Glenn Battles: In support of map 404.
- Lee Heller: Not disrupting the numbering protocol and recommended not using NDC's approach.
- Joan Livingston: In support of map 404.
- Bruce and Louise McKaig: In favor of the 400 series maps, especially 404 or 408B.
- Denice Spangler Adams: In support of map 404.
- J.L. Duncan: In support of map 816B (final version of map 816 and formerly identified as map 830).
- Jerry Rounds: In support of map 404 or 408B.
- Ellen Thermos: Against placing UCSB in the same district as Lompoc or Isla Vista, and don't split up Lompoc.
- John Thermos: Keep Lompoc Valley (including Lompoc City, Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills) whole and in one district.
- George Bedford: Keep North County away from Isla Vista.
- Bob Niehaus: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Chris Chirgwin: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keeping cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Rosanne and Harold Crawford: Fair representation for the coastal and foothill region, and in support of map 404 or 408B.
- Mark Oliver: In support of map 816B.
- Kari Campbell-Bohard: Opposed to splitting the City of Lompoc between districts and/or combining Lompoc with Isla Vista/UCSB, and in support of map 103.
- John Zemanovic: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106.
- Sherrie Jones: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106.
- Ralph Nobbe: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106.
- Janet Rowse: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and place Isla Vista and UCSB in a South County district.
- Edith Robinson: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Rosalea Greenwood: Keep the City of Lompoc whole (including Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills), and it should not be in the same district with Isla Vista and UCSB.
- Jeff Koligian: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Alfonso Velazquez: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.

- Connie Velazquez: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Susan Anderson: Consider one of the 400 series maps.
- Chuck Musselwhite: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Lorin Bronson: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and keep cities as whole as possible.
- Richard McKenzie: Consider one of the 400 series maps.
- Rob Mangus: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Ron and Tonya Baird: Opposed to splitting the City of Lompoc between districts and/or combining Lompoc with Isla Vista/UCSB, and in support of map 103.
- Katina Zaninovich: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Rick Soto: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Marjorie Popper: In support of map 816B.
- John Gustafsson: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Laretta Griffin: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Suzanne & John Petersen: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and Isla Vista and UCSB should be in District 2.
- Jim Glines: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Allison McAdams, on behalf of Kenneth Kahn, Tribal Chairman, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians: Chumash Reservation and villages between the Santa Ynez Valley, coastal areas near Gaviota and Isla Vista, Goleta Slough and west to Point conception, and in support of leaving the District 3 boundaries unchanged as much as possible.
- Suzanne Petrie: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Mark Jackson: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Loren Hiltner: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Mike Stoker: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Richard Souza: In support of map 808, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Jessica Tobin: Opposed to splitting the City of Lompoc between districts, and against combining Lompoc with Isla Vista and UCSB.
- Anita Dwyer: Keep cities as whole as possible and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in the North district.
- keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Loren McFarland: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.

- Mark Evans: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Michael Nicassio: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Colette Evans: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Tariq Kadri: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Sid Abma: In support of map 103, 106, 404 and 804, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Gwen Bullard: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- John and Joan Schumacher: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Jeff Lundberg: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Mike Harman: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Mark Williams: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Colleen Griffiths Estrada: Consider one of the 400 series maps.
- Margaret Hammel: In support of map 404 or 408B, and unite the Goleta Valley, Santa Barbara, Isla Vista and SBCC into one district.
- Marcia Tremblay: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Jim Thomas: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Cindy Gough: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Carol Redhead: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and do not put Isla Vista and Goleta with Lompoc.
- Justin Shores: In support of map 404.
- Terri Stricklin: In support of map 103, 106, 404 and 804, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Mary Arnold: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Greg Hammel: In support of map 404 or 408B.
- Jim Stollberg: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- George Bedford: Keep Isla Vista out of North County.
- Walter Guthrie: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Becky Grant: In support of map 404, 804, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district, and Orcutt and Lompoc areas should remain together.

- Renee Grubb: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Jeff Havik: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Dr. Lata Murti: Latinx representation and in support of map 801 and 818.
- Dulcie Sinn: In support of the plans that split Lompoc Valley and importance of representation in 2 supervisorial districts.
- Lisa Ostendorf: In support of map 404 and 407.
- Mike Sewall: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- J.L. Duncan: Revisions to map 816B and DistrictR map 82621.
- Justin Ruhge: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep Lompoc Valley undivided and in North County District 4, and move Isla Vista and UCSB to District 2.
- Marell Brooks: In support of map 816B, and Isla Vista and UCSB in District 3.
- Barbara Batastini: In support of map 404 or 408B.
- Baudelio Lara: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Meg DiNapoli: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Carmen Kershaw: Lompoc should be kept whole and not in the same district with Isla Vista and UCSB, and do not include Isla Vista and UCSB in the North district.
- Natalie Grubb-Campbell: In support of map 404 and 408B.
- Chuck Eras: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Pat Sullivan: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- J. Brett Marymee: In support of map 404 and will serve District 3 well.
- Barbara Rogers Scollin: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Bruce Scollin: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Dena Snedden: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Mary Joan Wallace: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Patrick Richmond (1): In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Patrick Richmond (2): In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Muriel Richmond: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Richard Williams: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106.
- David Perry: In support of map 103, 106, 404 and 804.
- Mike Lovell: In support of map 404 or 408B.

- Glenn Avolio: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Bob Lynn: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Shiloh Flagg: Isla Vista should not be with the Santa Ynez district.
- Barbara Lyon: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, Isla Vista and UCSB do not belong with Orcutt or North County, and keep them together and close to Santa Barbara.
- Richard “Dick” Graham: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, and UCSB and Isla Vista don’t have geographic or demographic commonalities with North County.
- Dallas White: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Judi Stauffer: In support of map 816B because it requires minimal modifications to current Santa Barbara County districts, and imperative that the Santa Ynez Valley remain intact within District 3.
- Clayton Turner: In support of map 804, 404, 103 and 106, keep cities as whole as possible, and opposed to Isla Vista and UCSB in a North County district.
- Dianne Johnson: In support of map 404 or 408B, Santa Ynez Valley should be its own district, SBCC and Isla Vista have common interests, and the different needs of Isla Vista and Santa Ynez Valley.
- Michael Schaumburg: Accompanying comments for map 816B (DistrictR map 80240).
- Michael Schaumburg: Concerns about faulty data with early map submissions, commented about the letter with 100 signatures, and decision making.
- Gary Hall: In support of the United Communities map 801.

Reports from Legal Counsel, Demographer and Communications Consultant

None.

Commissioner Comments

- Update the Attendance Note with the meeting dates.

Mrs. Tilton announced there will be a Closed Session at the beginning of the meeting on November 22, will last approximately 45 minutes, and will occur before deliberation of maps. The meeting will be called to order at 6 p.m., roll call taken, and then recess to Closed Session.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p. m. The next meeting is scheduled on Monday, November 22, 2021, at 6 p.m., in the Planning Commission Room, 123 Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara (and virtually via Zoom).



County of Santa Barbara
**Citizens Independent
Redistricting Commission**

Commissioner Cheryl Trosky, First District
Commissioner Karen Twibell, First District
Commissioner William McClintock, Second District
Commissioner Megan Turley, Second District, Vice Chair
Commissioner Norman "Doug" Bradley, Third District
Commissioner Kevin Kaseff, Third District
Commissioner James Bray, Fourth District
Commissioner Amanda Ochoa, Fourth District
Commissioner Glenn Morris, Fifth District, Chair
Commissioner Michael Hartman, Fifth District
Jannet Rios, Member-At-Large

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA CITIZENS INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

Date: November 22, 2021, 6:00 p. m.

Place: Planning Commission Room, 123 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara (and virtual via Zoom)

Carlos Cerecedo, Interpreter explained the process for Spanish interpretation services for the meeting.

Call to Order – Roll Call

Commission Convened at 6:00 p. m.

Commissioners Present: Bradley, Bray, Hartman, Kaseff, McClintock, Morris, Ochoa, Rios, Trosky, Turley, Twibell

Commissioners Absent: None

Informational Items (Items 1-2)

1. Commissioner disclosure of [ex parte communications](#) pursuant to County Ordinance Code Sec. 2-10.9A(5)(h) are posted on the commission website at www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org.
2. Community-Based Organizations for Outreach Information.

To submit the name of a community-based organization that the Commission should consider contacting with outreach information, visit www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org. Please review the existing the "suggest outreach" list; and, if the organization is not already listed, submit public contact information for the organization using the outreach form. Questions, suggestions, or other information can be emailed to redistricting@countyofsb.org.

The meeting recessed at 6:06 p.m. for Closed Session.

Recess for Closed Session (Items 3-4)

3. Conference with Legal Counsel–Existing Litigation

Pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9

c/o County Executive Office: 105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 406 Santa Barbara, CA 93101

- Email: redistricting@countyofsb.org
- Website: www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org
- Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/sbcredistrictingcommission>
- Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/sbcredistricting/>

Number of case: The Coalition of Labor, Agriculture & Business of Santa Barbara County v. Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors; County of Santa Barbara Citizens' Independent Redistricting Commission, Frederic D. Woocher; Strumwasser & Woocher, LLP; Case No. 21CV01642

4. Conference with Legal Counsel—Anticipated Litigation

Pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9

A point has been reached where, in the opinion of the legislative body of the local agency on the advice of its legal counsel, based on existing facts and circumstances, there is a significant exposure to litigation against the local agency.

The meeting reconvened in open session at 6:54 p.m.

Attorney Ordin announced the following:

- Item 3: No reportable action was taken.
- Item 4: Dr. Megan Gall and David Becker briefed Commissioners on various laws, including the Voting Rights Acts, for considering the 10 maps selected, and discussed possible litigation that may apply. Dr. Gall's final report will be presented at the next meeting, and there is no recommendation at this time and no reason not to proceed with the 10 maps selected.

Consent Calendar (Item 5)

5. Approval of Minutes of November 15, 2021.

Motion to approve the Minutes of November 15, 2021.

Motion Carried: 11 Ayes 0 Noes 0 Absent

Discussion Items (Items 6)

6. Presentation of draft maps to Commissioners, and discussion of draft maps by Commissioners and legal counsel regarding issues of voting rights compliance. Possible action to further refine focus maps and provide direction on map modifications (if any).

Chair Morris announced that following Public Comment for this item, each Commissioner will select 3 maps (maximum) to move forward in the selection process.

Dr. Phillips presented the following:

- Rules for Drawing the Lines
- Viable Plans Grouped as so:
 - Group A: Join Guadalupe with Santa Maria (7 plans)
 - Group C: Join Guadalupe with Orcutt (2 plans)
 - Group F: Join Guadalupe with Isla Vista (1 plan)

c/o County Executive Office: 105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 406 Santa Barbara, CA 93101

- Subgroup 2: Join Isla Vista with Santa Barbara (3 plans)
- Subgroup 4: Join Isla Vista with Lompoc (6 plans)
- Subgroup 5: Join Isla Vista with Guadalupe (1 plan)
- Table of Focus Plans: 104, 810, 821B, 815, 809, 818, 801C, 408B, 822, 816

Motion to add map 404 to the list of maps for consideration.

Commission Comments:

- The standard elimination process is to remove maps with the lowest number of votes.
- Maps that received 1 to 3 votes were not selected for consideration.
- Map 404 received 4 votes and has overwhelming public support.
- 400 series maps were very similar, and 408B best represented the series.
- Concerns about fairness if map 404 is added to the selection solely because of votes received.

Attorney Ordin stated it is a matter of choice, and there is no legal reason one way or another.

Motion Failed: 4 Ayes 7 Noes 0 Absent

Chair Morris commented on the high volume of in-person and virtual (Zoom) public participation, totaling over 150 speakers for this meeting.

Public Comments (Limited to 1 minute per speaker)

- Speaker 1, Lindsey Baker, Santa Barbara and Santa Maria League of Women Voters: Commented about making as few changes as possible, the Chumash community, historic connections, and the Santa Ynez Valley watershed.
- Speaker 2, James, Goleta: Goleta, regional airport, school district, and in favor of keeping Goleta in two supervisorial districts.
- Speaker 3, Daniel Segura: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 4: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 5, Bravo: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 6: In support of map 809, New Cuyama should not be included with Santa Barbara, Isla Vista should be separate from Goleta, and Santa Ynez Valley should be in District 3.
- Speaker 7, Alex: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 8, Mr. Castro: In support of map 801C, and representation.
- Speaker 9, Jen: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 10, Barbara: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 11, Paul: In support of map 816B.
- Speaker 12, Eric Caruso: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 13, Ethan: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 14: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 15, Marvia: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 16, Erica: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 17, Marisol Cruz: In support of map 801C.

c/o County Executive Office: 105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 406 Santa Barbara, CA 93101

- Speaker 18, Ms. Abdullah: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 19, Angie: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 20, Max Levin: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 21, Mr. Ignacio: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 22: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 23, Michael: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 24, Joey: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 25, Eddie: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 26, Fernando: High rental costs, the need for a rental majority district, and in support of map 801C.
- Speaker 27, Estella (via interpreter): In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 28, Wendy Santa Maria: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 29, Stanley: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 30, Frank Rodriguez: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 31, Frances Romero: In support of map 408B, and can also support map 822.
- Speaker 32, Colleen Estrada: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 33, Kathy Vreeland: In support of 408B.
- Speaker 34, Lucas Zucker: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 35, Julie Bischoff: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 36, Vanessa Teran: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 37, Marian Shapiro: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 38, Anahi Santos: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 39, Leo Ortega: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 40, Carol Redhead: Lompoc should not be split, be represented by one supervisor, and has little in common with renters/students at UCSB living in and around Isla Vista.
- Speaker 41, Benito Camarillo: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 42, Andrew Oman: In support of map 801C, and map 818 is also a solid option.
- Speaker 43, Karen Miller: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 44, Dalia Garcia (via interpreter): In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 45, George Relles: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 46, Roy Reed: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 47, Laura Selken: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 48, Cliff Solomon: In support of map 801C and 818.
- Speaker 49, Margaret Ontiveros: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 50, Deb Robinson: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 51, Ana Huynh: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 52, Debi Cloud: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 53, Susan: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 54, Lee Heller: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 55, Kathy Sharum: In support of map 801C, and would strongly support 818.

Recessed the meeting at 9:00 p.m., and reconvened at 9:10 p.m.

- Speaker 56, Amy Blair: In support of map 408B.

Dr. Phillips announced that for Public Comments, all hands raised for Public Comment by 9:15pm will be heard.

- Speaker 57, Ed Seaman: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 58, Lucille Boss: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 59, Susan Deacon: In support of map 818, or alternatively 816B.
- Speaker 60, Meagan Harmon: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 61, JL Duncan: In support of map 818 and 809.
- Speaker 62, Jake Parsons: In support of map 822 (combining Santa Maria with Guadalupe in District 5).
- Speaker 63, Ian Baucke: In support of map 801C, 818, 809, 810, and particularly 821B.
- Speaker 64, Corazon del Pueblo: In support of map 818 and 801C.
- Speaker 65, Leo E.: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 66, James Fenkner: Concerned that map 801C violates Measure G and should be removed from further consideration.
- Speaker 67, Mario Espinoza-Kulick: In support of map 801C and 818.
- Speaker 68, Ilene Pickle: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 69, Hillary Blackerby: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 70, Jason Dominguez: In support of map 818 and 816B.
- Speaker 71, Connie Alexander: In support of map 818 and 801C.
- Speaker 72, Michael Meredith: In support of map 801C, and alternatively 818.
- Speaker 73, Berkiel Molinard: In support of map 822 and 822B.
- Speaker 74, Emily Dieckmann: In support of map 822 (combining Guadalupe and Santa Maria).
- Speaker 75, Nadia Lee Abushanab: In support of map 801C and 818.
- Speaker 76, Jay Freeman: In support of map 818 and 801C is fascinating.
- Speaker 77, Lucia Trujillo: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 78, Barbara: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 79, Lee Pearson: Water sustainability, and in support of map 816B.
- Speaker 80, Lupe Aldecoa (via interpreter): In support of map 408B and 822, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 81, Chelsea Lancaster: In support of map (in order) 801C, 818 and 821B.
- Speaker 82, Michal Lynch: In support of map 801C and 818.
- Speaker 83, Danni Glaser: In support of map 801C or 818.
- Speaker 84, Joshua Medrano: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 85, Alan Ebenstein: In support of map 822, and consider 822A and 822B.
- Speaker 86, Nakia Zavella: In support of map 818 and 816B.
- Speaker 87, Yu Ling Zeng: In support of map 822 (combining Guadalupe and Santa Maria in District 5).
- Speaker 88, Gail Teton-Landis: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 89, John Kershaw: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 90, Jorge Sanchez: In support of map 408B and 822, and opposes 818, 816B, 821B, and 801C.
- Speaker 91, BL Borovay: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 92, Sam Cohen: In support of map 818 and 816B.
- Speaker 93, Lynn Carlisle: In support of map 816B.

- Speaker 94, Ignaao Hernandez: In support of map 408B and 822.
- Speaker 95, Claudia Martinez: In support of map 408B and 822, and opposes the CAUSE map 801.
- Speaker 96, Maria Lopez: Commented about Guadalupe and political activist organizations.
- Speaker 97, Helen Rivas Galvan: In support of 801C, can live with map 818., and the need for Latino representation.
- Speaker 98, Maria Ventura (via interpreter): In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 99, Matilde Cortes (via interpreter): In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 100, Cruz Phillips: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 101, Connie Ford: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 102, Jorge (via interpreter): In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 103, Zulema Aleman: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 104, Randy Jones: In support of map 408B and 822.
- Speaker 105, Reina (via interpreter): In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 106, Sara Macdonald: Keep Guadalupe and Santa Maria together for environmental reasons, such as the shared watershed and Highway 166.
- Speaker 107, Rose Munoz: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 108, Katie Davis: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 109, Kelly: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 110, Litzzy Moreno: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 111, Antonio Ramirez: A resolution adopted by the City of Guadalupe in support of map 801C.
- Speaker 112, Roberta Jaffe: In support of map 816B.
- Speaker 113, Yolanda Rodriguez: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 114, Victor Rodriguez: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 115, Ferial: In support of map 816B.
- Speaker 116, Kristen Wu: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 117, Michelle Escobar: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 118, Janet Flores: In support of map 408B and 822, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 119, Leah Braitman: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 120, Casey Mata: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 121, Christian Alonso: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 122, Geneva Lovett: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 123, Hazel Davalos: In support of map 801C, and opposes the 400 series maps and 822.
- Speaker 124, Erica Reyes: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 125, Natalia Sanchez: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 126, Nelda Martin: In support of map 408B and 822.
- Speaker 127, Geo Lucero: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 128, Jon Illman: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 129, Maria Castillejo Huanosta: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 130, Daniel Mitchell: In support of map 801C and 818B.
- Speaker 131, Juanita C.: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 132, Shannon Sweeney: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 133, Irene Cook: In support of map 801C and 818.
- Speaker 134, Sullivan Israel: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 135, Denise El Amin: In support of map 818.

- Speaker 136, Fahmee El Amin: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 137, Dora Maria Perez (via interpreter): In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 138, Athenas Guerra: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 139, Daniel Mora: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 140, Joan Vignocchi: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 141, Greg Hammel: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 142, Thomas Widroe: Commented about Measure G, and in support of map 408B (but preferred map 404).
- Speaker 143, Carlos Santos: Opposes the CAUSE map, and in support of map 408B and 822.
- Speaker 144, Yoselynn Vicente: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 145, Geordie Scully: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 146, Carlos Lopez: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 147, Rebeca Garcia: In support of map 801C.
- Speaker 148, Spencer Brandt: In support of map 818, 801 and 821.
- Speaker 149, Kym: In support of map 801C and second choice is 818.
- Speaker 150, Tania Lucero (via interpreter): In support of map 408B and 822, and opposes the CAUSE map.
- Speaker 151, Rebecca Gowing: In support of map 408B.
- Speaker 152, Lisa Sloan: In support of map 408B and second choice is 822.
- Speaker 153, Angelo Caciola: In support of map 408B primarily, or 822.
- Speaker 154, Galina Leonard: In support of map 408B.

Commissioner Top 3 Map Selections:

- Commissioner Twibell: 408B, 821B, 822
- Vice Chair Turley: 818, 801C and 822B
- Commissioner Trosky: 408B, 104, and 822
- Commissioner Rios: 801C, 818, 821B
- Commissioner Ochoa: 818, 408B, 821B
- Chair Morris: 104, 809 and 822
- Commissioner McClintock: 809, 818 and 822B
- Commissioner Kaseff: 408B, 801C and 821B
- Commissioner Hartman: 818, 801C and 408B
- Commissioner Bray: 408B, 822 and 104
- Commissioner Bradley: 821B, 818 and 809

Chair Morris suggested that commissioners prepare their edits and submit to staff by Sunday (November 29), to give staff time to make the changes for discussion at the meeting on December 1.

Map Selection Tally:

- 6 mentions: 408B, 818, and 822
- 5 mentions: 821B
- 4 mentions: 801C

Motion to accept and move forward with map 408B, 801C, 818, 821B and 822.

Motion passed: 11 Ayes, 0 Noes 0 Absent

General Public Comments

The General Public Comment period is reserved for comments on items not on this Agenda and for matters within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Citizens Independent Redistricting Commission. The Commission may adopt reasonable regulations, including time limits, on public comments. The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during the public comment section, except to decide whether to place a matter on the agenda of a future meeting.

General Public Comments (Limited to one minute per speaker)

None.

Written Public Comments

Due to the high volume received, Written Public Comments are posted on the website.

Reports from Legal Counsel, Demographer and Communications Consultant

None.

Commissioner Comments

None.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:49 p. m. The next meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, December 1, 2021, at 6 p.m., in the Betteravia Board Hearing Room, 511 East Lakeside Parkway, Santa Maria, CA (and virtually via Zoom).