

Contact Webpage Entries Containing Comments Regarding  
Maps

- #102 - Maps 818 and 822
- #101 - Map 408B
- #100 - Maps 801C, 818, 821B, 822, 408B
- #99 - Map 408B
- #98 - Maps 821B, 801C
- #97 - Maps 818, 821B, 408B, 801C, 822
- #96 - Map 818
- #94 - Maps 801C, 821B
- #93 - Maps 408B or 822
- #92 - Map 408B
- #91 - Map 821b

**Contact Us : Entry # 102****Name**

Todd Wilson

**Email**[toddwojai@comcast.net](mailto:toddwojai@comcast.net)**Message**

For final 5 review, Maps 818 and 822 should consider refinement to balance District Jurisdiction area. Extend District 2 to Northern county border and adjust Dist 3, 4 and 5 boundary lines for crisper landmark identification. For sure Finalist Maps 822 and 818 can be adjusted with very minimal demographic changes. 11-20 model to consider Map 822 ID88567 (ii566 is voided for 67 rename.

No district jurisdiction should exceed 40% of the full county..even if it's backcountry, which is a county wide community of interest in resources like water, minerals, oil & gas, timber, fire protection and recreation.

Goal should be as close to balance in both demographics and geographic district influence and authority. Commission appointments, committees, land use and resource management are not to be taken lightly.

thanki you all for your hard work and leadership.

Todd Wilson

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added 9 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

## Contact Us : Entry # 101

### Name

Michael Schaumburg

### Email

[mikeys2@cox.net](mailto:mikeys2@cox.net)

### Message

Please choose map 408B.

### Notes



#### Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)

added 17 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 100**

**Name**

Lucille Boss

**Email**

[pineapplesandpink@yahoo.com](mailto:pineapplesandpink@yahoo.com)

**Message**

## Contact Us : Entry # 100

Dear Chair Morris and Commissioners,

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments as follow-up to your choice of focus maps made on Monday, 11/22.

I see a common pattern in the final five maps -- between those that keep racial minority communities of interest together, and those that split them. I support the former (maps 801C, 818, and 821B) and oppose those that split communities (822, 408B).

I support maps that strengthen those communities of interest, as 801C, 818, and 821B do by connecting Isla Vista and parts of Goleta with the City of Lompoc.

I support the revised version of map 821B that keeps the same north county districts as the above maps, puts Cuyama in the 1st and 5th districts, and draws districts somewhat more equal in size. The original version of 821B has a much-too-large 4th district -- but the posted corrected version fixes that issue.

As an SBCC alumna and former employee of the Santa Barbara City College Foundation, I object to map 408B -- not just for splitting key communities of interest, but for creating a 'college district' that is purely fabricated. As I know first-hand, UCSB and Santa Barbara City College serve diverse populations and function very differently. A small number of enrolled City College students may live in Isla Vista at times. Some students do go on to transfer to the University. But City College is primarily a community college serving a wide range of non-four-year bound students, from high schoolers seeking higher educational opportunities, to young adults seeking career-focused certificates, to seniors pursuing new hobbies and interests. City College students who are local live all over the community college district; others are distance learners who don't even live in Santa Barbara County. Map 408B draws a district that makes no sense, and does so by splitting key communities of interest in Santa Barbara. I have been a homeowner on the Mesa for ten years; putting Santa Barbara's westside in my district, and separating it from the eastside, is a clear attack on the longstanding east/westside connection. Map 408B also separates Guadalupe from Santa Maria and moves it to a 4th district where it will be isolated.

Although map 822 is not as outrageous as 408B, I am concerned about how it clearly tries to draw Isla Vista out of the 3rd district by detouring around Goleta (moving Goleta in to the 3rd district) and putting IV in the 2nd district. It makes no sense to do this. Goleta can be in both districts, but to disconnect it completely from the 2nd district just to keep IV out of the 2nd district is a blatant tactic to exclude that population. If the Santa Ynez Valley doesn't want to be connected to IV, and says that it is a very different culture from the coast, then how does it make sense to put Goleta in the same district? That district is definitely not compact.

Based on the above observations, I urge you to move forward with maps 818, the revised version of 821B, and possibly 801C if you are selecting three options. I ask you to eliminate 408B and 822 in either its original or revised form.

Thank you,

Lucille Boss

Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Lucille Boss (she, her, hers)  
pineapplesandpink@yahoo.com  
805.637.5129

## Notes



### Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)

added November 30, 2021 at 12:50 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 99****Name**

Philip Gallanders

**Email**

[pgallanders@yahoo.com](mailto:pgallanders@yahoo.com)

**Message**

I would like to contact the Commission to make clear my request for consideration of a map, which I consider to be most applicable to best serve the needs of the residents of Santa Barbara County.

Map 408B seems to me, to be the best, most fair division of the County of Santa Barbara. Map408B keeps the populations of the county more correctly grouped, insofar as keeping agricultural, viticultural and rural areas together. Map408B also correctly and fairly groups the folks in the UCSB/SBCC/Isla Vista areas.

If the redistricting is to be seen and experienced as both a fair job and a job well done, the supervisorial districts need to have common ground so as to allow all the population of the county, equal voice.

I urge that Map 408B be chosen to go forward.

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added November 30, 2021 at 12:59 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 98****Name**

Kyra Solis

**Email**[kyrassolis@gmail.com](mailto:kyrassolis@gmail.com)**Message**

I prefer maps 821B or 801C. I am a resident of Isla Vista, although not a student – I'm one the working people you keep hearing about. You all have heard from me before, but I am speaking on behalf of myself, not any organizations I may be affiliated with. I want to echo what others have said about these maps, but specifically what Frank Rodriguez said about the East/Westside at the last meeting. Splitting them up despite them being a community of interest would be a huge disservice to us Latines in South county. I've worked on the Lower Westside, and separately worked in the private homes of the SB foothills, Montecito and the wineries of the Santa Ynez Valley as a caterer, and in my experience, the cities like Montecito and Santa Ynez have far more in common than say, Montecito and the Eastside. I use Latine to honor and include some of us that are nonbinary and to be inclusive of all gender identities. I really encourage you to think about how powerful it would be for our community to be able to elect a supervisor that reflects their background, and shares our dream and vision for the future. Thank you.

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added November 29, 2021 at 6:49 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.



**Contact Us : Entry # 97****Name**

Scott Baldwin

**Email**

[snpbaldwin@msn.com](mailto:snpbaldwin@msn.com)

**Message**

In regards to the last five maps, 4 of 5 are fine. Good job team!

818 needs to be dropped immediately. It's bad for Districts 3,4, & 5. Awful. This is a prime example of exactly what should be avoided at all costs.

Best, 821B. Solves all the problems found in 818.

Okay, 408B (#2) and 801C (#3)

Last Resort, 822

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added November 29, 2021 at 6:25 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 96****Name**

Greg and Theresa Duer

**Email**

[gtduer@gmail.com](mailto:gtduer@gmail.com)

**Message**

Adopt Plan 818

We are in support of adopting Plan 818 which would attach the Santa Ynez River watershed and the Gaviota Coast to the Santa Ynez Valley. The plan recognizes significant geographic, cultural and historic elements of the area. It also provides a maximum Latino CVAP of 67%.

We do not support adoption of the other plans for the following reasons:

- Plan 801C disconnects the Valley from the Gaviota Coast
- Plan 408B disconnects the Valley from Lake Cachuma and has a low maximum Latino CVAP of 59%
- Plan 821B puts the Valley in a mega district overwhelmingly dominated by Orcutt and Santa Maria and ignores the fact that the IV/UCSB area, along with the Gaviota Coast and the Santa Ynez Valley, have been in the Third District since 1880
- Plan 822 has a low maximum Latino CVAP of 59%

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added November 28, 2021 at 11:50 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 95****Name**

J C. Knapp

**Email**

[jc@utech.net](mailto:jc@utech.net)

**Message**

Why isn't Lompoc, Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks, Vandenberg Village and the Country club considered "Communities of interest"? We share much in common locally, but little with the so called south county. It is time to stop the cutting up this end of the county and not allowing us any voice in it's operation. Please give us the opportunity to be a factor in future elections.

JC Knapp, Lompoc

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added November 26, 2021 at 8:25 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 94****Email**

[LENFLECK@yahoo.com](mailto:LENFLECK@yahoo.com)

**Message**

Two of the five Round 2 maps should be thrown out. Both 801C and 821B include ridiculously large geographic areas for District 4. Both maps also fail to put even some parts of Lompoc in the same district as the other SY River Valley communities, i.e., Buellton, Solvang, and Santa Ynez. Map 801C is further uniquely absurd in linking the Buellton-to-Santa Ynez communities with Montecito and Carpinteria. The SYV communities should be with areas along Hwy 246 and the SY River, rather than pretending there is any linkage with the other side of the Santa Ynez mountains. Map 821B contains the absurd linkage of East of Cachuma-to-Buellton-to-Casmalia-to-Orcutt-to-East of Cuyama. That's a longer driving distance and time than going to LAX.

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added November 26, 2021 at 5:44 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 93****Name**

Jason Byard

**Email**

[jsbyard@gmail.com](mailto:jsbyard@gmail.com)

**Message**

I am a resident of Lompoc and am writing to voice my concern of the redistricting maps that lump our city in with Isla Vista! Lompoc is a vibrantly diverse community, but represents a very different demographic than that of the south county. We are a rural, agricultural, working class community that deserves to be represented with like areas and concerns. I am asking that the commission give more consideration to maps 408B or 822. These maps better represent us and keeps us from being overshadowed and trumped by UCSB.

Thank you for your efforts!

- Jason Byard

**Notes****Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)**

added November 24, 2021 at 10:02 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

## Contact Us : Entry # 92

### Name

Michael Schaumburg

### Email

[mikeys2@cox.net](mailto:mikeys2@cox.net)

### Message

As a citizen of Santa Barbara County, I'd like to voice my opinion for Map #408B.

### Notes



#### Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)

added November 22, 2021 at 10:31 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

## Contact Us : Entry # 91

### Message

Please consider these proposed amendments to map 821b. These make the map less disruptive. <https://districtr.org/edit/84588?event=sbcounty>

### Notes



#### Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)

added November 22, 2021 at 8:07 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.