

Contact Webpage Entries Containing Comments Regarding Maps

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> #144 - Map 818C | <input type="checkbox"/> #123 - Map 818C |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #143 - Maps 818, 821 | <input type="checkbox"/> #121 - Map 822 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #142 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #120 - Maps 818, 818C |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #141 - Maps 818, 821 | <input type="checkbox"/> #118 - Map 822 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #140 - Maps 818, 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #117 - Map 408B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #138 - Maps 822, 821, 818 | <input type="checkbox"/> #116 - Map 821B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #137 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #114 - Map 822 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #134 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #113 - Maps 408B, 822 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #133 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #112 - Map 408B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #132 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #111 - Maps 822, 408B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #131 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #109 - District R 79817/Plan
822 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #130 - Map 822C | <input type="checkbox"/> #108 - Map 408B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #129 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #106 - Map 408B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #128 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #105 - Map 408B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #127 - Map 822 | <input type="checkbox"/> #104 - Maps 821B, 801C |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #126 - Map 818C | <input type="checkbox"/> #103 - Map 822 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> #125 - Map 818C | |

Contact Us : Entry # 145**Name**

lammy johnstone

Emailolcott@silcom.com**Message**

You are down to three finalists, two of which place the SYV with Isla Vista/UCSB. We have absolutely nothing in common with that area. We are semi-rural with a healthy representation of seniors. To once again have the SYV voices silenced via the votes of transitory students is a travesty to all of us who have called our Valley "home" for, in my case, almost 30 years,. That area of our county should become a compliment to the southern region. After all, that is where it is! Make the right choice and do not put SYV in bed with UCSB/Isla Vista. Thank you.

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

added 4 mins ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 144**Name**

Philip Gallanders

Email

Pgallanders@yahoo.com

Message

I am a Lompoc resident and would like to comment on tomorrow's redistricting map choice.

Firstly, the insertion of a map version NOT PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED, #818c, into the final round is completely wrong, unethical and possibly illegal. Please delete this false choice from consideration.

Secondly, please bring back Map 408B into the mix, for it is fair, honest and not falsely separating community voices through gerrymandering.

Finally, it is my request that my political voice be restored. The voice of the North County, of Guadalupe and Lompoc, were suppressed 10 years ago. We want our voices back.

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

added 5 mins ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 143**Message**

Concerning Map #818: this number 818 has referred to at least THREE very different maps in a short amount of time such that comments on one of the versions would not apply over the last few days!!

This is not helpful to the public and puts us at quite a disadvantage in making comments. I strongly object to how this is being processed at present and I ask you to address the problem asap!

Secondly, I surely hope this commission is aware of the boundaries of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan and that it would be really wrong to cut across its boundary lines with different districts such as is done in Finalist Round Three Map #821. The SYVCP took ten years to accomplish, was made County policy in 2009 and has very specific goals. To suddenly have two districts trying to administer these goals would be ridiculously inefficient in duplication and coordination.

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

added 35 mins ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 142**Name**

L. Jon Simon

Message

Only viable map is 822...

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

added 39 mins ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 141

Message

Concerning Map #818: this number 818 has referred to at least THREE very different maps in a short amount of time such that comments on one of the versions would not apply over the last few days!!

This is not helpful to the public and puts us at quite a disadvantage in making comments. I strongly object to how this is being processed at present and I ask you to address the problem asap!

Secondly, I surely hope this commission is aware of the boundaries of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan and that it would be really wrong to cut across its boundary lines with different districts such as is done in Finalist Round Three Map #821. The SYVCP took ten years to accomplish, was made County policy in 2009 and has very specific goals. To suddenly have two districts trying to administer these goals would be ridiculously inefficient in duplication and coordination.

Notes



Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)

added 39 mins ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 140**Name**

Julie Hall

Email

julie.ann.hall@gmail.com

Message

I 100% REJECT Plan 818
Keep Orcutt in District 4
I vote for Plan 822

Thank you
Julie A Hall
4637 California Blvd
Orcutt CA 93457
805-588-9020

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

added 45 mins ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 139**Message**

The majority of Isla vista voters are basically UCSB students who come and go and they do not have the views of The Valley

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

added 1 hour ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 138**Name**

Mary Housel

Email

maryhousel@gmail.com

Message

Hello, I am writing in support of the redistricting map 822 or 821 which keep the community where I reside, Orcutt, in one community of interest and not split between two districts as Plan 818 does.

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

added 3 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 137**Name**

Susan Shehab

Email

snuzen@me.com

Message

To Whom It May Concern:

Please change your efforts to change all of us! Santa Ynez does not belong with Isla Vista. College towns are their own entity and should stay that way. Please consider changing in support of 822.

We appreciate you listening to us and reconsidering breaking up the map.

Thank you,
Susan

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

added 3 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 135**Message**

I do not support combining Isla Vista with the Santa Ines Valley, or Lompoc Valley with regards to drawing district lines.

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

added 5 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 134**Name**

Kristen Thomsen

Email

Peterthimsen@comcast.nett

Message

My husband and I live in the Santa Ynez Valley and we strongly support map 822. We do not feel any connection to the Isla Vista community for our day to day business or community connections.

Please hear and respect our voices in the SYV.

Thank you

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

added 6 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 133**Name**

Darlene Bayer

Email

Curvy805@gmail.com

Message

I am a resident of Solvang for over the past twenty plus years. Map 822 finally separates Isla Vista from our community and makes the most sense. As a long term resident here our community has NOTHING in common with Isla Vista yet we were unduly influenced by the massive IV vote year after year. Map 822 is the only map in the final 3 that is finally fair and equitable for the residents here in north county. It's time to finally remedy this so we please request map 822 be finalized.

Thank You for your work efforts towards a final palatable solution with Map 822.

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

added 10 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 132**Name**

Cary Snyder

Email

fcarysnyder@gmail.com

Message

What I like most about all these maps is how they all emphasize the importance of urban-rural balance. Any map that this commission selects will ultimately be an improvement on the current district map, so well done everyone involved. This whole process makes me proud and happy to be a Santa Barbara county resident. With that said, I'd like to make the case for 822. I believe this map does the best job at representing districts based on geographical boundaries and community ties when compared to the other two finalists.

Pro: Cuyama + Santa Maria Valley in the same district

822 is the only map that puts Cuyama + New Cuyama in the same districts as parts of the Santa Maria Valley. This makes sense because both areas are predominantly agricultural and geographically connected. On the other maps, where Cuyama/New Cuyama and the eastern South Coast are in the same district, community members would have to drive over 50 miles and potentially exit the county in order to get to a meeting.

Pro: Isla Vista remains in a district on the south coast

I think it's good to keep Isla Vista in the same district as the communities it neighbors for a few reasons:

1. It's the same economic zone. As a former resident of Isla Vista, I can say that nearly all Isla Vista residents rely on Goleta/East Goleta businesses for goods and services. T
2. Isla Vista has had a reputation for being a high crime area, especially when compared to Goleta and some of the other regions of the south coast. I think keeping county governance local will make the community stronger and more likely to address these issues than if Isla Vista remains an outlier in a larger district that's predominantly in the north part of the county.
3. It's geographically closer, meaning more opportunities for members of the Isla Vista community to engage in district-level politics.

Pro: Keeping the Santa Ynez Valley & its wine AVAs intact as a district.

The communities in the SYV depend more on viticulture and tourism than other parts of the north county.

Pro: Guadalupe + Santa Maria in the same district.

It's good to see that all maps did this since Guadalupe has strong communal and economic ties to Santa Maria.

Wash: Vandenburg AFB (village) / Lompoc in different districts, but also in the same district as Santa Maria

It would be ideal to have these two communities in the same district because they are both economically connected and geographically close. Splitting them will be unfortunate for both communities. However, Keeping Vandenburg in the same district as Santa Maria may also be helpful. According to the city's financial report from 2019, the AFB was Santa Maria's largest employer.

Con: Removing Goleta from the South coast

this is the only map that removes Goleta from the south coast which is unfortunate.

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

added 17 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 131**Name**

Shana Deleon

Email

igpon2@hotmail.com

Message

I live in Buellton and support 822

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

added 18 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 130

Message

Goleta residents want map 822c

Notes



Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)

added 21 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 129**Name**

Diane Mazur

Email

Diane_93463@yahoo.com

Message

The map that most aligns with the character and needs of the Third District is Map 822. Please implement that choice. To chose otherwise is just pure politics. Isla Vista has NO business being in this district. We are separate and disparate entities.

Thank you.

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

added 21 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 128**Name**

Nicholle Montalvo

Message

Map 822 is the map that makes the most sense in redistributing. Taking into consideration the demographics of each area, this map is the only one up for consideration that keeps voters satisfied.

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

added 22 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 127**Name**

Christina

Message

I live in Buellton and think map 822 makes the most sense. The latest map should not have been added in at eleventh hour without going through full review process. Santa ynez valley should stay in tact and IV should be districted with Goleta. Thank you!

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

added 23 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 126**Name**

John Coats Coats

Email

johncoats@aol.com

Message

I favor the map 818C because it sets the entire Cuyama Valley in a single district and leaves the eastern portion of the valley in District 1. This will simplify access with a single supervisor for the entire valley and preserve the existing district contact for the main population centers of the valley.

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

added 23 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 125**Message**

Definitely for 822C.

Orcutt Library is a capital improvement project for District 4. To select 818C would take Orcutt out of District 4 in which work is being done to establish a permanent residence for the Orcutt Library. 818C is an abomination!!! Orcutt with Isla Vista? A bad idea.

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

added 23 hours ago

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 123**Name**

Betty Gunn

Email

bgunn01@comcast.net

Message

Where is the 818C map?

KEYT has posted that 818c is one of the top contenders, but they show the 818 map. I can't find an 818c in the list on this website.

What is going on? When can we see the genuine 818c??

You have prided yourselves on being transparent so why keeping 818C map a secret?

When will you post this new and undiscussed by the public 818C?

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

added December 2, 2021 at 7:51 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 121**Name**

Karen Murphy

Email

Kmurph805@yahoo.com

Message

I support the redistricting map number 822. It is ridiculous to lump Isla Vista and Lompoc together. Thank you.

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

added December 2, 2021 at 7:01 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 120**Name**

Betty Gunn

Email

bgunn01@comcast.net

Message

When I check on KEYT's list of three proposed maps, I get 818 but not 818c as listed. Is the 818 map that is being shown correct?

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

added December 2, 2021 at 6:05 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 119**Name**

Marc Chytilo

Email

marc@lomcsb.com

Message

Please post the Committee-revised versions of the advancing maps asap and circulate email notification to the list. Last night the member-proposed revisions were poorly displayed. pls always leave a revised map on the screen long enough for pictures/screenshots to be captured for reference later in the hearing
thanks

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

added December 2, 2021 at 4:47 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 118**Name**

Jamie Davin

Email

jamiemdavin1@gmail.com

Message

Hello,

I support map 822 for redistricting. Lumping in North County areas into Isla Vista doesn't make any sense and gives the feeling the county is trying to gerrymander the districts.

Please choose map 822 so our county can have fair representation.

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

added December 2, 2021 at 2:52 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 117**Name**

Katie Hay

Email

khay@ccremanagement.com

Message

I am a resident of Santa Barbara and respectfully request the Commissioners implement map 408B. Isla Vista belongs in District 2!

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

added December 2, 2021 at 4:51 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 116**Name**

Leo Ortega

Email

leo.ortega@mixteco.org

Message

Good evening Commissioners,

My name is Leo Ortega, and I come from the Mixteco community here in Santa Maria, and I'm a community youth organizer. I am also here on behalf of the Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project better known as MICOP and our indigenous community that we serve.

Today, we are asking you to support Map 821B because it better represents our communities of interest, both Latino and Indigenous.

I support map 821B. From previous hearings, there has been so much public comment throughout this process in favor of uniting Guadalupe and Santa Maria's neighborhoods, who are indigenous and Latinx farmworkers. It is important to recognize our voices, because we are the ones who are affected the most when it comes to decision making. Not all of us are English speakers, not all of us are Spanish speakers, most of us speak Tu'un savi and other indigenous languages. Separating North West of Santa Maria with Guadalupe, will minimize our voices that will leave us unheard for another decade.

For our district, we would like someone that will represent our voices, someone who will understand our struggles, who will understand our needs in the community.

Thank you and good evening.

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

added December 2, 2021 at 4:30 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 114**Name**

Jake Parsons

Email

jakepparsons7@gmail.com

Message

Dear Commissioners,

I support Map 822. I've lived in Isla Vista for 4 years and am currently a student at UCSB. I believe Isla Vista and UCSB should be located in the 2nd Supervisorial District. The community of interest between Isla Vista and UCSB is much more with Santa Barbara and the south coast of Santa Barbara County than with the Santa Ynez Valley or Lompoc.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jake Parsons

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

added December 2, 2021 at 3:56 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 113**Name**

Gianna Colombo

Emailgiannam@hotmail.com**Message**

Please support 408B and 822. I am a native Californian and have properties in both Montecito and Los Olivos. Do not be deceived that Isla Vista residents have anything in common with Santa Ynez valley residents. Please use logic, reason and common sense to vote for 408B or 822. Thank you.

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

added December 2, 2021 at 3:49 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 112

Message

Dear Sir or Madam,

I'm writing to bring your attention to District 3, the least cohesive district in our county.

I lived in Isla Vista as a student for 4 years, and I am well aware of the differences between this community and nearby rural communities, both of which are currently part of District 3. More specifically, Isla Vista and the Santa Ynez Valley are 2 very different communities. Unlike Santa Ynez, Isla Vista does not contain farms or ranches and most of its residents are busy students or those who prefer an urban lifestyle. Therefore, Isla Vista should not be included in the same district as the Santa Ynez Valley. Please support map 408B.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Cheryl Jaworski

Notes



Admin Notification (ID: 5aeca69eea8d6)

added December 2, 2021 at 3:44 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 111**Name**

Terry Harden

Email

TerryHarden@gmail.com

Message

In district 3 we should not have Isla Vista. It belongs with Santa Barbara and Goleta areas. Please reconsider and remove Isla Vista from current map in district 3. I prefer map 822 or 408B. Thanks you Terry Harden

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

added December 2, 2021 at 1:43 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 110**Name**

Pamela Baczuk

Email

pambaczuk@fastmail.fm

Message

Thank you Commissioners for your dedication to this important and challenging process. I want to offer special thanks to Chair Morris and Vice Chair Turley.

I am a resident of New Cuyama.

My previous comments have focused on keeping the boundaries of the two districts that currently divide Cuyama, District One and District Five, as they are now. This seemed necessary for continuity of representation in the Groundwater Sustainability Agency.

During a community meeting last night, it became evident that many Cuyama residents are inclined to prefer the Cuyama Valley be placed in one district. The points made about the support Cuyama has received from the 1st District since its inclusion in District 1 concluded that District 1 has heard the needs of Cuyama and responded. Those residents in the Western portion of the Valley, feel that extending the boundaries of District 1 further west to the natural boundary near Rockfront Ranch, thus creating one district, would serve the population of the greater Valley.

If placed all in District 5, Cuyama's concerns could become overshadowed by the needs of Santa Maria and its surrounding towns. Furthermore, keeping Cuyama in District 1 will keep the knowledge, and research that has been accumulated by participation in the GSA, intact. We also discovered that doing so would not upset the balance of the GSA representation.

Therefore, I am requesting, that although no current map shows this boundary line, that one of the maps that indicate the current District 1 boundary, be revised to include this extension.

The very low population in the Western part of Cuyama Valley to Rockfront Ranch will not upset the demographic distribution.

Please extend the western boundary of District 1 to the natural geographic boundary just east of Rockfront Ranch.

Thank you.

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

added December 2, 2021 at 12:43 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 109**Name**

Karen Adams

Message

DistrictR 79817 / Plan 822

Public Comment

As a resident of the Cuyama Valley for over 17 years I have come to appreciate the uniqueness of our valley and the importance continuity plays in the representation of the residents of the Cuyama Valley and our plans for our future sustainability.

Over the last 10 years, the Cuyama Valley has greatly benefited under the representation of District 1. Several major issues remain in progress and will be best shepherded to completion by the cumulated knowledge of District 1 & District 5. I cannot stress strongly enough the importance of retaining the knowledge base, resources, relationships, and the environmentally sustainable vision that District 1 & District 5 bring to the table when advocating on behalf of the Cuyama Valley. Their representation has been, and continues to be, invaluable.

Currently, two ongoing issues of great concern to the Cuyama Valley are groundwater sustainability and cannabis growing. These issues are both pertinent examples of the need for continuity in our representation due to the complexity and long-term implementation of both issues. The residents of the Cuyama Valley would be hard pressed to impart over 5 years' worth of specialized knowledge to a new district. Any district other than District 1 and District 5 would be thrown into the intricacies of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and the District 1 brokered Cannabis Advisory Committee without benefit of having been involved from their inception.

I respectfully request that the greater Cuyama Valley area continue to be represented by District 1.

DistrictR 79817 / Plan 822 is a very good example of a map that allows for continuity of representation for the Cuyama Valley. Additionally, Plan 822 meets the goals of balancing population density, ethnic/racial diversity, and prevention of gerrymandering.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

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

added December 2, 2021 at 12:04 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 108**Name**

Lorin Bronson

Emailr805bronson@verizon.net**Message**

408B

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

added December 1, 2021 at 8:40 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 107**Name**

Brenton Kelly

Email

cuyamadorax@gmail.com

Message

My name is Brenton Kelly, I am in favor of keeping all the Cuyama Valley in the 1st District
I have been living and working in Cuyama Valley for over 14 years
I am on the Stakeholders Advisory Committee to the Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
The Cuyama Groundwater Basin absolutely needs the continuity and consistency of representation by the 1st District on the GSA .
The communities of Carpinteria, Montecito and Cuyama are all connected commercially and by public services with Ventura Co.
and that connection is best represented by one continuous 'eastside' district.
The Cuyama Valley is identified as everything upstream of Rock Front Ranch at the FS Road, east to Ventura Co. line
I strongly support keeping all of the Cuyama Valley in the 1st District in whichever map you consider.

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

added December 1, 2021 at 8:25 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 106**Name**

Tobe Plough

Email

TPlough@aol.com

Message

I have looked over the maps that are before the Commission and have a few comments. Currently and in the future, the control of natural resources and particularly water will be even more controversial than they are today. For this reason 408B is probably the fairest when looking at communities of common interest when it comes to water resources. Keeping South Coast communities together is accomplished by keeping large South Coast water users aligned with representation from the South Coast. Map 822 is close but strays by placing Cuyama in the First District. The three remaining maps really fail in their ability to address these resource issues in a coherent manner as the South Coast Communities are merged with North County communities where the water users have completely different circumstances.

Keeping common communities together will equate to better representation.

Thank you for your efforts.

Best regards,

Tobe Plough

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

added December 1, 2021 at 8:05 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 105**Name**

Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce

Message

The Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce supports Plan 408B. This plan preserves the integrity of our coastal communities by avoiding unnecessary splits along the coast. And by including Isla Vista in the 2nd district, this plan keeps our local college communities in Isla Vista and Santa Barbara together. Plan 408B also avoids merging communities that have little in common geographically, like what can be seen in other plans. Overall, Plan 408B is the best choice for maintaining community identity throughout Santa Barbara County. We hope the Commission will take these points into consideration as they move forward with their decision. Thank you.

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

added December 1, 2021 at 6:28 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 104**Name**

TJ Crandall

Emailtjcrandall95@gmail.com**Message**

Dear Commissioners,

I urge you to vote for Map 821B or Map 801C to bring fair representation to the SY Valley. The homeowners and taxpayers of the SY Valley should not be in the same district as transient college students of IV. This message has been loud and clear throughout the redistricting process and I hope it is reflected in your final vote. Please do what is right for the taxpayers of SB County!

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

added December 1, 2021 at 6:22 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

Contact Us : Entry # 103**Name**

Betty Gunn

Email

bgunn01@comcast.net

Message

I prefer 822.

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

added December 1, 2021 at 5:18 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.