

Contact Webpage Entries Containing Comments Regarding  
Maps

- ☐ #164 - Maps 818 and 821B
- ☐ #163 - Map 822
- ☐ #162 - Maps 822, 821, 818
- ☐ #160 - Map 822C
- ☐ #159 - Maps 818B and 821B
- ☐ #158 - Map 818
- ☐ #157 - Maps 818, 818B, 818C
- ☐ #156 - Map 181
- ☐ #155 - Map 822
- ☐ #154 - District R map 89794, Map 821
- ☐ #152 - Maps 822, 821B
- ☐ #151 - Map 821, 818C
- ☐ #150 - Map 821C
- ☐ #149 - Map 822
- ☐ #148 - Maps 822C, 408B
- ☐ #147 - Maps 821C, 822
- ☐ #146 - Maps 821C, 818, 818C, 822

**Contact Us : Entry # 164****Message**

As a member of the Los Alamos community, I would like to submit a score for district maps 818 and 821b .

Thank you,  
Carlin Jones

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

added December 5, 2021 at 12:21 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 163****Name**

Betty Gunn

**Email**

[bgunn01@comcast.net](mailto:bgunn01@comcast.net)

**Message**

As President of the Friends of the Orcutt Library, I am reporting that our members wholeheartedly select map 822. When it comes to "tweaking" the map, please keep Old Orcutt, New Orcutt, and the neighborhoods east of 101 such as Lake Marie intact. Thank you.

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

added December 4, 2021 at 9:14 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 162****Name**

Mario Espinoza-Kulick

**Email**

[mvespinoza@ucsb.edu](mailto:mvespinoza@ucsb.edu)

**Message**

Good afternoon commissioners,

My name is Dr. Mario Espinoza-Kulick. I am a resident of Santa Barbara County, educator, and a concerned community member and voter. These are my own views.

Map 822 is an insult to Latinx voters in Guadalupe and Santa Maria, as well as the many renters, including students, that are struggling against a housing crisis that many of the wealthy homeowners in Santa Barbara and Montecito benefit from. How are we at a place where we are deliberately dividing protected groups and neighborhoods? Is that not Gerrymandering? I am strongly opposed to Map 822 because of the seemingly unintended consequences it will have on Isla Vista, Goleta, and the Santa Maria Valley.

For that reason, I am expressing my full support for maps 821 and 818. Not only does this provide an opportunity for politically diverse Latinx voices to be heard, it also preserves the geographical integrity of each district and is more close in respecting the interests of our Native Chumash Community. This is my public comment, thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Mario Espinoza-Kulick, MA, PhD

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

added December 4, 2021 at 9:03 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 161****Name**

Lynn Carlisle

**Email**

[lynn@cvfrc.org](mailto:lynn@cvfrc.org)

**Message**

I was in chambers today (12/4) and intended to speak in person today. However several people in the audience were not masked or properly masked. So I will make my comments via Zoom. Please enforce the mask mandate next time.

Thank you,  
Lynn

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

added December 4, 2021 at 8:15 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 160****Name**

Greg Ulrick

**Email**

[dgulrick@verizon.net](mailto:dgulrick@verizon.net)

**Message**

I support Map 822c.

Please remove Isla Vista from the voting area for north county - Lompoc, Santa Ynez Valley, and Santa Maria Valley.

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

added December 4, 2021 at 5:33 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 159****Name**

Theresa Doutney

**Email**

[TeriD1318@yahoo.com](mailto:TeriD1318@yahoo.com)

**Message**

I speak in support of maps 818B and 821 B. Would like to speak at hearing but having trouble finding the link, at 9:26 a.m. on 12/4/2021

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

added December 4, 2021 at 5:27 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 158****Name**

Jon Hooten

**Email**

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

**Message**

In support of map 818: Placing Guadalupe and North Santa Maria together presents an important opportunity for the Latino community to have an elected voice in county business. Keeping the third district with IV but expanding it to include Orcutt balances that district politically and will keep it a competitive seat.

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

added December 4, 2021 at 2:29 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.



**Contact Us : Entry # 157****Name**

Todd Wilson

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

Final 3. I like Map family 818 the best, with IV a more reasonable 3rd District than Goleta split. One of them must go to Dist 3. Latest Map 818-C is too harsh on Orcutt and not necessary. I drew a modified 818-B (12-3 ID89826) by extending district 2 into Lake Cachuma and surrounding watershed and North to North County Boundary line. I extended Santa Maria east of US 101 and moved from Berreravia to Stowell and I extended Goleta Westward to City Limits. Results very tight population balance and significant geographic District Boundary Balance.

Map 821 is unnecessarily bloated District 4. Lake Cachuma could be adjusted out of Dist 4 and into Dist 2, just as Public GalleryMap Model ID89826 shows above. Also no reason for Dist 4 to extend into the National forest. Orcutt, VAFB, Santa Ynez Valley, Lake Cachuma, Resources of National Forest. District 4 is not deserving and my least favorite of the three.

Map 822 has potential with modification. District 2 is underutilized for some reason. Same treatment available with Dist 2 extended to cover Lake Cachuma and watershed +extend to North County Line to reduce both Dist 3 and Dist 1 footprint for a balanced map. I don't like the Goleta Split.

Argument for Guadalupe to be in District 5. Former District 4 Supervisor said in open hearing - I can't wait to get Covid. District 4 Supervisor said in open hearing - Patterson Rd land use appeal, I tend to approve anything that puts a nail to a plank. Current District 4 Supervisor said in open hearing after 4 District Supervisors gave rave complements County Women's Commission - I apologize for being late filling two of the commission seats. I've been trying to get the right ideology, it's important to get the right fit for the community. Fourth District - Orcutt Community Plan Area land use public hearings are packed with opposition public comment - it's like the wild west.

Guadalupe is best served in District 5, they deserve a strong voice in their leadership.

I vote Map 818, assuming Orcutt issues and any overextension of District 4 are cured. District 2 is underutilized - let's extend coverage. Balance the population and geographic District Boundary authority.

Todd Wilson

Orcutt

These Redistrict Commission

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

added December 4, 2021 at 5:47 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 156****Name**

Katie Hay

**Email**

[khay@ccremanagement.com](mailto:khay@ccremanagement.com)

**Message**

Dear Commissioners,

Throughout the course of your many months of service, you have stated time and time again, that commissioners would NOT draw their own maps. Instead, they would “adjust” maps as necessary based on final commission deliberations.

Unfortunately, Map 818 is an aberration of your intentions. No one from the public requested that Orcutt be placed in the same district as Isla Vista and UCSB!

This version of Map 818 came from one commissioner only and not the public.

This late in the process, the community should not have been shocked at the last minute by way of this commissioner drawn and submitted map!

Orcutt, the Santa Ynez Valley and IV/UCSB are disparate communities, not communities of interest.

Orcutt is primarily working class families.

SY Valley is a semi-rural community primarily comprised estates and vineyards with many retirees.

IV and UCSB are single students here on a temporary basis living in a densely populated coastal community.

Please reject map 818 from further consideration accordingly.

Furthermore, please place IV and UCSB in a south county district, where IT IS and where IT BELONGS!

Sincerely,  
Katie Hay  
SB County Resident

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

added December 4, 2021 at 3:24 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 155****Name**

Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce

**Message**

The Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce supports Plan 822 for final consideration. Of the remaining plans, 822 best preserves the integrity of our coastal communities by avoiding unnecessary splits along the coast. Plan 822 is also the only remaining plan that places Isla Vista in the same district as Santa Barbara, keeping our local college communities together. Unlike Plans 818 and 821, which draw districts spanning unnecessarily large geographic areas, Plan 822 avoids merging communities that have little in common geographically. Plan 822 instead draws succinct and common-sense boundaries across all five districts, which are the best representation of local communities that can be reached, given the restrictions of population distribution. Even still, Plan 822 manages to only have a population deviation of 0.07%. Overall, Plan 822 is the best remaining choice for maintaining community identity throughout Santa Barbara County, while still adhering to the proper guidelines of the redistricting process. We hope the commission will take these points into consideration as they move forward with this important decision. Thank you.

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

added December 4, 2021 at 2:35 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

## Contact Us : Entry # 154

### Message

Dear Commissioners,

821 is clearly the best choice for uniting as many communities of interest as possible and protecting underrepresented groups. It also is the map that has earned the most support from commissioners so far. It would be a good choice to narrow it down to 821 and then make needed small changes in order to reach 7 votes for a map before the deadline.

One small change I'd suggest to satisfy some recent concerns would be to make small edits to the SYV border between the 3rd and 4th Districts. It was a good idea to modify 821 to include the Chumash Reservation in the 3rd District. However, some have argued this change leads to splitting the SYV. Please consider District R map 89794 ( <https://districtr.org/plan/89794?event=sbcounty> ) for an improved boundary that reduces total splits from 4 back to 3 while accomplishing the same goals. This ensures the Chumash are united with their important ancestral heritage sites while keeping all 5 towns and cities, and the vast majority of the inhabited unincorporated areas in the SYV, in the same district. Thank you.

### Notes



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

added December 4, 2021 at 1:49 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 153****Name**

D'Ann Bartley

**Email**

[dann@dannbartley.com](mailto:dann@dannbartley.com)

**Message**

Orcutt should not be lumped with Isla Vista! We want to stay in North County with Santa Maria!! Keep Orcutt in District 4!!

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

added December 4, 2021 at 1:08 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 152****Name**

Ed Fuller

**Email**

[ed@sanroquerealty.com](mailto:ed@sanroquerealty.com)

**Message**

Dear Commissioners,

I would like to recommend that you adopt the modified 822 map. This map not only has a high Hispanic district (62%, not far off of 821B's 68% that so many people recommended) but it keeps both the cities of Goleta and Lompoc largely intact, it keeps the Santa Ynez tribe of Chumash intact and includes their Gaviota coastline, it combines the lower westside and lower east sides of the city of Santa Barbara, and it keeps the Cuyama communities, water basin and watershed largely intact. It is the clear, fair, and just choice amongst all the maps. I urge you to adopt 822 as modified.

Thank you,

Ed Fuller

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

added December 4, 2021 at 12:59 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 151****Name**

Pamela Baczuk

**Email**

[pambaczuk@fastmail.fm](mailto:pambaczuk@fastmail.fm)

**Message**

Thank you Commissioners for your dedicated work. Once again, I must thank Chair Morris and Vice Chair Turley for taking the time to talk to the people of Cuyama in person, to hear our voices.

As Chair Morris and Chair Turley heard, Cuyama finds it preferable to be placed all in one district, preferring District One. Since the inclusion of Cuyama in District One, the Cuyama Valley has experienced better support and our concerns have been recognized. District One has been instrumental in several improvements in the area.

The formation of the Community Association, the public library annex, the Urban Greening project to revitalize the community park adding trees and a walking path, the rebuilding of the community swimming pool that failed due to improper construction name a few of the benefits Cuyama has experienced from the support of District One.

Extending the boundary of District 1 to the natural geographic boundary of Rockfront Ranch will not upset the population balance due to the fact that the western portion of the Valley has a very low population density.

Of the three finalist focus maps, one draws the boundary for District One in the area that people in Cuyama requested. However, I can not support 818C in its entirety as it is drawn.

Of the three finalist maps, I would suggest that 821 be amended to draw the Western boundary of District 1 at Rockfront Ranch, thus including the entire Cuyama Valley in District One.

In 821 communities of interest are grouped. The vineyard towns are in District 4. Santa Barbara is grouped with Isla Vista and Goleta, as I have heard from residents that it is their preference, in District 2. District 3 groups Vandenburg and Lompoc. District 5 groups Santa Maria and Guadalupe. Orcutt in District 4 on Map 821 is separated from Guadalupe, which I have heard from residents of Guadalupe is preferable to them.

If possible, please amend map 821 to include that portion of District 5 in the area west of Rockfront Ranch. If it is not possible, then the amendment of the District One boundary to extend to Rockfront Ranch is acceptable on Map 821.

Thank you for all your hard work.  
Pamela Baczuk

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

added December 4, 2021 at 12:32 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 150****Name**

Michael Lebell

**Email**

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

**Message**

Please keep SB the environmental paradise it is. Map 821c gives the environmental loving residents a. Hance to preserve this jewel...

Thanks  
ML

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

added December 4, 2021 at 12:03 am

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.



**Contact Us : Entry # 149****Name**

Justin Shores

**Email**

[j\\_shores@hotmail.com](mailto:j_shores@hotmail.com)

**Message**

After researching and talking with others it seems the map that was snuck in without being imputed from the public is a violation of the law and Redistricting process. Who drew this map?

Please support maps that do not have political party influence like the CAUSE maps do. IV should not be in the same district as Lompoc and SYV by any logical explanation. Map 822 is the only logical and possibly legal option at this point. Thank you.

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

added December 3, 2021 at 11:49 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 148****Name**

Jennifer Mehl

**Email**

[jennifer.mehl@gmail.com](mailto:jennifer.mehl@gmail.com)

**Message**

I would like to provide feedback on the three finalist maps. As a resident of Orcutt, I believe Map 822C is the most representative map for the community of Orcutt and most fairly represents the demographics, characteristics and interests of the different areas of Santa Barbara County. Map 408B is a distant second place, but it is not in the finalist group.

Please strongly consider Map 822C for your final vote.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Mehl  
1291 Hollysprings Ln  
Orcutt, CA

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

added December 3, 2021 at 11:17 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 147****Name**

Lucille Boss

**Email**

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

**Message**

Dear Chair Morris and Commissioners,

I am a long time resident of the County's Second District, and I support map 821C Rios, with slight improvements.

It is important to allow the Chumash to connect their valley and coastal territories. 821C Rios map allows that, while otherwise retaining the structure created by its original maker. The one change I would make is to move the line between the Lompoc Valley and Santa Ynez Valley regions to reflect a more logical separation, which is where the 101 runs north/south. I would, however, put Buellton on the Santa Ynez Valley side of that boundary because it clearly is part of that community of interest. Once you exit the city limits, however, it is clearly more closely aligned with the area west, heading towards Lompoc and the Lompoc Valley.

I am unhappy with plan 822 for a few reasons. It bypasses Goleta, which is closer to adjacent communities it has more in common with -- just to add Isla Vista into the 2nd district and out of the 3rd district. Really, this is obvious gerrymander. It also does not reflect the wishes of the Goleta City Council (in a 4-1 vote), which is to have two supervisors. However, if you decide you like it because it separates the Santa Ynez Valley from IV, as some of you have supported, please make sure the boundaries make sense. The tiny amount of Goleta left in the 2nd district hardly counts, and it splits a neighborhood.

For reasons not expressed publicly to my knowledge, the "821 FINALIST" version of this map changes the boundary between the 1st and 2nd districts for no logical reason. State Street has mostly been the boundary for the north/south area above Mission, with a bit pushed further north of State. The 821 FINALIST map moves that line all the way south to De La Vina, not State St., which is the more significant natural road boundary between the east and west sides of the City. Moving the line to De La Vina splits neighborhoods and changes which district these voters will vote in, for no reason I can discern.

I appreciate all your work and the time you take to read my concerns.

Sincerely,

Lucille Boss  
Santa Barbara

Lucille Boss (she, her, hers I ella)  
[pineapplesandpink@yahoo.com](mailto:pineapplesandpink@yahoo.com)  
805.637.5129

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

added December 3, 2021 at 11:06 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.

**Contact Us : Entry # 146****Name**

Nadia Lee Abushanab

**Email**

[nadia@abushanab.com](mailto:nadia@abushanab.com)

**Message**

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to you as an individual and a resident of the Westside of Santa Barbara, and a former resident of Isla Vista. I support map 821C because it keeps the Chumash Santa Ynez reservation with the Gaviota Coast as requested by the tribe. I also support 821C because it keeps my community of the Westside with the Eastside of Santa Barbara. On the east and west side we are essential workers, low income, people of color, young people, and families, and we should be kept together. I oppose map 818C (which is extremely different from map 818, which I initially did support) because it puts Isla Vista with Orcutt. These communities have nothing in common, Isla Vista is majority renters, students, and low income families, and Orcutt has many more homeowners who have higher incomes. Isla Vista's voice will be drowned out in this district. Map 822 would do the same thing to Isla Vista by putting it with Hope Ranch, another community made of mostly homeowners with very high incomes.

Please support map 821C

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

added December 3, 2021 at 11:05 pm

WordPress successfully passed the notification email to the sending server.