



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: December 4, 2021, 10:00 a.m.

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

Call to Order – Roll Call

Commission Convened at 10:01 a.m.

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

Commissioners Absent: None

Chair Morris announced the meeting will recess at approximately 11 a.m., and Item 2 (Closed Session) will be taken out of order.

Informational Items (Items 1)

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.

Item 2 was taken out of order at 11:01 a.m.

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.

Attorney Ordin reported the following:

- No reportable action was taken.

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

• Email: redistricting@countyofsb.org

• Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/sbcredistrictingcommission>

• Website: www.DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org

• Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/sbcredistricting/>

- Discussed Dr. Meagan Gall’s process and report on racially polarized voting analysis in Santa Barbara (particularly in District 4 and 5), commissioners received a copy of the confidential report, and at their discretion agreed to release the confidential report to the public.
- Legal Counsel will prepare a draft of the final report for the next meeting, to be filed at the same time a plan is adopted.
- Final Map Selection/Adoption Timeline:
 - December 4, 2021 (today) – Identify final map
 - December 8, 2021 – *Adopt map and present and approve final report
**There is some flexibility (to add a meeting if necessary) if no map is adopted on December 8, 2021*
 - December 15, 2021 – Entire process must be completed

Discussion Items (Items 3-4)

3. Approval of Minutes of November 18, 2021, and November 22, 2021.

Motion to approve the Minutes of November 18, 2021, and November 22, 2021.

Motion Carried: 11 Ayes 0 Noes 0 Absent

Commissioner Trosky expressed concerns about fairness and transparency regarding the approved round 2 focus maps 818, 821B and 822, and the maps selected at the December 1 meeting. The Commissioners discussed map 818 (Turley), 821B (Ochoa/Twibell), and 822 (Bray/Trosky/Turley) to move forward for further consideration.

Motion made for the round two focus maps 818 (Turley), 821B (Ochoa/Twibell), and 822 (Bray/Trosky/Turley) move forward for further discussion and consideration.

Motion Carried: 11 Ayes 0 Noes 0 Absent

Chair Morris announced the following:

- The County public health order has been extended requiring face coverings be worn at all times in public buildings.
 - In-person speakers for public comment complete a speaker form, and only those Zoom participants who use the “raise your hand” prior to the first public comment will have an opportunity to speak. Those who were not able to speak may submit written comments at www.drawsantabarbaracounty.org under the “Contact Us” tab.
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.

Dr. Phillips presented the following:

- Rules for Drawing the Lines
- Table of Finalist Focus Plans: 818 (Turley), 821B (Ochoa/Twibell) and 822 (Bray/Trosky/Turley)
 - 818 (Turley):
 - Joins Guadalupe and Santa Maria, and Isla Vista linked with Santa Ynez Valley and a portion of Lompoc
 - 4 Splits: Santa Barbara, Goleta, Lompoc and Santa Maria
 - 821B (Ochoa/Twibell):
 - Joins Guadalupe and Santa Maria, Isla Vista linked with Lompoc Valley (including Vandenberg area), and not the Santa Ynez Valley
 - 3 Splits: Santa Barbara, Goleta and Santa Maria
 - 822 (Bray/Trosky/Turley):
 - Joins Guadalupe and Santa Maria, Isla Vista part of District 2 and joins Santa Barbara and Eastern Goleta Valley
 - 5 Splits: However, with minor adjustments can be reduced to 2 splits, as Goleta and Lompoc have small areas in other districts that can be joined with the rest of the city

Recessed the meeting at 11:01 a.m., for Closed Session, and reconvened in Open Session at 12:08 p.m.

Public Comments (Limited to 1 minute per speaker, and 2 minutes if Spanish interpretation is needed)

- Speaker 1, Denice Adams: In support of map 822, and concerns about the process.
- Speaker 2, Justin Shores: Commented about Latino representation, Isla Vista, and gerrymandering.
- Speaker 3, David Fierro: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 4, Grace Wallace: In support of map 822, and keep UCSB with Goleta.
- Speaker 5, Hillary Blackerby: In support 821B with revision connecting the Chumash Reservation to the Gaviota Coast, and 818 with slight modification to the watershed.
- Speaker 6, Spencer Brandt: Commented about Isla Vista, and in support of map 821B and 818.
- Speaker 7, Fermina Murray: In support of map 821B, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 8, Julie Bischoff: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 9, Miki Hammel: Concerns about the process, map 818, and in support of map 822.
- Speaker 10, JL Duncan: In support of map 818 public version.
- Speaker 11, Rebecca Gowing: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 12, Stephanie Velazquez: Concerns about commissioners accepting maps submitted after the deadline, and in support of map 822.
- Speaker 13, Dr. Karen Rice: In support of map 818 (as it's been reverted), and 821B or 821C.
- Speaker 14, Sam Cohen: In support of map 818.
- Speaker 15, Carol Mahoney: Commented about Guadalupe and Orcutt common connections, in support of map 822C, and opposes map 818C.
- Speaker 16, Carlos Santos: Opposes map 818.

- Speaker 17, Carol Redhead: Commented about Isla Vista, and in support of map 822.
- Speaker 18, Doug Dougherty: In support of map 822, and opposes 818.
- Speaker 19, David Hudspeth: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 20, Paula Perotte: In support of map 818 and 821, keep Goleta supervision in District 2 and 3, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 21, Skylar Payab: In support of map 821, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 22, Christian Alonso: In support of map 821.
- Speaker 23, Leilanie Rubinstein: In support of map 818 and 821B, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 24, Bobbi McGinnis: Commented about the process, and opposes map 818C.
- Speaker 25, Carol Gregor: In support of map 822, and opposes 818C Turley.
- Speaker 26, Denise El Amin: Commented about commissioner selection and diversity, and in support of map 821.
- Speaker 27, Fahmee El Amin: In support of map 818 and 821B.
- Speaker 28, Jesus Uribe: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 29, Lupe Aldecoa (via interpreter): In support of map 822.
- Speaker 30, Maria Lopez: In support of map 822, and opposes 818.
- Speaker 31, Tania Lucero (via interpreter): In support of map 822, and opposes 818.
- Speaker 32, Teri Doutney: In support of map 821B (to include Chumash ancestral land) and 818, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 33, Yolanda Rodriguez: In support of map 822, and opposes 818.
- Speaker 34, Antonio Medina: In support of map 822 or 821, and opposes map 818.
- Speaker 35, Connie Ford: In support of map 821.
- Speaker 36, Geneva Lovett: In support of map 818 and 821B, keep Isla Vista with Ellwood and Western Goleta, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 37, Dr. Paul Chounet: In support of map 821B (with amendment extending to Rockfront Ranch).
- Speaker 38, Amy Blair: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 39, Dr. Thomas Cole: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 40, James Kyriaco: In support of map 818 and 821B, keep Goleta in 2 districts, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 41, Michele Weslander Quaid: In support of map 822 with modifications to keep Goleta with Santa Barbara.
- Speaker 42, Michael English: In support of map 822 with modifications to keep Goleta with Santa Barbara in District 2, and opposes 818 and 821.
- Speaker 43, Erica Reyes: In support of map 818 and 821.
- Speaker 44, Lisa Ostendorf: Isla Vista, UCSB and SBCC should be in District 2, Lompoc and Santa Ynez kept with (mostly) agricultural areas in District 3 and 4, and in support of map 822.
- Speaker 45, Ignaao Hernandez: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 46, Janet Flores: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 47, Jorge Sanchez: Disappointed with late map submission, and in support of map 822.
- Speaker 48, Kyle Richards: Opposes map 822.
- Speaker 49, Lee Heller: In support of map 818 and 821B with revisions to both, and problem with map 822C.
- Speaker 50, Lorena Gonzalez: Commissioner diversity and late map submission.

- Speaker 51, Lynn Carlisle: Commented about Cuyama Valley, in support of 821B with modifications to Chumash land in District 3, and 818 with a modification to both moving the District 1 boundary 20 miles west to Rockfront Ranch.
- Speaker 52, Maria Aldecoa (via interpreter): In support of map 822.
- Speaker 53, Rebeca Garcia: In support of map 821B.
- Speaker 54, Jennifer Smith: Keep Isla Vista with Western Goleta, and in support of map 821.
- Speaker 55, Greg Hammel: In support of map 822, and opposes map 818 and 821.
- Speaker 56, Joseph Mitchell: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 57, Barbara Batastini: In support of map 822, keeping Isla Vista and UCSB together with Goleta, and opposes 818 and 821B.
- Speaker 58, Roy Reed: In support of map 822, and opposes 818 and 821.
- Speaker 59, Ruth Johnson: In support of map 818 and 821B, and concerns about boundary changes to 822.
- Speaker 60, Lisa Sloan: In support of map 822, and commented about the Chumash Tribal Home Lands and Reservation.
- Speaker 61, Lawanda Lyons-Pruitt: In support the original map 818 revised by Lata Murti, and 821C Rios.
- Speaker 62, Gail Teton-Landis: In support of map 818 and 821 Rios amendment, and questioned the revision to 822C.
- Speaker 63, Gabe Escobedo: In support of map 821.
- Speaker 64, Hazel Davalos: In support of map 818 and 821, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 65, Zulema Aleman: In support of map 818 and 821.
- Speaker 66, Ian Baucke: Referenced written comment submission, and in support of map 821.
- Speaker 67, George Relles: Opposes map 822.
- Speaker 68, Sara Macdonald: In support of map 821B.
- Speaker 69, Alan Ebenstein: In support of map 822, and opposes 821B.
- Speaker 70, Lucille Boss: Commented about typo in written comment submitted yesterday, and in support of map 821 Rios.
- Speaker 71, Tiela Black-Law: Commented about tenants/renters, in support of map 821, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 72, Rosanne Crawford: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 73, Nik Schiffmann: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 74, Gail Osherenko: In support of map 821C Rios, and concerns about changes to map 822 at Wednesday's meeting.
- Speaker 75, Cliff Solomon: In support of map 821 Rios.
- Speaker 76, Jenelle Osborne: Keep Lompoc and Lompoc Valley as whole as possible, and in support of map 821B with changes to the Chumash ancestral land.
- Speaker 77, Elizabeth Cortez: In support of map 821 or original map 818, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 78, Angelo Caciola: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 79, Karen Miller: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 80, LeAnne: Opposes map 822.
- Speaker 81, BL Borovay: In support of map 818 or 821, and opposes 822.
- Speaker 82, Dar Ringling: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 83, Ken Hough: Referenced written comment submission in support of map 818 and 821, and opposes 822.

- Speaker 84, Antonio Ramirez: Commented about Guadalupe residents, and in support of 818 and 821.
- Speaker 85, Jay Freeman: Commented about Measure G and map changes.
- Speaker 86, Michelle de Werd: In support of map 822.
- Speaker 87, Steve LeBard: In support of map 822, and opposes changes to map 818 adding Orcutt to Isla Vista.
- Speaker 88, Juan Garcia (via interpreter): In support of map 822.
- Speaker 89, Matt Lowe: In support of map 821, and opposes 822.

Recessed the meeting at 2:03 p.m., and reconvened the meeting at 2:23 p.m.

Commissioner Discussion:

- Goal is to select a map (7 vote minimum to pass)
- Combining elements of maps into one map
- Select a map as a starting point
- Start with map 822 with the lowest deviation
- Start with 818 or 821 as they have a large amount of public support

Following discussion, the Commissioners were polled, and a majority selected map 822 as the starting point.

Commissioner Suggested Changes to Map 822:

- Commissioner Turley
 - Cuyama Valley in District 1
 - Guadalupe and East Santa Maria to be together
 - Use a modified version of District 1 from map 818
 - Use a modified version of District 5 from map 821
- Commissioner Rios
 - Agrees with Commissioner Turley's suggestions
 - Eastern border Highway 101, Southern border Highway 135 (Broadway)
- Commissioner Bradley
 - Likes District 3 from map 818
- Commissioner Bray
 - Agrees with combining Cuyama Valley into District 1
 - Concerns about the Goleta split, and a way to realign Eastern Goleta Valley
- Commissioner McClintock
 - Agrees with combining Cuyama Valley into District 1, and also likes District 3 from map 818
- Commissioner Trosky
 - Agrees with moving Cuyama Valley into District 1
- Commissioner Ochoa
 - Agrees with moving Cuyama Valley into District 1
 - Make the City of Lompoc whole, including coastal access
- Commissioner Hartman
 - Agrees with moving Cuyama Valley into District 1

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

- How to split Goleta
- Commissioner Kaseff
 - Concurs with Commissioner Turley's suggestions
 - Supports removing Isla Vista from District 3
 - District 3 should include Los Alamos
 - Concerns about splitting Lompoc
- Commissioner Twibell
 - Agrees with moving New Cuyama into District 1 (including the Cuyama Valley ground water basin)
 - Like to see Goleta made whole (part not in District 3), and the small portion of Lompoc not included
 - Where to place Los Alamos
- Chair Morris
 - In agreement with making Cuyama Valley whole in District 1 (suggest adopting the School District boundaries)
 - Look at District 5
 - Majority of public testimony seems in favor of splitting Goleta, and suggests using highway 101 as the boundary (look at the split of the City of Santa Barbara)

The commissioners discussed keeping Isla Vista and South Goleta in District 3, North Goleta in some fashion in District 2, and the results are as follows:

- Commissioner Hartman: Keep working on it as it appears on the screen
- Commissioner Ochoa: Open to flipping
- Commissioner Trosky: Keep it with the 101 South in District 2
- Commissioner Kaseff: Keep 822 as we see it
- Commissioner Twibell: Keep 822 as we see it
- Commissioner Bray: Keep 822 as we see it
- Commissioner Turley: Open to flipping
- Commissioner Rios: Open to flipping
- Commissioner Bradley: Open to flipping
- Commissioner McClintock: Open to flipping
- Chair Morris: Keep it

Recessed the meeting at 4:43 p.m., and reconvened at 4:58 p.m.

Following discussion and modifications to the proposed final preferred map, the statistics are:

- Total Population Deviation: 7.7%
 - District 1 – over by 1.7
 - District 2 – over by 3.5
 - District 3 – over by 3.1

- District 4 – under by 4.0
- District 5 – under by 4.2

- CVAP: District 1 – 23%
District 2 – 23%
District 3 – 27%
District 4 – 29%
District 5 – 67%

- Splits: 5

Public Comments (Limited to 1 minute per speaker, and 2 minutes if Spanish interpretation is needed)

- Speaker 1, Lee Heller: Concerns about Goleta not being asked how they want to be split and suggests putting Goleta south of highway 101 in District 3.
- Speaker 2, Carol Redhead: Likes the version of the final preferred map presented.
- Speaker 3, Alan Ebenstein: This map is a good compromise.
- Speaker 4, Jenelle Osborne: Appreciates the compromise and keeping Lompoc whole, but disappointed that it isn't linked with the Vandenberg area.
- Speaker 5, JL Duncan: Not happy as the deviation on this map is high and should have used 818 as the base.
- Speaker 6, Jennifer Smith: Good progress on this map, and suggests that Goleta should be East/West, and not North/South, as that changes the voting for a large group in Goleta Valley.
- Speaker 7, Julie Bischoff: Good compromise and Goleta should be with UCSB and Isla Vista.
- Speaker 8, Justin Shores: Likes the map compromise, and keep Isla Vista out of Santa Ynez.
- Speaker 9, Mary O.: Shocked that eastern Goleta Valley is in 3 supervisorial districts, and the importance of keeping the unincorporated area together, and not split into 3 districts.
- Speaker 10, Ian Baucke: This map still needs a lot of work, should have started modifications from 818 or 821, and the need for a second proposal.
- Speaker 11, Geneva Lovett: Agrees that 821 is a better map to start, and disappointed with using 822 as a base.
- Speaker 12, James Kyriaco: Put Old Town Goleta and the Airport in District 3 with Ellwood, and Western Goleta in District 2 north of highway 101.
- Speaker 13, Rebecca Gowing: This map is a good compromise.
- Speaker 14, Roy Reed: This map is pivotal.
- Speaker 15, Jonathan Abboud: Isla Vista staying District 3 along with Western Goleta Valley is critical.
- Speaker 16, Carlos Lopez: Agrees with Jonathan Abboud, and disappointed map 818 was not used as the baseline.
- Speaker 17, Rosanne Crawford: Impressed with this compromise.
- Speaker 18, Fahmee El Amin: Dismayed with the process, and commented about diluting political power in District 3.
- Speaker 19, Denice Adams: Makes sense to use 822 as the base map.
- Speaker 20, Greg Hammel: In favor of map 822, and the maximum CVAP.
- Speaker 21, Amy Blair: The map is a good compromise.
- Speaker 22, Grace Wallace: Likes the preferred map 822.

- Speaker 23, Lisa Ostendorf: Fair map and likes the compromise.

Motion to approve the final preferred map as shown, and NDC to perform a technical review.

Commissioner Comments:

More work needs to be done to Goleta, in response to public comments.

Motion Failed: 5 Ayes 6 Noes 0 Absent

Discussion included East/West modifications that reduced the split in Eastern Goleta Valley to 2 districts, instead of 3.

Dr. Johnson commented about compactness and contiguity.

Motion to accept the map with the changes to Goleta as shown, as the final preferred map.

Commissioner Discussion:

Statistics for the proposed changes to District 2 and 3 as presented:

- Renters: District 2 is still a majority renters district just over 50%, and District 3 is at 44%
- CVAP: District 1 = 23%, District 2 = 21%, District 3 = 30%, District 4 = 29%, and District 5 = 67%
- Final Deviation: 7.65%

Commissioner Comments:

- This change moves Isla Vista out of District 3
- Most growth in the County is anticipated to be in District 4 and 5

Motion Carried: 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. Written public comments are posted at <https://DrawSantaBarbaraCounty.org/calendar-agenda/>

General Public Comments (Limited to 1 minute per speaker, and 2 minutes if Spanish interpretation is needed)

- Speaker 1, Denice Adams: Unhappy with this entire process.
- Speaker 2, Michelle de Werd: Thanked the Commissioners.
- Speaker 3, Nik Schiffmann: Congratulated the Commissioners.
- Speaker 4, Bret Filippin: Great work.

- Speaker 5, Sara Macdonald: Thank Commissioners and suggested adjourning the meeting in memory of Commissioner Kate Adams.
- Speaker 6, Lee Heller: Thanked the Commissioners.
- Speaker 7: Commented about fairness and disappointed with the results.

Reports from Legal Counsel, Demographer and Communications Consultant

Attorney Ordin: The final report will be posted on the website.

NDC: Closed Session will be on the next agenda, and the adopted map will be posted on the website.

Commissioner Comments

Anticipated agenda on December 8, 2021 to include formal ratification of the map, and adoption of the legal report.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:54 p. m. The next meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, December 8, 2021, at 6:00 p.m., in the Planning Commission Room, 123 Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara (and virtually via Zoom).