

**Subject:** Comments on July 14 CRC Meeting and Visualizations

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Date:** 7/14/2011 3:26 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

July 14, 2011

Via electronic mail

Commissioners of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission  
901 P Street, Suite 154-A  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Comments About Visualizations for San Diego County Districts

Dear Commissioners:

The visualizations you discussed today for San Diego County do not look good for the API community because they are a step backward in respecting the community of interest testimony.

1. AD RCHMM now includes Fairbanks Ranch and Rancho Santa Fe. You were presented with numerous community of interest testimony from the API community both in person and via electronic mail that they had nothing in common with Fairbanks Ranch and Rancho Santa Fe and they should not be in a district with those extremely wealthy communities.
2. AD LMSAND again splits the Filipino American community in National City. The lines you are currently proposing do not extend far enough along E 8th Street and E Plaza Boulevard to the west up to D Avenue. The exact lines which match the community of interest testimony by the Filipino American community both in person and via electronic mail can be found in CAPAFR's Unity Map for AD LMSAND.
3. The Senate visualizations again draw east/west districts. There was an abundance of community of interest testimony that East County residents had nothing in common with Imperial County and urban/suburban residents in mid-section of the County had nothing in common with East County residents. Yet, you now include the Filipino American urban/suburban community in South Bay with the agricultural community of Imperial County. Clearly, there is no common or shared interests here. You also now include urban/suburban communities of Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos et al. with the northeast areas to the Riverside County line, ignoring the community of interest testimony. The overwhelmingly testimony was to draw north/south districts for most of the Senate Districts which would make more sense. The CAPAFR-MALDEF-AARC Unity Maps respects a Latino Voting Rights Act District while drawing north/south districts respecting the community of interest testimony for San Diego County.
4. The Congressional visualization options split the API community in

National City from Chula Vista.

We respectfully request that you compare the CAPAFR Unity Maps for San Diego County with your proposed visualizations. The Unity Maps have paid attention to the details of the minority community of interest testimony. We urge you to do the same.

Sincerely,

Palma Hooper  
President, SOUTHWEST CENTER FOR ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LAW  
San Diego County Regional Partner, CAPAFR

**Subject:** NO to MURTM visualization - It violates your policies

**From:** Stewart Gage <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** 7/14/2011 4:34 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioner Ontai and Commisisoners,

Recently, the State Redistricting Commission took a left turn in dramatically changing the North San Diego Inland Assembly district. They created a district called MURTM which splits two cities - Vista and Murrieta, and splits two counties - Riverside and San Diego. I can't believe you would support this change!

**The mission of the commission is to unify communities of interest, not split them. The initial Draft Map 1 was perfect for North Inland Assembly area. It unified Escondido and joined it with Valley Center, Pauma, Ramona and the agricultural interests to the east. It did not split cities. Please do not support MURTM but go back to the original, untainted by politics Draft map #1 which fulfilled the mission of the commission!**

The first draft of maps was perfect because it created a coastal and inland Assembly and Senate seats. These interests make sense. Now it is planned to cross counties and chop cities which is the number one mission of your efforts.

Thank you.

Stewart V. Gage

[REDACTED]  
Escondido, CA 92027  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** North/Central San Diego

**From:** Valerie Sanfilippo <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** 7/14/2011 4:02 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

LEG - TO STATE REDISTRICT COMMISSION, [REDACTED]

Re State Assembly District, I'm currently in 76, Toni Atkins, needs to be 250K:

Proposed map: You have put Linda Vista urban low income inland included with Pt Loma upscale coastal suburban, and cut off other parts of North Central San Diego.

Prefer: Do not make any cuts at 163-805 cross, this is not a boundary, neighborhoods on either side are similar and belong to our area.

Keep Clairemont, Bay Park, Linda Vista and Serra Mesa together, this is North Central San Diego, boundaries should be 5 on the West, 52 on the North, 15 on the East, and 8 on the South, excluding any communities of Mission Valley, this is about 250K people.

Re State Senate District, I'm currently in 39th, Christine Kehoe, needs to be 500K:

Proposed map: You have put Linda Vista, Central San Diego urban low income, included with El Cajon East County suburban, not part of San Diego city, and cut it off from other parts of North Central San Diego.

Prefer: Do not make any boundary line at 163/805 these roads cross our area, either side of them are similar neighborhoods and belong to our area.

Keep Clairemont, Bay Park, Kearny Mesa, Linda Vista, Serra Mesa together as North Central San Diego, boundaries should be 5 on the West, 52 on the North, 15 on the East, and 8 on the South including Mission Valley, excluding upscale Coastal area, this is about 500K.

Re US Congressional District, I'm currently in 53, Susan Davis, needs to be 750K:

Proposed map: You have put Linda Vista, central San Diego city urban low income, with upscale Poway suburban neighborhoods North County that are not in the city of San Diego.

Prefer: Do not use 163/805 cross area as a boundary, the neighborhoods on either side are similar and should be kept together, we are North Central San Diego.

Keep Clairemont, Linda Vista, Kearny Mesa, Serra Mesa, Bay Park, Mission Valley together with North Park, City Heights, College area, these are all Central San Diego, middle to low income with boundaries 5 on the West, 52 on the North, 15 on the East and 8 or 94 on the South, to include South Central San Diego, would come up to about 750K.

The city of San Diego is 1.3 M, taking off 600K of Northern, Eastern and Western suburbs of Ranchos, Del Cerro, and La Jolla-Point Loma would make Central San Diego.

It is clear to me that you have used the 163/805 interstate crossing between Clairemont and Serra Mesa as a dagger to slash the heart of San Diego and dilute middle and low income voters.

You have torn my low-income neighborhood of Linda Vista to shreds, throwing it to the wolves to the North, East and West.

I do not want a competitive district, I want a representative district, and I do not want to be overshadowed by richer neighborhoods who have more resources to influence and takeover elections.

Thank you.

--

Regards, Val Sanfilippo,

Seiu, Sierra, Moveon.