

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]My vote

---

**From:** joanne cowan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 4:50 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]My vote

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I feel it is very unfair to allow the Pattern's map to become our district map when there was no reason to change the map at all. This is a clear intent to gerrymandering and I for one will sign on to take this matter into a court of law. It is unfair and takes away citizens right to vote and be counter. What the heck is going on with our current BOS?

Sincerely,  
Dr. Joanne Smith

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]gerrymandering the SLOCO supervisor Districts

---

**From:** Lori Mather [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 5:30 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]gerrymandering the SLOCO supervisor Districts

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly condemn the supervisor board majority for voting to adopt the Patton redistricting map. It is partisanship and gerrymandering, pure and simple. The Patton district lines do not balance geography, population, communities of interest and party registration.

Lori Mather

--

[Lori Mather](#)

Lori Mather Video Services  
[REDACTED]

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: [EXT]SLO Redistricting

---

**From:** David Drenick [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 7:50 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]SLO Redistricting

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As residents of Morro Bay, and as a sportsman who recreates primarily between Montana de Oro and San Simeon, I strongly object to the Patten Map.

There can be no doubt that Baywood/Los Osos, Morro Bay, Cayucos and Cambria are tied together by their common interest in the coast and coastal tourism, shared schools and shopping.

It is incomprehensible to suggest that Baywood/LosOsos shares common interests with Oceano, south of Point Buchon, as it does with communities on Estero Bay.

It is also incomprehensible to suggest Cambria has more in common with Paso Robles than Cayucos and Morro Bay.

In light of that, it is not cynical to believe the new districts were designed with ulterior political motives.

No change is better than bad change. Keep the coastal community district intact.

Sincerely,  
Mr. & Mrs David Drenick  
Morro Bay

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: [EXT]Patten Map

---

**From:** Beverly Cohen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 8:53 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Patten Map

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Wade Horton, I was shocked to learn that the clearly gerrymandered Patten map was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. It has no advantages for county residents and has many disastrous disadvantages. For instance: --The new districts have been devised to give Republicans—who are a minority by population in the county—almost perpetual rule. --A perfect illustration of the fancy footwork required to attain that Republican advantage is the skinny dog-bone-shaped version of District 3, which connects SLO to Morro Bay via a long, mostly empty span of highway. --San Miguel is separated from Paso Robles—its closest neighbor and strongest community of interest. --The whole point of the Patten map was—patently—to keep cities whole. Yes SLO is still divided. So, clearly, that was not the real point at all. --As the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has pointed out, the Patten map also accelerates some 48,000 Republican voters and defers 48,000 Democrats. Again, this is no coincidence but is part of the Republican power grab. --State law states that communities of interest should be kept together. But not only is San Miguel split from Paso Robles but Los Osos and Morro Bay—about as close, in terms of interests, as two towns can get—are separated. --And not only that, but Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. Ignoring the fact that residents of Cayucos are in Morro Bay constantly for shopping, that their children attend school there. --Splitting up Los Osos and Morro Bay is literal insanity; the two towns have so much in common that “local” to a resident of either one can mean either town. --And grouping Los Osos with Avila Beach is also ludicrous—it takes forty minutes even to get from one to the other. You might as well group Los Osos with San Miguel, for all the use this would do. (But hold on: that’s already happened for Cambria.) The map the board selected is clearly intended to engineer and cement minority rule for the next ten years. That is not democracy. Is it not absurd to give the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries? This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel. The Patten map spits in the face of the ideals that are America. Sincerely yours,

Beverly Cohen  
[REDACTED]

I AM HAPPY BEING ME .....  
SOMETIMES I'D LOVE BEING A BIRD.... SO THAT I COULD FLY

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment - ID 325

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 8:58 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Public Comment - ID 325

RedistrictingID 325  
Form inserted 12/8/2021 8:57:39 AM  
Form updated 12/8/2021 8:57:39 AM  
First Name Paul  
Last Name Excoffier  
Email [REDACTED]  
Phone [REDACTED]  
Name of Organization self  
Represented  
City San Luis Obispo  
Zip 93405

Comment I strongly oppose the Patten map. It is a radical change to the supervisor districts for obvious partisan gain that has no respect for communities of interest, like the North Coast. As with congressional, state assembly, and senate districts, our supervisor districts should be drawn and selected by an independent commission. It is an unacceptable conflict of interest for supervisors to cherry pick the voters that will decide their re-election.

Public Records Notice True

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: [EXT]gerrymandering

---

**From:** laura Richie [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 9:03 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]gerrymandering

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

The recently approved redistricting SLO map by the board of supervisors is clearly a GOP power grab. Republicans are by population a minority group in San Luis Obispo County.

--A perfect illustration of the fancy footwork required to attain that Republican advantage is the skinny dog-bone-shaped version of District 3, which connects SLO to Morro Bay via a long, mostly empty span of highway.

--The whole point of the Patten map was—patently—to keep cities whole. Yes SLO is still divided. So, clearly, that was not the real point at all.

--As the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has pointed out, the Patten map also accelerates some 48,000 Republican voters and defers 48,000 Democrats. Again, this is no coincidence but is part of the Republican power grab. --State law states that communities of interest should be kept together. But not only is San Miguel split from Paso Robles but Los Osos and Morro Bay—about as close, in terms of interests, as two towns can get—are separated. --Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. Ignoring the fact that residents of Cayucos are about 4 miles apart from Morro Bay where they do their shopping and their children attend school in Morro Bay. --Splitting up Los Osos and Morro Bay is literal insanity; the two towns have so much in common and to locals are interchangeable. The map the board selected is clearly intended to engineer and cement minority rule for the next ten years. That is not democracy. Is it not absurd to give the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries? This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel.

Submitted by a very concerned citizen of Morro Bay.

Laura Richie

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: Public Comment - ID 326

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 9:12 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Public Comment - ID 326

RedistrictingID 326  
Form inserted 12/8/2021 9:11:29 AM  
Form updated 12/8/2021 9:11:29 AM  
First Name Laura  
Last Name Durban  
Email [REDACTED]  
Phone [REDACTED]  
Name of Organization Los Osos CSD  
Represented  
City Los Osos  
Zip 93442

Comment Can you please send me a copy of the Public Hearing Notice for the adoption of Final Map for the Districting at the December 14 BOS Meeting? It was requested that we make it available at our District office. I could not find it on the website or on the Tribunes Legal Notice Website. Thank you for your assistance with this!

Public Records Notice True

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Patton map

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Carol Wright [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 9:15 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Patton map

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Los Osos has nothing in common with Pismo Beach. This is such an obvious travesty!



**Maria G. Brown**

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Patten Map Illegal

-----Original Message-----

**From:** alan thomas [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 9:17 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Patten Map Illegal

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

The Patten map will not stand. It clearly does not meet legal requirements for redistricting. It's a sad day when 3 supervisors show such callous disregard for honesty.

Alan Thomas  
[REDACTED]

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Gerrymandering in SLO County

---

**From:** Brandon Jones [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 9:34 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Gerrymandering in SLO County

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Wade Horton,


The letter below from Bonnie Thompson, Los Osos, echoes my sentiments regarding redistricting in SLO County.

Dear Wade Horton,

I was shocked to learn that the clearly gerrymandered Patten map was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. It has no advantages for county residents and has many disastrous disadvantages. For instance: --The new districts have been devised to give Republicans—who are a minority by population in the county—almost perpetual rule. --A perfect illustration of the fancy footwork required to attain that Republican advantage is the skinny dog-bone-shaped version of District 3, which connects SLO to Morro Bay via a long, mostly empty span of highway. --San Miguel is separated from Paso Robles—its closest neighbor and strongest community of interest. --The whole point of the Patten map was—patently—to keep cities whole. Yes SLO is still divided. So, clearly, that was not the real point at all. --As the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has pointed out, the Patten map also accelerates some 48,000 Republican voters and defers 48,000 Democrats. Again, this is no coincidence but is part of the Republican power grab. --State law states that communities of interest should be kept together. But not only is San Miguel split from Paso Robles but Los Osos and Morro Bay—about as close, in terms of interests, as two towns can get—are separated. --And not only that, but Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. Ignoring the fact that residents of Cayucos are in Morro Bay constantly for shopping, that their children attend school there. -- Splitting up Los Osos and Morro Bay is literal insanity; the two towns have so much in common that “local” to a resident of either one can mean either town. --

And grouping Los Osos with Avila Beach is also ludicrous--it takes forty minutes even to get from one to the other. You might as well group Los Osos with San Miguel, for all the use this would do. (But hold on: that's already happened for Cambria.) The map the board selected is clearly intended to engineer and cement minority rule for the next ten years. That is not democracy. Is it not absurd to give the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries? This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel. The Patten map spits in the face of the ideals that are America.

*Brandon Jones*



## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment - ID 327

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 9:48 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Public Comment - ID 327

RedistrictingID 327  
Form inserted 12/8/2021 9:47:30 AM  
Form updated 12/8/2021 9:47:30 AM  
First Name TODD  
Last Name KATZ  
Email [REDACTED]  
Phone [REDACTED]  
Name of Organization none  
Represented  
City SAN LUIS OBISPO  
Zip 93401

Comment  
Thank you for taking my comment. The redistricting plan pending before county commissioners accelerates some 40,000+ votes in RURAL and EX-URBAN areas and and defers some 40,000+ voters in URBAN and SUBURBAN areas. Such disenfranchisement seems quite intentional and is in my opinion very much in violation of the spirit and letter of the SLO county charter and sworn responsibilities of all the commissioners.

Public Records Notice True

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]I as NO to the new redistricting map!!!!

---

**From:** Jan Smith [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:17 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]I as NO to the new redistricting map!!!!

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

This is a disgrace!. Los Osos has nothing to do with Grover Beach and Pisomo. Why is Morro Bay shoved in with the Cal Poly Area of SLO?

This is nothing but partisan politics at its worst. I thought that gerrymandering was bad in the South and never thought that it would happen here. As a retired US History and Government teacher I am appalled.

There is NO reason to tamper with the current map other than to give more people less representation and the chance to VOTE.

Keep the current map and let representation be more equal and just.  
Jan Smith  
Morro Bay

**Maria G. Brown**

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Map

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lisa Gibson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:59 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Map

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I would like an analysis done of the map to see whether it is partisan.

Lisa Gibson  
Grover Beach

Sent from my iPad

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]in opposition to the Patten map

---

**From:** Jenni James [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 11:07 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]in opposition to the Patten map

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

This is my first comment on this topic because I couldn't imagine that the Board would actually select the Patten map.

As a civil litigation attorney who regularly sues government agencies, I recognize a lawsuit when I see one. The Patten map tees up costly litigation that the county will likely lose since the map hacks up the county and separates communities of interest without any legitimate government interest. Separating Cayucos from Morro Bay and Morro Bay from Los Osos is the equivalent of shooting a decapitated corpse to make sure it is dead. Residents commonly flow between the three towns, as do their school-aged children. Cayucos residents rely heavily on Morro Bay's grocery stores, pharmacies, and restaurants. They surf at the Rock and at Hazard's. People from Los Osos and Morro Bay regularly show up in Cayucos for its cookies, antiques, and parades, and to surf the Pier. Cayucos and Morro Bay are so intertwined that they nearly shared a sewer treatment plant and Cayucos happily allowed Morro Bay to buy Dog Beach. Yet somehow the beach I see out my Cayucos window is not considered part of my community?

The Patten map's only purpose is to benefit Republicans, who make up the minority of county residents. That Republicans nevertheless already have the majority of votes on the Board establishes that this transparent power grab is unnecessary. Instead of governing the county as a whole, which is your duty, the Board's majority is abusing its power to try to cement its death grip on the county in perpetuity. It's bad enough that the Patten map will accelerate 48,000 Republican votes and defer 48,000 Democrats' votes. It's unconscionable that to accomplish its illegitimate goal, the Board's majority had to tear our coastal community limb from limb.

Please abandon the Patten map,

Jenni James

Cayucos

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: [EXT]The Patten map

---

**From:** Jay L. Devore [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 11:30 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]The Patten map

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To whom it may concern: Adoption of the Patten map for redistricting in SLO County is ridiculous. As a resident of Los Osos, I strongly object to being separated from Morro Bay, as these are communities of interest. Also, adoption accelerates the votes of thousands of those living in Republican areas and defers the votes of thousands living in Democratic areas. I have many other objections. This is a crass effort at gerrymandering to maintain political control. Our county deserves better.

Jay Devor |  
[REDACTED]  
Los Osos, CA 93



## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]The Patten map

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lynne Breakstone [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 11:41 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]The Patten map

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I am shocked and dismayed that the Board of Supervisors has adopted this travesty of a redistricting map: it is blatant anti-American gerrymandering. I feel as if I've have been bullied by this obvious Politicized decision.

Dr. Lynne Breakstone  
San Luis Obispo

Sent from my iPad

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: Public Comment - ID 328

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 11:42 AM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Public Comment - ID 328

RedistrictingID 328  
Form inserted 12/8/2021 11:41:42 AM  
Form updated 12/8/2021 11:41:42 AM  
First Name David  
Last Name Richards  
Email [REDACTED]  
Phone [REDACTED]  
Name of Organization Represented  
City San Luis Obispo  
Zip 93405  
Comment As a registered voter I find the Gerri in the Patten map insulting and unfair - and unnecessary. How can I get involved in overturning this travesty? Will there be a petition/referendum?  
Public Records Notice True

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting travesty

---

**From:** jody vollmer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 12:24 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting travesty

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Wade Horton,

I was shocked to learn that the clearly gerrymandered Patten map was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. It has no advantages for county residents and has many disastrous disadvantages.

For instance: --The new districts have been devised to give Republicans—who are a minority by population in the county—almost perpetual rule.

--A perfect illustration of the fancy footwork required to attain that Republican advantage is the skinny dog-bone-shaped version of District 3, which connects SLO to Morro Bay via a long, mostly empty span of highway.

--San Miguel is separated from Paso Robles—its closest neighbor and strongest community of interest.

--The whole point of the Patten map was—patently—to keep cities whole. Yes SLO is still divided. So, clearly, that was not the real point at all.

--As the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has pointed out, the Patten map also accelerates some 48,000 Republican voters and defers 48,000 Democrats. Again, this is no coincidence but is part of the Republican power grab.

--State law states that communities of interest should be kept together. But not only is San Miguel split from Paso Robles but Los Osos and Morro Bay—about as close, in terms of interests, as two towns can get—are separated.

--And not only that, but Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. Ignoring the fact that residents of Cayucos are in Morro Bay constantly for shopping, that their children attend school there.

--Splitting up Los Osos and Morro Bay is literal insanity; the two towns have so much in common that “local” to a resident of either one can mean either town.

--And grouping Los Osos with Avila Beach is also ludicrous--it takes forty minutes even to get from one to the other. You might as well group Los Osos with San Miguel, for all the use this would do. (But hold on: that’s already happened for Cambria.)

The map the board selected is clearly intended to engineer and cement minority rule for the next ten years. That is not democracy. Is it not absurd to give the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries?

This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel.

Sincerely,  
Jody Vollmer

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting map

---

**From:** Nina Reinacher [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 12:56 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting map

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Supervisors,

Thanks for your hard work and leadership. I am concerned about the redistricting map that is to be voted on at the Dec. 14 meeting. As a 30-year resident of San Luis Obispo County, I feel strongly that this map needs to be studied further before adoption. In order to put all citizens' trust in the system, **we should analyze whether this map benefits in favor of a particular political party or not.**

I have seen Lucia Mar school board meetings being infiltrated by out-of-town people, organizing protests in front of the homes of community leaders, trying to push an agenda even though they do not even live in our community. What appears to be locals protesting at these school board meetings is an organized movement.

I will have more trust in our government if we take the time to analyze these proposed maps and put at rest any ideas of a power grab. If this is not a power grab, why not simply do the analysis to set residents at ease so that we can invest our trust in this process?

Thanks,  
Nina Reinacher  
[REDACTED]  
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

**Maria G. Brown**

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Fair Analysis

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lucy Pierson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:00 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Fair Analysis

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

SLO Country Board of Supervisors ,

Since there is a large percentage of the population of this country requesting transparency , it would relieve contentions if the board were to ask its consultant , Redistricting Partners , to conduct a partisan analysis of the map currently in favor.

Sincerely , Lucy Hunt-Pierson  
Cayucos Resident

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment - ID 329

---

**From:** Web Notifications <webnotifications@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 2:07 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Public Comment - ID 329

RedistrictingID 329  
Form inserted 12/8/2021 2:06:38 PM  
Form updated 12/8/2021 2:06:38 PM  
First Name Marshall  
Last Name Witkowski  
Email [REDACTED]  
Phone [REDACTED]  
Name of Organization Represented  
City Morro Bay  
Zip 93442

Comment I'm disappointed to learn that the Patten map was adopted by the Board of Supervisors it has many disastrous disadvantages: --San Miguel is separated from Paso Robles --SLO is still divided. --Los Osos and Morro Bay are separated. --Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. --Grouping Los Osos with Avila Beach is also ludicrous This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel. The Patten map spits in the face of the ideals that are America.

Public Records Notice True

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]The Patten Map - Redistricting - Patten Map = Wrong

-----Original Message-----

**From:** ELIZABETH KUNEMOTO [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 2:19 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]The Patten Map - Redistricting - Patten Map = Wrong

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

This is shocking. This is wrong.

Just one example here is that Los Osos and Avila Beach are grouped together. Makes absolutely no sense. None.

This is not democracy.

It is unacceptable and as responsible citizens who want only the best for all concerned, we object 100% and will be heard and respected.

Elizabeth S. Kunemoto  
[REDACTED]  
Los Osos



## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]ATTN: Wade Horton - The Patten Map - Redistricting - Patten Map = Wrong

-----Original Message-----

**From:** ELIZABETH KUNEMOTO [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 2:21 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]ATTN: Wade Horton - The Patten Map - Redistricting - Patten Map = Wrong

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

>  
> This is shocking. This is wrong.  
>  
> Just one example here is that Los Osos and Avila Beach are grouped together. Makes absolutely no sense.  
> None.  
>  
> This is not democracy.  
>  
> It is unacceptable and as responsible citizens who want only the best for all concerned, we object 100% and will be heard and respected.  
>  
> Elizabeth S. Kunemoto  
> [REDACTED]  
> Los Osos  
>

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: [EXT]Patten Map

---

**From:** Kim Reed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 2:34 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Patten Map

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Wade Horton, I was dismayed to learn that the clearly gerrymandered Patten map was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. It has no advantages for county residents and has many disastrous disadvantages. For instance: --The new districts have been devised to give Republicans—who are a minority by population in the county—almost perpetual rule. --A perfect illustration of the fancy footwork required to attain that Republican advantage is the skinny dog-bone-shaped version of District 3, which connects SLO to Morro Bay via a long, mostly empty span of highway. --San Miguel is separated from Paso Robles—its closest neighbor and strongest community of interest. --The whole point of the Patten map was—patently—to keep cities whole. Yes SLO is still divided. So, clearly, that was not the real point at all. --As the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has pointed out, the Patten map also accelerates some 48,000 Republican voters and defers 48,000 Democrats. Again, this is no coincidence but is part of the Republican power grab. --State law states that communities of interest should be kept together. But not only is San Miguel split from Paso Robles but Los Osos and Morro Bay—about as close, in terms of interests, as two towns can get—are separated. --And not only that, but Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. Ignoring the fact that residents of Cayucos are in Morro Bay constantly for shopping, that their children attend school there. --Splitting up Los Osos and Morro Bay is literal insanity; the two towns have so much in common that “local” to a resident of either one can mean either town. --And grouping Los Osos with Avila Beach is also ludicrous—it takes forty minutes even to get from one to the other. You might as well group Los Osos with San Miguel, for all the use this would do. (But hold on: that’s already happened for Cambria.) The map the board selected is clearly intended to engineer and cement minority rule for the next ten years. That is not democracy. Is it not absurd to give the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries? This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel. The Patten map is a disaster that benefits only the ~~vitvixirxexziw~~ that voted for it.

Sincerely,

Kim Reed

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: [EXT]Dr starrett Keep old system

---

**From:** starrettdr [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 3:05 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Dr starrett Keep old system

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Gerrymandering is illegal in CA independent republican and democratic are against this unfair plan

Sent from my Galaxy

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting comment

---

**From:** Sara Semmes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 3:06 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting comment

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Thank you, majority Board, for choosing the map that provides our county with the most equitable division of boundaries for our 5 districts. This will best guarantee that all of the voices in our county will hold equal weight in the ears of our individual district Supervisors and that our supervisors will have equal weight within the board.

Thank you for selecting balanced district boundaries, which are the only way to ensure that the interests of one of our seven cities will not outweigh the remaining cities by concentrating power to itself - regardless of its politics.

Sara Semmes  
District 2

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting Map Comments - against the Patten map

---

**From:** Mary Power-Hall [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 4:07 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting Map Comments - against the Patten map

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Map Review Committee, I am extremely distressed that the Board of Supervisors is recommending that the Patten map be adopted for our county. There are clear signs of gerrymandering in the strange boundaries on non-contiguous areas and communities of interest. The new districts seem to be reaching across huge distances to dilute the interest of particular communities. I strongly agree with examples drawn by Bonnie Thompson of Los Osos in characterizing the Patten map as:

"--A perfect illustration of the fancy footwork required to attain that Republican advantage is the skinny dog-bone-shaped version of District 3, which connects SLO to Morro Bay via a long, mostly empty span of highway. --San Miguel is separated from Paso Robles—its closest neighbor and strongest community of interest. --State law states that communities of interest should be kept together. But not only is San Miguel split from Paso Robles but Los Osos and Morro Bay—about as close, in terms of interests, as two towns can get—are separated. --And not only that, but Cayucos and Morro Bay are also split. Ignoring the fact that residents of Cayucos are in Morro Bay constantly for shopping, that their children attend school there. --Splitting up Los Osos and Morro Bay is literal insanity; the two towns have so much in common that "local" to a resident of either one can mean either town. --And grouping Los Osos with Avila Beach is also ludicrous—it takes forty minutes even to get from one to the other. You might as well group Los Osos with San Miguel, for all the use this would do. (But hold on: that's already happened for Cambria.)

--As the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has pointed out, the Patten map also accelerates some 48,000 Republican voters and defers 48,000 Democrats. Again, this is no coincidence but is part of the Republican power grab. --The map the board selected is clearly intended to engineer and cement minority rule for the next ten years. That is not democracy. --Why are we giving the power to redraw the map to the very people who will benefit from the new boundaries? This should have been entrusted to a nonpartisan panel." I strongly oppose the Patten map on the grounds that it divides communities that are strongly linked by proximity, common cultural interest, and common economic interest, and strongly dilutes the power of these communities to have a common voice together. Sincerely yours,

Mary Power-Hall and Roger Hall  
[REDACTED]

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Maria G. Brown  
FW: [EXT]Patten Map

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Don Nicholson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 7:26 PM  
**To:** Redistricting <Redistricting@co.slo.ca.us>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Patten Map

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I would like the Board to know that my voice and vote joins those who have expressed concern with the Patten redistricting map. I am appalled that three supervisors are choosing this map despite the fact there is no need to redistrict at all and the Patten map will not be in the best interest of the people of SLO County. Moreover, it will like subject our county to a lawsuit that could be avoided. Please reconsider and do what is right.

Don Nicholson  
[REDACTED]

SLO

Sent from my iPhone

## Maria G. Brown

---

**From:** Redistricting  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** Maria G. Brown  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT]Redistricting  
**Attachments:** BOS Redistr cmts 12-7.docx

---

**From:** Patricia Gomez [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 8, 2021 9:45 AM  
**To:** John Peschong <[jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:jpeschong@co.slo.ca.us)>; Dawn Ortiz-Legg <[dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:dortizlegg@co.slo.ca.us)>; Bruce Gibson <[bgibson@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:bgibson@co.slo.ca.us)>; Debbie Arnold <[darnold@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:darnold@co.slo.ca.us)>  
**Cc:** Rita L. Neal <[rneal@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:rneal@co.slo.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** [EXT]Redistricting

**ATTENTION:** This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Honorable Members of the Board,

Please consider the attached comments as you make your decision on redrawing the County supervisorial districts.

Thank you,

***Patricia***

---

*Patricia Gomez.*  
*San Luis Obispo, CA*

*This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s) and no privileges are waived by virtue of mistaken transmission of this email. Unauthorized reception, interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.*

December 6, 2021

TO: County Board of Supervisors, County of San Luis Obispo  
CC: Rita Neal, County Counsel  
FROM: Patricia Gomez, San Luis Obispo

RE: SLO County Redistricting, Implications of Proposed Supervisorial Districts

Honorable Members of the Board:

Please consider these comments regarding the implications of the proposed configuration of District 5 in the Patton map and its future representation.

Facts

- Supervisor Arnold represents the current District 5, which consists of portions of North County.
- Current District 5 is subsumed by Patton map proposed Districts 1 and 4.
- Patton proposed District 5 encompasses portions of the current Districts 2 and 3, Coastal and South County regions.
- Supervisor Arnold resides in the current District 5 and the Patton proposed District 4.

Applicable Law (*emphasis added*)

Gov. Code § 25040

*Each member of Board of Supervisors shall be elected by the district which he represents, & not at large, except in any county in which supervisorial districts have not been established by law or ordinance & in which supervisors were on 5/17/07 required to be elected at large, but from particular wards, the members shall be elected a large and without regard to residence.*

Gov. Code, § 25041

In all other cases each member shall have been a registered voter of the district which he seeks to represent for at least 30 days immediately preceding the deadline for filing nomination documents for the office of supervisor, and *shall reside in the district during his incumbency.*

Gov. Code, § 21506

(a) The term of office of any supervisor who has been elected and whose term of office has not expired shall not be affected by any change in the boundaries of the district from which the supervisor was elected.

.....

(d) Except as provided in subdivision (a), a person is not eligible to hold office as a member of a board of supervisors unless that person meets the requirements of Section 201 of the Elections Code and Section 24001 of the Government Code.

- Section 201 provides one cannot be elected or appointed to an elective office unless the person is registered voter at the time nomination papers are issued.
- Section 24001 provides a person is not eligible for a county or district office unless he/she is registered voter of the county or district in which the duties are to be exercised at the time nomination papers are issued.



## Analysis

A supervisor cannot be one at-large, Gov. Code § 25040. The Patton map raises the question of which district Supervisor Arnold would be representing for the remainder of her term. Elections Code § 21506(a) allows a supervisor to complete her term of office even if the boundaries are changed by redistricting. The Patton map does not change the boundaries of the current District 5; it completely eliminates them. The territory is subsumed into two other existing districts, 1 and 4. Supervisors Perschong (District 1) and Compton (District 4) presumably continue to represent these districts, including the newly subsumed territory, as their district boundaries were “changed.”

A supervisor must reside in the district she represents during the entirety of her incumbency. Gov. Code, § 25041. Supervisor Arnold resides in the Patton proposed District 4. There is no authority for a single district to be represented by two supervisors. Nor may Supervisor Arnold serve the remainder of her term in the proposed boundaries of the new District 5 because she does not reside there, contrary to the requirements of the Government Code.

If the Patton map is adopted then Supervisor Arnold must step down. The purpose of the residency requirement of Gov. Code, § 25041 is that the supervisor be familiar with the problems of the district and the needs of its voters. Further, if this purpose is not thwarted “ ‘by upholding the eligibility of this candidate,[to run for office] then we should, as a matter of policy, do so, and leave to the voters the fullest possible measure of freedom in their choice of officers.’ ” *Wenke v Hitchcock* (1972) 6 Cal.3d 746, 755 overruling *Lindsey v. Dominquez* (1933) 217 Cal. 533. *Wenke* also noted that it’s *Zeilenga v. Nelson* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 716 decision the year prior echoed this same premise of the *Lindsey* dissent by stating that the purpose of residence restrictions on the right to run for public office was to insure some knowledge of the general requirements of the constituency. *Wenke*, 6 Cal. at p. 723.

While *Wenke* interpreted Gov. Code, § 25041’s residency requirement to run for office that same statute requires residency in the district for the duration of her incumbency. The purpose of residency to run for and to hold office align: to ensure familiarity of the district and its residents, and to ensure voters of the district the fullest measure of freedom to choose their representatives. Absent retaining District 5 in a semblance of its former self, Arnold has no district home. Districts 1 or 4 have their own supervisors entitled to complete their terms. She cannot represent the ‘new’ District 5 in South County. She is neither familiar with the issues of this district nor its residents, having represented North County for over 9 years. Further, adding insult to injury, it would disenfranchise the ‘new’ District 5 voters even more by depriving them the freedom to choose their own representative. Supervisor Arnold must step down so that the Governor can appoint a ‘new’ District 5 supervisor, a process that allows the residents to give input.

Alternatively, Supervisor Arnold could remain in office if the statutes are harmonized. The law provides that seemingly conflicting statutes be harmonized to give effect to both. In order to give effect to both Gov. Code, § 25041 and Elections Code, § 21506(a) a “change in the boundaries” must be interpreted to preclude the complete elimination of a district thereby nullifying the benefit of § 21506(a). In order to give full effect to both the statutes must be read to preclude the elimination of the district and allowing only for modifying boundaries of an existing district. This would give Supervisor Arnold a territory to legally represent providing her the benefit of Elections Code § 21506(a)

## Conclusion

The conclusion is clear. If the Patton map is adopted, Supervisor Arnold must step down. She could serve out the remainder of her term only if the Board adopts a map that changes, not eliminates, the boundaries of District 5. The Chamber 2030 map fulfills this criteria.