

---

**From:** Cynthia Brock <cjbrockca@cs.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 31, 2022 2:31 PM  
**To:** City Clerk Group  
**Subject:** Agenda Item C.1 Consideration of Draft Maps for City Council Voting Districts

Re: Consideration of Draft Maps for City Council Voting Districts

Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers,

I urge you to consider a district map that does not use Highway 101 to cut the City in half. As our Public Works Director states (in the description of Project No. 9027), "The City is severed down the middle by 101 and the railroad.." Let's not use this process to severe it further.

Our community does not stop or start at the freeway. Our lived experience as Goleta residents includes moving back and forth across 101 in order to shop, to dine, to worship, to recreate, to go to school, to obtain services. Problems and concerns—like traffic, noise, pollution, UCSB impacts—also flow back and forth across the freeway. Whether we live north or south of the freeway, our sense of community and our concerns involve both areas, so our representatives on the council need to be equally concerned about what happens in the northern and southern parts of the City.

One advocate of using 101 as a district boundary calls it a "natural boundary." But, of course, it is not natural. The real natural boundaries, running mostly north-south, are the watersheds that feed our creeks, sloughs and ocean. As our City has a track record of endeavoring to preserve our creeks ecological value and enhance their recreational value, considerations about a common creek and watershed can unite the north and south.

The maps that bi-sect the city horizontally (including those recommended by the Public Engagement Commission) seem far less likely to allow for compact and understandable districts. These maps have districts that appear discontinuous (even if they may legally be considered "contiguous" because of being connected by a small point or a thin strip of land). In the four recommended maps, areas of District 4 are distant from each other and connected apparently only by a tiny strip or point.

The one map recommended by the PEC that does group much of western Goleta together with a vertical boundary, cuts my Santa Barbara Shores neighborhood away from the Ellwood Mesa that we worked so hard to preserve. And separates us from our neighbors to the north and west.

I hope you will consider a map with compact districts that span the highway like numbers 207, 211, or 223.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Regards,  
Cynthia Brock  
7629 Pismo Beach Circle

---

**From:** kitnjon <kitnjon@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 01, 2022 8:00 AM  
**To:** City Clerk Group  
**Subject:** Public Comment for February 1, 2022, City Council Meeting--Item C1

Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers,

I ask you to consider adopting a district map for the city of Goleta with all four districts running north to south.

All four maps favored by the Public Engagement Commission portray District 4 with a large eastern section that includes Old Town connected to a much smaller western section by a thin line.

That line does not represent a viable road or path directly connecting the east and west sections of District 4. Someone in Old Town must either exit the City of Goleta west of Fairview Avenue and travel through the City of Santa Barbara's "airport corridor" or use the Fairview overcrossing to access Calle Real or (ironically) the 101 to reach the western segment of the proposed District 4. Likewise residents in the eastern portion of the proposed district must also temporarily exit their district to connect with the western half in Old Town.

Please do not accept the 101F freeway as a border between north and south Goleta.

Goleta residents cross that freeway many times in a week. For example, Old Town children attend schools across the freeway. Its residents attend churches across the freeway and use the city library across the freeway. Many of us work, shop, bank, and volunteer across the freeway. Residents in some sections of the city (although not Old Town residents) must cross the freeway to attend meetings at City Hall or events at the Community Center. The freeway may cut a swath through our city, but the overpasses allow us to reconnect.

Further, Goleta is still a small enough city that what happens in other neighborhoods affects all of us. Traffic, development, noise, and crime are not isolated within any individual area or neighborhood - north or south.

A map with compact districts that span the freeway, as drawn, for example, in maps 207, 211, or 223, would better serve the city and its residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kitty Bednar  
5701 Gato Avenue

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 01, 2022 10:20 AM  
**To:** David Cutaia  
**Subject:** RE: Comments for tonights Council meeting re District Maps

Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers:

Thank you for considering my comments below.

I appreciate there are many considerations for how proposed district maps can be drawn. And rather than tell you what map number I think is appropriate to consider for setting district boundaries, I want to tell you what I believe is important to consider: keeping long established together. While I cant speak for other areas outside of the area I live in, which is the North East quadrant, I feel quite strongly that it is really important that the neighborhoods in this quadrant be kept together. Most of the maps that have been submitted recognized this importance. Splitting the NE quadrant horizontally, like through Berkeley Rd or even vertically like through Kellogg or Cambridge, would divide the long established neighborhood I live in. I have talked to a few of my neighbors about this mapping exercise and they are in favor of keeping the NE quadrant intact. Lastly, I have greatly appreciated that several of you have talked to me about my concerns and I hope you have asked others who live elsewhere in the City as well.

Whatever final map you select will only be good until the next census, when another Council will be tasked with reconsidering district maps. And if the map that you select tonight doesn't seem to work for the City or the residents in 10 years later, new maps can be drawn based on what works or doesn't. So, as a starting point, I would appreciate your considering my comments and incorporating them into the map you select, which is to keep neighborhoods intact, particularly those in the NE quadrant. Thank you very much.

Happy Birthday and Best wishes!  
Cecilia Brown

---

**From:** Pat Forgey <patriciaforgey@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 01, 2022 12:22 PM  
**To:** City Clerk Group  
**Subject:** Winchester Commons

Hello,  
I am not seeing the neighborhood of Winchester Commons on the maps.

Am I correct?

Best  
Pat Forgey  
7822 Day Road  
Goleta

---

**From:** Gregory Johnson <gm\_johnson@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 01, 2022 4:56 PM  
**To:** City Clerk Group  
**Subject:** District Map Review

Due to the 2020 census use requirement for population and a four district count requires at least one district crossing 101 to achieve the required population variance  $\leq 10\%$ . I believe it is desirable to keep the 101 splitting to this one district minimum. I believe that district map #703 is the best choice for this split since one PEC commissioner stated that far west Goleta that straddles 101 has frequently had common concerns such as foul air from oil processing facilities. Therefore combining both sides of 101 in this Goleta district makes the most sense. There are other good #703 features, but they are shared with the other PEC recommendations (#202, #226, & #701)

Gregory M. Johnson

---

**From:** C. Dave G <cdg55@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 01, 2022 5:04 PM  
**To:** City Clerk Group  
**Cc:** Dave G  
**Subject:** Agenda Item C.1 22-016 "City Council Consideration of Draft Maps for City Council Voting Districts Boundaries and Sequencing for District Elections," meeting date 2/01/22.

Dear City Clerk Group – I respectfully request distribution of my written email response regarding Agenda Item "C.1 22-016 "City Council Consideration of Draft Maps for City Council Voting Districts Boundaries and Sequencing for District Elections," meeting date 2/01/22, or please attach my comments to the list of public comments received since I believe the Mayor and Councilmembers are presently in a closed session (current time 5:03 pm).

My name is C. Dave Gaughen, email address of [cdg55@earthlink.net](mailto:cdg55@earthlink.net), and phone number of (805) 275-6457.

Presently, I do not plan on speaking on this agenda item.

-----

Dear Madam Mayor and Council Members:

First, I wish to compliment NDC for their excellent work in assisting the City of Goleta and the PEC (Public Engagement Commission) – good job/great work! I am also extremely impressed with the level of effort provided by the City's participants with respect to submitting draft maps and providing valuable comments during the review process.

However, after briefly reviewing the document entitled "City Council Consideration of Draft Maps for City Council Voting Districts Boundaries and Sequencing for District Elections (127 pages)" specifically Attachment 5. Public Engagement Commission Recommendations and Attachment 7. Revised NDC Presentation, I was hoping the PEC would add additional expertise such as demographic data from the Interactive Review Map @

<https://ndcresearch.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=8d7cbd5588914037bd8e46188cb905b6> . For example, the Interactive Review Map provides for enhanced analysis such as percent minorities, percent renters, percent multi-family housing, percent with BA or higher education, etc. – this enhanced demographic data could link individual districts to other common themes in addition to the generic themes presented on slides 30 and 31 (see pages 124, 125). Furthermore, I was unable to locate PEC's written justifications as to why they rejected each draft map that met the redistricting

requirements. Nevertheless, I believe it would be prudent if the Mayor and Councilmembers recommended that the PEC provide additional demographic data to the public as to why their four choices are in the best interest of Goleta. If this is not an option, then please select Draft Map Plan 701.

On a related side note, I am a big proponent of offering each incumbent City Councilmember the opportunity to finish their elected four-year term in the newly formed district where they currently live. Page 5 of the previous Agenda Item A.1 states, "Other traditional considerations that are permitted but not required include: Respect voters' choices / continuity in office for incumbents, and future population growth."

### My Review and Analysis of Draft Maps

REVIEW OF DRAFT MAP PLANS @ <https://drawgoleta.org/draft-maps/>

First Choice: Map Plan 224. Second Choice: NDC's Map Plan 704. Third Choice: NDC's Map Plan 702

#### Map Plan 224

NDC's review of Map 224 identifies this map as having "Three Districts Cross Substantially" and further states, "Splits the Mathilda neighborhood; technically contiguous but "iffy" (see Page 137 of Agenda Item A.1, Subj: Recommendations to the City Council regarding Draft Maps for City Council Voting Districts Boundaries for District Elections, meeting date January 26, 2022: hereinafter "Agenda Item A.1"). Additionally, NDC states on Page 70 of Agenda Item A.1 under the heading of Demographic Outliers: "Ellwood Beach/Mathilda (low income, high multi-family housing, high renter housing)." However, the percent Household Income difference between District 1 and District 2 appears to be negligible and is presented as follows (as extracted from the Demographics button at <https://drawgoleta.org/plan-224/>): A) 1 % difference for household income 0 – 25K, B) 1 % difference for household income 25K – 50K, C) 3 % difference for household income 50K – 75K, D) 8 % difference for household income 75K – 200K, and E) 3 % difference for household income 200K plus. Furthermore, the percent Housing Stats difference between District 1 and District 2 appears to be minor and is presented as follows (extracted from the same Demographics button as above): A) 8 % difference for single family, B) 8 % difference for multi-family, C) 12 % difference for rented, and D) 12 % difference for owned. Nonetheless, if the minor concerns identified above by NDC appear to be significant when evaluated by the PEC (Public Engagement Commission), then NDC's Map Plan 704 (four districts cross; same splits of the Mathilda neighborhood) is my preferred option to Map Plan 224 followed by NDC's Map Plan 702 as my third choice.



### Map Plan 704

NDC's review of NDC's Map 704 identifies this map as having "Four Districts Cross, District 3 Minimally" and further states, "Splits the Mathilda neighborhood" (see Page 142 of Agenda Item A.1). Additionally, Page 148 of Agenda Item A.1 reads in relevant part as,

"All four districts cross over the freeway; Population deviation: 5.7%, District Latino CVAP: 30%, 24%, 31%, 16%; All four districts are contiguous; Splits the Ellwood Beach / Mathilda neighborhood; Does not adhere as closely to general plan subareas as communities of interest, but splits them fairly significantly; Does not split the airport noise corridor, but does split one "demographic outlier" (Ellwood Beach / Mathilda); Only some district boundaries follow the railroad and major streets; District 4 may not be compact."

### Map Plan 702

NDC's review of NDC's Map 702 identifies this map as having "One District Crosses Minimally" and further appears, of noteworthy importance, to have drawn districts without splitting any communities of interest or neighborhoods (see Page 114 of Agenda Item A.1). Additionally, Page 147 of Agenda Item A.1 reads in relevant part as,

"District 3 crosses over minimally, all other districts stay on one side of the freeway; Population deviation: 9.5%; District Latino CVAP: 29%, 25%, 17%, 31%; All four districts are contiguous; Does not split any neighborhoods; Closely adheres to general plan subareas as communities of interest and, to a lesser extent, elementary school attendance areas; Does not split the airport noise corridor or "demographic outliers;" District boundaries follow the railroad and major streets; District 3 may not be compact."

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully, C. Dave Gaughen