



Oak Park Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 5755, Sacramento, CA 95817

June 14, 2011

Attn: City Clerk
Sacramento Redistricting Citizens Advisory Committee
City of Sacramento
915 "I" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of the Oak Park Neighborhood Association, we thank you for taking on the difficult task of determining the political boundaries and political representation of members of the Sacramento community. It's no easy task.

Oak Park is one of the city's largest, most diverse, and active neighborhoods, filled with a deep source of pride in our history and how we continue to grow together. While we face challenges not dissimilar to other parts of the city, we stand united in our commitment to addressing our common and our unique challenges as one community.

With the above in mind, the Oak Park Neighborhood Association Board of Directors and membership has identified the following key criteria that we urge you to consider as you move forward with a map consideration:

- (1) **Don't break up Oak Park.** Oak Park, from Highway 99 to Stockton Blvd and Fruitridge to 2nd Ave (minus Lawrence Park NA), stretches across a large segment of the city, that is united by a shared commitment to the neighborhood.
- (2) **Partner Oak Park with affluent neighborhoods.** It's no secret that Oak Park is one of the less (economically) affluent neighborhoods in the city. We should leverage resources from the more affluent neighborhoods nearby, likely to the West, to serve the best interests of the region as a whole. To be clear: council districts that might concentrate poverty do not benefit those districts or the region.
- (3) **Keep Oak Park connected to Curtis Park.** Oak Park has some shared history of efforts together (e.g. Oak Park Farm Stand/Farmers Market), as well as a similar geographic place at the edge of the downtown core. We find this less true of neighborhoods to the East.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions or for further discussion at opnaSAC@gmail.com or 916-572-6762.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Michael Boyd in black ink.

Michael Boyd
President

Handwritten signature of Paul S. Towers in black ink.

Paul S. Towers
Vice-President
Chair, Government Relations Committee



THE RIVER DISTRICT

June 16, 2011

Mr. Julius Cherry
Chair, Sacramento Redistricting Citizens Advisory Committee
c/o Scot Mende
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Redistricting Maps Under Consideration

Dear Mr. Cherry,

Many thanks to you and the other members of the Committee for the time and effort you are giving to the Sacramento Redistricting Citizens Advisory Committee (SRCAC). Your willingness to serve the community in this capacity is very much appreciated.

The position of The River District is to keep the Central City (as defined as the American River on the North, Business Highway 50 on the South, the Sacramento River on the West and Business Interstate 80 on the East) within a single Council District. In addition, as would follow from this position, we wish to keep The River District within one Council District. With this in mind, we offer the following comments on the maps remaining after the June 13 meeting:

- **We support maps 2, 14, 17, 22, 24, and 27:** these support our position of keeping the Central City and River District together;
- **We strongly oppose maps 2, 8, 9, 30 and 31:** 2, 8 and 9 separate the eastern portion of The River District and split the Central City; 30 splits The River District in half, and 31 separates The River District from the Central City to include it with suburban neighborhoods north of the American River;
- **We do not support maps 3 or 15:** these split the Central City.

As we communicated in earlier correspondence, The River District shares commonalities with other neighborhoods located in the Central City, making a community of interest appropriate to consider including the area within one Council District:

- **Urban Density Development** standards that attract unique population groups inclined to migrate to higher density development and an urban lifestyle;
- **Mixed Use Development** standards that create a vital environment for both commercial, residential and recreational uses;
- **Urban Infrastructure** that encompasses the unique needs for infill development as well as funding for new development in the Railyards;
- **Urban Policy Issues** common to Central City neighborhoods including the concentration of social services, parks and greenspace development, circulation and traffic.

Our comments on the above mentioned maps are purely based on each map's ability to address our position for The River District and the Central City. The comments are not intended to advocate for or against any one map's ability to satisfy the criteria supported by other neighborhood groups. If any of the maps under consideration were to be edited to keep The River District and the Central City within one Council District, we might be convinced to change our position for that map.

Sincerely,

Patty Kleinknecht
Executive Director



THE RIVER DISTRICT

June 16, 2011

Mr. Julius Cherry
Chair, Sacramento Redistricting Citizens Advisory Committee
c/o Scot Mende
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Redistricting Maps Under Consideration

Dear Mr. Cherry,

Please accept this as a supplement to our letter dated June 14, 2011. An oversight omitted comments on two of the maps currently under consideration. **The River District also supports maps 1 and 35** which keep both the Central City and The River District together and in one Council District.

As stated in the June 14 letter, our comments on maps are purely based on each map's ability to address our position for The River District and the Central City. The comments are not intended to advocate for or against any one map's ability to satisfy the criteria supported by other neighborhood groups. If any of the maps under consideration were to be edited to keep The River District and the Central City within one Council District, we might consider changing our position for that map.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Patty Kleinknecht".

Patty Kleinknecht
Executive Director

**Sacramento Redistricting Citizens Advisory Committee
Citizen Correspondence - June 20, 2011**

From: Devin Lavelle [<mailto:devinlavelle@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2011 2:13 PM
To: Scot Mende
Subject: e-comment re Redistricting Com

Thank you commissioners for your time and thoughtful comments yesterday evening.

I write to reaffirm my commitment to keeping the Midtown/Downtown community whole. Having a single Council Member responsible for representing the people of our community is critical for ensuring effective representation of our neighborhoods. So long as the residents of the Grid are divided into small minorities of other districts, our common interests will always be secondary to outlying neighborhoods in those districts.

Second, I wish to apologize to the good people of Valley View Acres. When drawing my map (#14), I was unaware of their desire to stay with District 1. I think that is reasonable and if my map proceeds into the next round, I hope the commission will adjust it to reflect those priorities.

Additionally, it may be wise to shift more of South Natomas into District 2, to better reflect the priorities of the Latino community and to allow for likely growth in Districts 1 and 4.

Please also consider switching the numbering of Districts 5 and 7.

Finally, while I do not have specific recommendations, I hope the Commission can better meld East Sacramento with communities north of the river in District 3.

Thank you, I look forward to the continuing conversation.

Devin Lavelle

From: "Arturo Aleman" <aaleman01@comcast.net>

Date: June 15, 2011 7:29:49 AM PDT

Cc: "Gustavo Arroyo" <gustavoarroyo01@gmail.com>, <artvenegas@gmail.com>, "Reynoso, Cruz" <creynoso@ucdavis.edu>, <ul_board@unitedlatinopac.org>

Subject: Redistricting

Dear Commissioners,

First let me thank you for the hard work you are doing in arriving at the future representative boundaries for our elected officials. Every community seeks to be representative no less than that of the Latino Community. As such I urge you to take into serious account the needs for the future. United Latinos, Promoviendo Accion Civica, is an organization dedicated to ensuring the full participation of Latinos in the civic arena. Your work directly impacts our efforts to fully engage the Latino community to elect a representative government. As you move towards your next task in reducing the number of maps that have been submitted to the Commission for consideration, the following maps are those that the Latino community of Sacramento considers of high importance: 1, 2, 8, 14, 15, 17, 24, and 27. As you proceed through the difficult task of addressing the interest of all concerned, I ask you to consider the need to establish districts that also balance representative opportunities and/or don't divide communities of interest.

Again thank you for your consideration and your contribution to our community.

Best wishes,

Arturo A. Aleman, Director of Strategic Initiatives
United Latinos, Promoviendo Accion Civica
PO Box 161753
Sacramento, CA 95816-1753
916-213-3717

From: John Shiels [<mailto:jshiels01@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 09:38 PM
To: Scot Mende
Cc: Brody Lorda <brody8336@yahoo.com>; Cheryl Gilbertson <cherylmg@surewest.net>; David Brady <davb49@att.net>; Jules Tran <jules.tran@rocketmail.com>; Kathy Kelleher <kelleher_kathy@yahoo.com>; Miller Jim <jmillerpptpambest@att.net>
Subject: Redistricting impact on ROCA

Dear Scott,

ROCA desires to go on record that if a choice must be made, we believe that it is most important that ROCA be represented by one council member. It is also very important to us that we be in the same district as North Natomas because of the many issues that we have in common. I discussed this in my testimony to the committee on June 13th.

Thank You,

John Shiels
President, ROCA

From: "Francisca E. Godinez" <francisca7edilia@gmail.com>
Date: June 19, 2011 11:39:34 AM PDT
Subject: Preserve the following maps

My name is Francisca E. Godinez. I am the daughter of Joe and Connie Godinez. My roots are deeply planted in the Chicana/o community of Sacramento. I am writing to ask you to preserve specific maps in the process of redistricting Sacramento areas. The maps to preserve are: 1,2,8,14,15,17,24, and 27.

Your work is important and you hold a strong stake in furthering the work that many communities have built over the years and decades. Thank you for your consideration and leadership in taking us to the next steps of furthering personal, familial, and social quality of life.

Francisca E. Godinez
Registered voter in District 6

From: rjherber@comcast.net [mailto:rjherber@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 12:09 PM

To: Scot Mende; Maria MacGunigal

Subject: Comments from the LGBT Community on the Redistricting maps

Hi Scott,

I'm writing on behalf of the Rainbow Chamber's LGBT Redistricting Committee that is made up of several LGBT community groups and key LGBT leaders in Sacramento.

First, we want the Redistricting Committee to know how much we value the time and care they are taking to craft new districts for the City Council. We have appreciated how the Committee has listened to the variety of voices that have come before them and how they are working diligently to ensure communities of interest are not divided.

As you know, the LGBT Community didn't submit one map that would redraw lines for all the Council districts. **The LGBT Community submitted a map that asked that the Sacramento Central City (urban core) be united AND that the Central City be joined with another neighborhood that has demonstrated strong support for the LGBT community. Those neighborhoods include Curtis Park, Land Park and East Sacramento.** We have defined the Sacramento Central City as the American River on the north, the Sacramento River on the west, Hwy 50 to the south and Hwy 80 east. We took this approach because we thought it was important that the Committee have flexibility in drawing districts that would take into consideration other communities of interest.

In reviewing the remaining maps left after the June 13 meeting we have these initial comments. As background, we want to say that we have looked at the maps from the viewpoint of choosing those that best meet our goals. As a result, we may have supported a map that doesn't satisfy the criteria of other groups who have contacted you. Should one of these top five maps be revised in a manner that meets other group's interests and still keeps the Central City together and joins it with Curtis Park, Land Park or East Sacramento, we would be open to supporting such a map.

The LGBT Community identifies these maps as our top five maps and why:

Map #01	Keeps the Central City together and joins it with Curtis Park.
Map #24	Keeps the Central City together and joins it with East Sacramento.
Map #27	Keeps the Central City together and joins it with Land Park.
Map #32	Keeps the Central City together and joins it with Curtis Park.
Map #35	Keeps the Central City together and joins it with Land Park.

The LGBT Community strongly opposes the following maps for these reasons:

Map #02 Splits the Central City and dilutes the electoral power of the LGBT Community
Map #03 Splits the Central City and dilutes the electoral power of the LGBT Community
Map #08 Splits the Central City and dilutes the electoral power of the LGBT Community
Map #09 Splits the Central City and dilutes the electoral power of the LGBT Community
Map #15 Splits the Central City and dilutes the electoral power of the LGBT Community

We would appreciate you sending this email on to the City's Redistricting Committee with our best regards.

Sincerely,
Rosanna Herber
Chair
Rainbow Chamber's LGBT Redistricting Committee