E1- 1 OF 2

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/20/2011 12:57 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/20/2011 12:57:26 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Judith Mathat
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	530-[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I recently tried to comment and had a computer glitch so am resending. The Alternative 3 is the map I had asked Dan Russell to produce as a curiosity for information 10 years ago as it provides several benefits to this county and ease of adjustment from each decade to the next along with other revealed benefits, not the least of which is the fair and equitable distribution of precincts throughout the county that afford the opportunity to "gerrymander" districts for kingdom building, party line clusters and voter donation blocks to be coveted by any sitting supervisor or prospective candidate for election. The adjustability will function whether using mailer voter precincts or actual voting precinct locations and it allows for a good differentiation of the distribution requirements of the populations totals needed. Any other map allows for the politicalization of the counties populations. A. All Supervisors will have to understand the impacts of their decisions on a North County through the populated and development directed Hwy 50 corridor and the South County agricultural issues and future development issues and the District 5 change will finally require the Supervisor to be more cognizant of how to meld South Lake Tahoe issues into the entire county and make them a part of the whole instead of a distant step child. B. THe topographical, economic and future development of this county will all come in to play for every Supervisor, sitting and future and allow them to equally represent the whole county and work together for the good of all residents rather than political pundits and major developer interests. C.The logic of this alternative makes one wonder why we do not have

E1-2 of 2

this methodology used within the state but using a North to South rather than a West to East direction. Expanding and contracting a district by adding or subtacting a precinct still allows for some "gerrymandering" but reduces the overall effect.
D. The main argument of not keeping all of the communities and CSD's and other areas with like interests together, i.e., agriculture, rural, urban, city limits and topographical delinations together is the best reeason for making Alternative 3 the best choice as it reuires the Supervisors to learn and represent all factions stated above.
E. The only drawback is that campaigning will be one heck of a roadtrip!! Will make these supervisor candidates get familir with the rest of the county rather than their little kingdoms they have built from the existing distribution of 10 years ago that was a disaster,

Thank you for your consideration and please know that Iwill be championing this Alternative map to others and to organizations I where I am involved.

Judith Mathat

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/20/2011 12:57:26 PM.

E2

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/20/2011 07:53 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/20/2011 7:53:07 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Sam Muscarello
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	530[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I think alternative map 1 and 2 are good, with 2 being the best. I think 3,4 and 5 are not good at all. I feel it is important for the major communities to be in the same district so they have clear representation. Thanks for the opporunity to respond.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/20/2011 7:53:07 PM.

E2-1 of 2

Letter to the editor El Dorado County Redistricting
Judy Mathat
to:
Pat Lakey, Richard Esposito
04/21/2011 04:10 PM
Bcc:
Mike T Applegarth
Show Details

Here is a letter to the editor I am sending, this is the map (see attachment and link to all maps http://www.edcgov.us/Government/Redistricting/Redistricting_Maps.aspx) I had hoped Map ALternative 3 would get looked at and have discovered it is to be one of the 5 and one that makes the most sense. Sometimes logic will prevail if we wait long enough. Hope you will print it as it is something I have proffered for many years as being the best of all worlds. All states and counties could use this model and turn it based on length of state or county.

As one of the most important decisions for our county in the next TEN years this is number one! Hopefully the Board of Supervisors will choose the best interests of the people and not their political will by choosing Alternative Map 3. Those others of like mind should let their supervisors know so they will have the benefit of making the right choice based on their constituents requests.

Thank you,
Judy Mathat

Letter to the Editor,

Alternative 3 is the map for me!! And should be for any other resident that wants to prevent gerrymandering, kingdom building, party clustering and campaign donor preferential districting! This will not be popular with the larger developers, some sitting supervisors and political pundits. It literally breaks the majority of those special interests up in favor of true and pure numbers in precincts and allows the average county resident to be represented fairly and honestly by their choice of area of residence that will require sitting supervisors to learn all the problems and issues of the entire county and force them to make decisions based on the combined topographical and lifestyle populations of their districts, not by developer interests and donation pockets.

The Alternative 3 is the map I had asked Dan Russell to produce as a curiosity for information 10 years ago as it provides several benefits to this county and ease of adjustment from each decade to the next along with other revealed benefits, not the least of which is the fair and equitable distribution of precincts throughout the county that afford the opportunity to "gerrymander" districts for kingdom building, party line clusters and voter donation blocks to be coveted by any sitting supervisor or prospective candidate for election. The adjustability will function whether using mailer voter precincts or actual voting precinct locations and it allows for a good differentiation of the distribution requirements of the populations totals needed. Any other map allows for the politicalization of the counties populations.

A. All Supervisors will have to understand the impacts of their decisions on a North County through the populated and General Plan development directed Hwy 50 corridor and the South County agricultural issues and the District 5 change will finally require the

Supervisor to be more cognizant of how to meld the South Lake Tahoe into the entire county and make them a part of the whole instead of a distant step child.

B. The topographical, economic and future development of this county will all come in to play for every Supervisor, sitting and future and allow them to equally represent the whole county and work together for the good of all residents rather than political pundits and major developer interests.

C. The argument that this will alienate the community, cities, CSD's and Agricultural and topographical delineations are all the more reason to select this map. It will prevent special interests groups from prevailing over the average resident in the district.

D. The biggest reward will be to force supervisor candidates for re-election and new candidates to learn about the entire county and they will have one long road trip to "glad hand" their prospective constituents.

Will this force them to understand areas they have not had to understand previously? What do you think? When you hear a sitting Supervisor saying from the dais that they haven't been in that community or area for x years it behooves all of us to force the issue and request this board to do the right thing by the residents of this county and choose Alternative Map 3 for the good of everyone; not their developer and environmentally polarized friends and get off their political agendas and stop kingdom building and look out across this beautiful county and give us a break with honest and open decision making not backroom predisposed outcomes behind campaign rhetoric for ten more years!

Judith Mathat
Placerville, CA
[redacted]

--
Judy Mathat Realtor
DRE #01343052
American Heritage Real Estate Professionals, inc.
(530) [redacted]
(530) [redacted] Home Office
(916) [redacted] FAX
[redacted]

"Life's not about waiting for the storms to pass... it's about learning to dance in the rain." These words come from BJ Gallagher

"If ever a time should come, when vain and aspiring men shall possess the highest seats in Government, our country will stand in need of its experienced patriots to prevent its ruin." Samuel Adams, 1776

E3

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/23/2011 11:24 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/23/2011 11:24:05 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Ray P. Griffiths
Address	[redacted]
City	Georgetown
State	CA
Zip	95634
Business Phone	530[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I believe Alternative 4 is the best alternative available. One flaw of the current districts is that for both Districts 2 and 5, the land use decisions are made for the rest of the County by Supervisors that do not currently make the land use decisions for the voters that elect them. So currently the City of Placerville makes decisions for District 2 and TRPA makes decisions for District 5. These Supervisors are disconnected from their voters for land use decisions and therefore do not represent the County as a whole. Thank you.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/23/2011 11:24:05 AM.

E4

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/23/2011 06:11 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/23/2011 6:10:27 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Diana Hankins
Address	
City	
State	CA
Zip	
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	When are you planning on meetings in Tahoe???????

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/23/2011 6:10:27 PM.

Re:

Judi E McCallum to: Duane Wallace 04/26/2011 02:34 PM

Cc: angela swanson, bruce grego, bosfive, claire fortier, tomhdavis, Norma Santiago, Mike T Applegarth, Richard L Briner, Edward L Knapp

Thank you for writing, Duane.

The board of supervisors discussed redistricting today at their public meeting and took comment, reviewed staff presentations and have scheduled some community meetings throughout the county. There was no preference of alternatives stated, just a discussion of process, pros and cons and input from legal counsel on requirements.

Mike Applegarth is staff from administration, the County Surveyor, Rich Briner, is the lead department, and Ed Knapp is our counsel.

We welcome input throughout the process and will invite the City Council to the public meeting as soon as it is scheduled. We hope to secure the council chambers for an evening meeting sometime next month.

Thank you again for your thoughtful input. We really appreciate it.

Judi

Judi McCallum
Assistant to Supervisor Norma Santiago
District V, Lake Tahoe
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
530.621.6577
530.573.7918

Duane Wallace Norma, I was in Placerville at the El Dorado Co... 04/26/2011 01:31:23 PM

From: Duane Wallace [redacted]
To: <bosfive@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
Cc: [redacted]
<judi.mccallum@edcgov.us>
Date: 04/26/2011 01:31 PM
Subject:

Norma,

I was in Placerville at the El Dorado County Chamber meeting last week. They had just received the proposed alternatives for redistricting the County.

There were I think 6 alternatives. I didn't pick a favorite because I didn't have time to study them, but, it could be a crucial issue. As you know, since we have lost population, we are going to have District 5 bleed over the hill. If for instance all of Pollock Pines were in our District a Pollock Pines resident could conceivably end up representing us. At one point we had two Supervisors representing us. One just had Meyers in their District.

In any case, I would think our Council should take a look at the alternatives. Perhaps having our District include more rural areas would be better than having a concentrated voting block like all of Pollock Pines. Are you going to be the one to circulate the alternatives?

Regards,

Duane Wallace

E6 1 OF 2

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/30/2011 11:55 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/30/2011 11:55:31 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Richard W. Nichols
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	530-[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I am the General Manager of the Grassy Run Community Services District, and the Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee of the Grassy Run Homeowners' Association. I am submitting these comments as an individual, however, and not on behalf of those entities. The Grassy Run community is presently located entirely within District 4, represented by Supervisor Briggs. Proposed Alternative Maps #4 and #5 would divide Grassy Run between two different Supervisorial Districts, Nos. 3 (Sweeney) and 4 (Briggs). That concept is unacceptable. Grassy Run is, perhaps, the most unified and cohesive (or at least one of the most unified and cohesive) communities in the County. Grassy Run spent twelve years in litigation with the Shingle Springs Band of Indians (ultimately successfully) with regard to the Tribe's attempt to use the Grassy Run road system to allow patrons to access the Red Hawk Casino. In this we had the aid and support, at various times, of Supervisors Nielsen, Bradley, Nutting and Briggs. Although the CSD is in the process of dissolving, the Homeowners' Association will continue to be responsible for that road system. Proposed alternatives #4 and #5 would split that community in two, for no good purpose. At a personal level, I happen to own two homes within Grassy Run, located approximately 200 yards from each other. I live in one, and my son, daughter-in-law, and granddaughter live in the other. Proposed alternatives #4 and #5 would put one of my homes in District 3 and the other in District 4. In any election involving voting eligibility by

	parcel ownership rather than by residence, I would be able to vote in both districts. That seems to me to be counterproductive to electoral integrity. Further, I agree with Supervisor Sweeney's quoted comment that proposed alternative #3 is "an abomination." I believe that redistricting should take into account, as the single most important factor after population equalization, the retention of communities of interest. What possible community of interest does Georgetown have with Nashville? In my view the only benefit to proposed alternative #3 would be to heighten the power of single-issue advocates, who can more easily convince voters who have no particular interest in their issue (one way or the other) because they have no familiarity with the issue. So, by process of elimination, I respectfully submit that the Board should adopt either proposed alternative #1 or proposed alternative #2; I have no particular choice as between the two of them.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/30/2011 11:55:31 AM.

E7

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/30/2011 05:07 PM
Show Details

History: This message has been replied to.

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/30/2011 5:07:19 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Gary Steele
Address	[redacted]
City	Shingle Springs
State	CA
Zip	95682
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	The County Redistricting Team does not include anyone from the El Dorado County Office of Education. For those of us with children enrolled in public elementary school, we need to know now what future school enrollment consequences (i.e. Junior High School/High School) will result from each available redistricting option. Difficult to make an informed decision without the requested information.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/30/2011 5:07:19 PM.

E8

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/30/2011 05:56 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/30/2011 5:55:53 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Raymond and Barbara Sebastian
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667-9709
Business Phone	530-[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	We are against any redistricting plan which would divide our homeowners' association between two different districts. There have been times we have approached our supervisor for help with issues and it does not make sense to have to deal with two different supervisors. Grassy Run Homeowners' Association is comprised of 81 parcels and it only makes sense that we reside within the same district. We would ask that you support either proposed Map #1 or #2. Thank you.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/30/2011 5:55:53 PM.

E9

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
04/30/2011 07:40 PM
Show Details

History: This message has been replied to.

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 4/30/2011 7:40:26 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Gina Posey
Address	
City	
State	(Select)
Zip	
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Alternative 3 is not acceptable since it takes Rescue out of the same boundary as Ponderosa High school. This could be a precursor to having Rescue students attend a different high school than Ponderosa which would not be acceptable. How will this decision be made? Are we going to vote on this? Thanks Gina

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 4/30/2011 7:40:26 PM.

E10 - 1 of 2

RE: Redistricting maps feedback
John Skeel
to:
loretta.featherston
05/02/2011 05:10 PM
Cc:
mike.applegarth
Show Details

Loretta,

Attached are the 7 comments I have received so far. I will respond to each person informing them that their comments have been forwarded to the county redistricting team.

John P. Skeel, MS, CPRP
General Manager
El Dorado Hills Community Services District
Phone: [redacted]

Hi Mr. Skeel,

I am a resident of the Serrano Community and I can confidently say that everyone in this community has been waiting a long time for something like this to happen. I believe that when redistricting occurs that it is important to keep communities together. The residents of Serrano have long desired to be one whole community and the crazy district lines that separate us have been pretty frustrating to say the least. I have noticed that four of the five maps have all of Serrano in the same district. It is disappointing to see that a map was created that splits Serrano into two parts, leaving our community in its current state. I am looking forward to the meeting on May 5th in El Dorado Hills so that we can voice how important it is that Serrano stays together as one community.

I appreciate your consideration on this matter.
Shanen Palmer

John,

I received this mailing today and reviewed the proposed redistricting alternatives. I recommend that Alternative 2 be adopted for these reasons:

- It appears to redistrict the county by logical, existing municipal, geographic, economic and cultural boundaries, and
- It provides equitable, representative distribution of votes.

Of the other alternatives,

- Alternative 1 is objectionable because it gerrymanders Pollock Pines into a district with Camino and Placerville. Pollock Pines is clearly a mountain community and has more in common with South Lake Tahoe, than with down slope communities. Alternative 2 seems, therefore, preferable. Further, alternative 1 is not logical geographically and would be more difficult to manage/represent than alternative 2.
- Alternative 3 is objectionable because it divides Placerville. Placerville has – to its credit – had a long history of political involvement (going back to the Gold Rush). However, because of this dividing Placerville will likely result in two supervisors coming from Placerville, which would disproportionately represent Placerville compared to El Dorado Hills, which is much more populous and deserves greater representation in county affairs.
- Alternatives 4 and 5 are objectionable because of the way they divide the Sierra Nevada, which should be represented by a supervisor all its own. The Sierra and South Lake Tahoe have different needs than down slope areas of the county. Therefore, the eastern side of the county needs its own representation.

Yours truly,
John Poimiroo
[redacted] El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

WHY DOES EL DORADO HILLS ALWAYS HAVE TO BE IN TWO DIFFERENT DISTRICTS?
BETTY ENGELHARDT

Dear Mr.Skeel,
The CSD can play a pivotal role in seeing that EDH gets proper representation. Is the CSD willing to be proactive in providing coordination of EDH residents the forum to gather and coalesce in order to rpesent a united front?
Sincerely,
Ray Myers

I live at [redacted]y, the rural area of El Dorado Hills. For years we have been swallowed up by Auburn and vicinity in the purple area. Please encourage the Supervisors to keep like parcels with like communities. It appears that the option 4 proposal would give us a little chance of having a representative who would present out views and work toward our needs.

Connie DeCoud

The County Redistricting Team does not include anyone from the El Dorado County Office of Education. For those of us with children attending public elementary school, we need to know now--instead of after the fact-- what enrollment consequences (i.e Junior High School/High School) will result with each proposed Redistricting alternative.

I can not make an informed decision on what Redistricting alternative I prefer until the requested information is provided.

Thank You

Gary Steele
[redacted]

Hello:

Is this in reference to the re-districting that is attempting to take my daughter out of her current elementary school and into another? If that is the case, I have a lot to say and

E10 - 2 of 2

it isn't positive. You have re-districted our area twice now.... and pulled kids to and from.

I find it interesting that you didn't touch Serrano (further away) and that they had an attorney and the country residents did not. I guess money does matter and the kids don't. Let me know if this is the case and I will elaborate.

Lisa MacKie

I don't mean to sound rude. It is just so hard on our children to be torn from one school to the other...whenever these district lines change. With that said, I am confident that the school district will do the right thing and let our daughter finish school in her current situation. Thank you. Lisa

Lisa MacKie
Principal Marketing Research Specialist
Customer Strategy
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
[redacted]

From: loretta.featherston@edcgov.us [mailto:loretta.featherston@edcgov.us]
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 4:52 PM
To: John Skeel
Cc: mike.applegarth@edcgov.us
Subject: Re: Redistricting maps feedback

Hi John,

Supervisor Knight asked that you relay the comments to him at this address and we can share the comments with the redistricting team.
Thank you.

Loretta Featherston
Assistant to Supervisor John R. Knight
District 1
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
Phone: (530)621-5650

loretta.featherston@edcgov.us

From: "John Skeel" [redacted]
To: <loretta.featherston@edcgov.us>
Date: 05/02/2011 12:15 PM
Subject: Redistricting maps feedback

Loretta,

I have asked residents of the El Dorado Hills CSD for feedback on redistricting and have received several comments, how would you like me to share those comments?

John P. Skeel, MS, CPRP
General Manager
El Dorado Hills Community Services District
Phone: [redacted]

E11

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/02/2011 10:16 PM
Show Details

History: This message has been replied to.

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/2/2011 10:15:52 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	VAL STEVENS
Address	
City	
State	CA
Zip	
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	WHY ISN'T THERE A MEETING IN THE GEORGETOWN DIVIDE? YOU ARE GOING ALL THE WAY TO POLLOCK PINES AND TO TAHOE AND OF COURSE, "RICH" EL DORADO HILLS, BUT YOU IGNORE GEORGETOWN. NO ONE WANTS TO DRIVE DOWN THE HILL, ALL THE WAY TO PLACERVILLE AT NIGHT. WHY ARE YOU CUTTING US OUT OF THE DISCUSSION OR MAKING IT DIFFICULT FOR US TO ATTEND?

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/2/2011 10:15:52 PM.

E12

Re: Save LTB for the local's safety!
Linda J Silacci-Smith to: Michael Doyle 05/03/2011 09:58 AM
Cc: EDCquestions
Bcc: Mike T Applegarth

Forwarding your email to the Board of Supervisors and Redistricting Committee for response...

Linda Silacci-Smith
El Dorado County
Information Technologies

Michael Doyle There will come another time where Lake Taho... 05/03/2011 08:49:52 AM

From: Michael Doyle <[redacted]>
To: EDCquestions@edcgov.us
Date: 05/03/2011 08:49 AM
Subject: Save LTB for the local's safety!

There will come another time where Lake Tahoe Blvd west of the Y will need to be at full capacity for the safe people here, whether they are locals or visitors. It would be very short-sighted to sacrifice the safety of all for the recreation of a few. Alternative 3 is the ONLY SAFE option.
Thanks,
Mike Doyle

EB 1 of 2

Proposal for a variant of a BOS redistricting alternative
Paul Raveling
to:
Mike Applegarth
05/04/2011 10:17 AM
Cc:
Harry Norris, Paul Raveling
Show Details

History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.
Mike,

A number of us have been discussing BOS redistricting by email. Harry Norris suggested offering a map that I've edited graphically as a new Alternative. My original rough draft is shown below in reduced scale, and two links point to copies of the map that have been uploaded to my web site for sharing with the email discussion group.

The two image files are at these links:

- High resolution copy of slightly refined map, from the Sacramento county line to the west side of District 5: ***http://www.sierrafoot.org/civics/bos_redistricting/concept_example_hires.jpg***

- Lower resolution original rough draft, edited from a copy of the Alternative 3 map: ***http://www.sierrafoot.org/civics/bos_redistricting/concept_example.jpg***

This map was done by graphically editing the Alternative 3 image, captured from the County's pdf file. Balancing populations among districts is by first-cut estimation of densities in the areas where I shifted boundaries between districts -- It won't be precise but I think it'll be fairly close to meeting the legal requirements.

Main features for this variation that drove the change in shape of proposed districts in the west end of the county are generally:

- Keep communities together as much as possible.
- Keep similar land uses together as much as possible
- Recognize that the road network sometimes is the most important factor defining communities
- Leverage low-density rural land as a means for fine-tuning allocation of population among districts.

and more specifically:

- Keep as much current EDH population in District 1 as possible. This is mostly an urban district.
- Keep the rest of EDH and all of Cameron Park in District 2. This is urban for EDH businesses, otherwise more generally suburban, but necessarily including some rural land.
- District 3 is mainly rural but includes all of the City of Placerville and the general area around Diamond Springs that appears most likely to move farther toward suburban land use.
- District 4 is almost entirely rural.
- District 5 is exactly as defined in Alternative 3: The boundary between Districts 4 & 5 is the only one that I've left completely unchanged.

The overall "view from a distance" resembles the notion I suggested at a BOS meeting, of a pattern somewhat resembling concentric circles of gradually decreasing population density radiating from the highest density area at the west end of the county.

Thanks for considering this suggestion.

-- Paul

Paul Raveling
[redacted]

E13 2of2

Web site: http://www.sierrafoot.org

(916) [redacted] Home
(916) [redacted] Cell phone

Original rough draft map:



E14

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/04/2011 08:02 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/4/2011 8:02:14 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Lester Lubetkin
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	530[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I feel that Alternatives 1 and 2 best retain communities of place and interest while meeting the population distributions. However,in Alt 1 or 2, I would prefer to see Mosquito area stay in District 4, in Alterntive 1, swap the El Dorado area into District 3 (El Dorado and Diamond Springs should stay together as a common community) and Pollock Pines into District 2 (which means adjustments to District 5, including probably putting Grizzly Flat into District 2). The other is, if possible, to include the portion of El Dorado Hills south of Hwy 50 into District 1 and moving that portion of Cameron Park into District4 (or possibly District 2). At first blush it seems logical to have Highway 50 serve as a breaking point, but there are too many communities that span the highway to really be appropriate (as shown by the maps). I do NOT feel that Alt 3 does a good job of avoiding splitting communities.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/4/2011 8:02:14 PM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/06/2011 01:42 PM
Show Details

E 15

History: This message has been replied to.

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/6/2011 1:41:40 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Scott Johnston
Address	[redacted]
City	Garden Valley
State	CA
Zip	95633
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I am in favor of alternative.4. It most represents the current district layout in my opinion and would balance the population with the current district layout. Many people here on the Georgetown Divide have pride in the heritage of this district all the way up to and including Tahoe. So much rich history related to the area. Splitting the representation of that would be like making California in to two States. Seems so simple to me. Scott Johnston

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/6/2011 1:41:40 PM.

E16

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/07/2011 09:08 AM
Show Details

History: This message has been replied to.

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/7/2011 9:07:32 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Judy Ryland
Address	[redacted]
City	Garden Valley
State	CA
Zip	95633
Business Phone	530 [redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I see that you may try to divide the Divide. not so fast here. There are many other ways to do this. I for one am not in favor of dividing up our Divide into little spots of neglect. We are already ignored by one. now we will be ignored by many. Not so good. AND where is the meeting going to take place on the Divide... again not a meeting on the Divide, whats up with that. My suggestion is to take the other four districts and give and take on them and leave us alone, as usual. Judy Ryland 530 [redacted]

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/7/2011 9:07:32 AM.

E 17

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/10/2011 07:09 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/10/2011 7:09:27 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Mark Almer
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	530-[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Hello, I am writing to provide my comments about the proposed redistricting of the Supervisor's Districts. Of all the proposed alternatives, I would suggest that Alternative #2 is used, HOWEVER, MODIFIED to include the community of Grizzly Flats within District 2, using North-South Road as the divider between Districts 2 and 5. The community of Grizzly Flats has area commonality with the proposed Alternative 2 Supervisor's District 2 and it makes clear sense to include Grizzly Flats in District 2. Grizzly Flats is legislatively phenomenally different from the Lake Tahoe area (District 5 in Alternative 2). Grizzly Flats is on the west slope in a detached pocket far off of the Highway 50 corridor and there is a strong likelihood that Grizzly Flats would receive LITTLE REPRESENTATION from the District 5 Supervisor. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need further clarification on my comments. Respectfully, Mark R. Almer [redacted] Grizzly Flats, CA 95636 (530) [redacted]

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/10/2011 7:09:27 AM.

E18

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/10/2011 08:19 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/10/2011 8:18:26 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Richard Englefield
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Of all the proposed alternatives, I would suggest that Alternative #2 is used, HOWEVER, MODIFIED to include the community of Grizzly Flats within District 2, using North-South Road as the divider between Districts 2 and 5. The community of Grizzly Flats has area commonality with the proposed Alternative 2 Supervisor's District 2 and it makes clear sense to include Grizzly Flats in District 2. Grizzly Flats is legislatively phenomenally different from the Lake Tahoe area (District 5 in Alternative 2). Grizzly Flats is on the west slope in a detached pocket far off of the Highway 50 corridor and there is a strong likelihood that Grizzly Flats would receive LITTLE REPRESENTATION from the District 5 Supervisor.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/10/2011 8:18:26 AM.

E19 1 of 2

Re: Redistricting Comment/Question
stoneypoint to: mike.applegarth
Cc: toohighranch

05/11/2011 08:24 AM

Thank You mr. Applegarth,
I did go to that meeting. I do like the number 2 map with the addition of Stumpy Meadows to the 4th district. That would be OK. I asked Rich the person presenting if he could come to Garden Valley with his maps and information.
Judy Ryland
530 [redacted]

cc Buzz Chrenoff

> Dear Ms. Ryland:
>
> Thank you for your feedback. I will ensure your comments are provided to
> the Board of Supervisors. I thought you might also be interested in
> knowing that that the Georgetown Advisory Committee has scheduled a
> redistricting presentation from the County Surveyor tomorrow evening,
> Tuesday, May 10. Their meeting is at 7:00 PM at the Fire Station in
> Georgetown.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Mike Applegarth
> Interim Air Pollution Control Officer
> El Dorado County
> (530) 621-5123
>
>
>
> From: mike.applegarth@edcgov.us
> To: mike.applegarth@edcgov.us
> Date: 05/07/2011 09:08 AM
> Subject: Redistricting Comment/Question
>
>
>
> Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/7/2011 9:07:32 AM.
> Comment Form
>
> Field
> Value
> Subject
> Contact Form
> Full Name
> Judy Ryland
> Address
> [redacted]
> City
> Garden Valley

E19 2 of 2

> State
> CA
> Zip
> 95633
> Business Phone
> 530 [redacted]
> Email Address
> [redacted]
> Comment-Question
> I see that you may try to divide the Divide. not so fast here. There are
> many other ways to do this. I for one am not in favor of dividing up our
> Divide into little spots of neglect. We are already ignored by one. now we
> will be ignored by many. Not so good. AND where is the meeting going to
> take place on the Divide... again not a meeting on the Divide, whats up
> with that.
> My suggestion is to take the other four districts and give and take on
> them and leave us alone, as usual.
> Judy Ryland
> 530 [redacted]
> Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to
> mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/7/2011
> 9:07:32 AM.
>
>
> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents
> may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for
> the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized 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, or authorized to receive for the intended

E20 1 of 2

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/11/2011 04:01 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/11/2011 4:02:03 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Craig Allen Heinrich
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	530-[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Hello, I am writing to provide my comments about the proposed redistricting of the Supervisor's Districts. Of all the proposed alternatives, I would suggest that Alternative #2 is used, HOWEVER, MODIFIED to include the community of Grizzly Flats within District 2, using North-South Road as the divider between Districts 2 and 5. The community of Grizzly Flats has area commonality with the proposed Alternative 2 Supervisor's District 2 and it makes clear sense to include Grizzly Flats in District 2. Grizzly Flats is legislatively phenomenally different from the Lake Tahoe area (District 5 in Alternative 2). Grizzly Flats is on the west slope in a detached pocket far off of the Highway 50 corridor and there is a strong likelihood that Grizzly Flats would receive LITTLE REPRESENTATION from the District 5 Supervisor. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need further clarification on my comments. Respectfully, Craig Heinrich [redacted]

[redacted] Road
Grizzly Flats, CA 95636
(530) [redacted]

E20 2052

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/11/2011 4:02:03 PM.

E21

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/12/2011 10:44 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/12/2011 10:44:36 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Bruce Rogers
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado Hills
State	CA
Zip	95762
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Districts should try to keep communities together. Dividing all communities along hwy 50 is the worst idea as it splits all communities that have pop. on both the North and South sides of hwy. 50. Splitting EDH improperly would allow those voters to dominate the vote in two electoral districts and same for Placerville assuming that they were largely of a single community mind in each case. Overall #1 and # 2 seem to make the most sense.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/12/2011 10:44:36 AM.

E22

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/14/2011 02:54 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/14/2011 2:55:17 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Pat Relfe
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado
State	CA
Zip	95623
Business Phone	530/[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Alternate #2 is the best with a few changes such as Pollock Pines included in district 5 and Grizzly Flat area in district 2.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/14/2011 2:55:17 PM.

E23

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/14/2011 04:23 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/14/2011 4:23:25 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Walter J. Miller
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado
State	CA
Zip	95623
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Equal size districts are necessary. Communities of interest are okay only if they fit in an equal size districts. Map 2 is best if Grizzley Flat is included in District 2. Pollock Pines goes to District 5 to maintain equality. I'm against District 5 having less than equal population even if 5 loses its Tahoe Supv. The population to be served by the county (cops, roads et al) in the basin is significantly less than 36,000 people.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/14/2011 4:23:25 PM.

E24

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/14/2011 06:55 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/14/2011 6:56:14 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	William E. Kaighn
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado
State	CA
Zip	95623
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	In my opinion I believe that the Proposed redistricting map #2 with modification would preserve the demographic and topographic nature of the current districts with the least disruption. I would like to see Map #2 modified to add Grizzily Flats to Distric 2 and remove the portion of proposed district 2 north of US 50 near Rescue. If further modification were needed to equalize the population allocation I would remove small parts of the area south of Eldorado Hills south of US 50 and add it to District 1.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/14/2011 6:56:14 PM.

The real deal, 3 redistricting maps via GIS
Paul Raveling
to:
Harry Norris, 'Rachel Michelin', 'Hal Erpenbeck', hidahl, rmroads, edh, DICKGOAP, gprada, coy, doctorjet, nanapapagibson, gskallan, 'John Raslear', Norman & Sue, Ray Myers, John W (Mission Systems)Hidahl, Linda Wright, Mike Applegarth
05/15/2011 09:42 PM
Cc:
Paul Raveling, Mike Roberts, Paul Raveling
Show Details

Folks, again borrowing a long list of email addresses from a more or less recent message on this topic, adding a couple more, doubtless omitting a couple too

Yesterday I finished working up 3 alternatives by means of the GIS support at the Sacramento Central Library. Thanks go to Robin Evans, the dauntless librarian who enabled the GIS session, and to Mike Roberts, source of the information about the Central Library's assistance for citizen access to GIS support for redistricting.

Notes and links to maps follow below. They're on www.sierrafoot.org again, and the notes below are added to them at *http://www.sierrafoot.org/civics/bos_redistricting/pr_bos_redistricting_maps.html*. As before, there's still no reference to any of this in a sierrafoot web page.

-- Paul

Paul Raveling
[redacted]
Web site: http://www.sierrafoot.org

(916) [redacted] Home
(916) [redacted] Cell phone

BOS redistricting: 3 new variations

Each of these was produced on a GIS at the Sacramento Central Library, using 2010 Census redistricting data. Populations of each district were balanced to within 1% of the target of 26,212 people per district. The population balance may actually be within ~ ½% of target in all cases due to GIS-related technical factors.

Additional notes are below the table.

Variation	GIS-generated map renditions	Image Formats	Maps with color-filled districts	Image Formats
1		1 2 3 4		2 3 4
2	Variation 2 superseded by Variation 3			
3		1 2 3 4		2 3 4
4		1 2 3 4		2 3 4



Variation 2 was superseded by variation 3. It is noted only to make sense of why the variations are numbered 1, 3, and 4.

Image formats are:

- 1: Full scale, highest resolution: jpeg image quality = 100%, file size ~ 4-6 megabytes
- 2: Full scale, lower resolution: jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~ 2 megabytes
- 3: Intermediate (scale & resolution): 800 pixels wide, jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~100K bytes
- 4: Small format : 400 pixels wide, jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~30K bytes

In the table, click on any Image Format number to retrieve the image at the corresponding scale and resolution.
Each map will open in a separate window or a separate browser tab.

The GIS images show shaded areas for all incorporated cities and Census Designated Places. The colored images overwrite that shading. That overwriting was only to conserve the time required to do a semi-manual shading process.

These maps attempt in part to collect like interests together and do so in two demographic domains: West county, with special attention to El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park in Districts 1 and 2; West Slope and Tahoe Basin in Districts 3-5.

All three alternatives have identical boundaries for Districts 3, 4, and 5 while looking at 3 approaches to Districts 1 and 2. **Also, all alternatives seek to keep Cameron Park and Shingle Springs together in District 2.** Alternatives 1 and 2 are entirely successful in doing that, Alternative 3 is close but erodes that objective slightly by needing to place perhaps 10% of the north-side CP/SS population in District 1.

The three alternatives for Districts 1 and 2 are:

- **Alternative 1 makes District 1 the area of maximum population density in El Dorado Hills. It does this by including** Serrano in the district while excluding areas with lower population densities. It excludes the Town Center and Business Park areas not because of population, but rather to make this a district with maximum focus on residential constituents. A cost is that it includes very little south-side population, including that which will develop in the Valley View and Carson Creek Specific Plan areas.

- (Alternative 2 was superseded by Alternative 3 and is not one of these 3 alternatives)

- **Alternative 3 makes District 1 the area of maximum residential land area in El Dorado Hills while also bringing in the Town Center commercial area and the Business Park.** It exchanges residential land area mainly on the east side, including part of Serrano, for additional land on the south side. Added south-side lands include Four Seasons, the remainder of the Carson Creek Specific Plan area, and the Valley View Specific Plan area.

- **Alternative 4 seeks to assign roughly equal portions of the El Dorado Hills population in each of Districts 1 and 2.** It appears that the most feasible way to do this is with an east/west boundary between the two districts. This is partly to encourage equal representation for EDH constituents, partly to anticipate the planned future growth on the south side of EDH. This concept is likely to be the most viable geometry for redistricting afterthe 2020 Census, with the border between Districts 1 and 2 almost certainly needing to move south at that time.

<u>Districts 3-5 are identical in these 3 alternatives but differ from the preliminary County-defined alternatives in these ways:</u>

- Placerville, Camino, and Pollock Pines are all grouped into District 4 instead of being split among separate districts. On a smaller scale, all of the City of Placerville is in one district.

- District boundaries in rural areas are drawn somewhat differently in order to balance population among districts and to make District 3 primarily an area of rural lands containing clusters of CDPs generally corresponding to Rural Centers as defined by the 2004 General Plan. This includes the developing area immediately west and south of Placerville in the Diamond Springs CDP. Smaller CDPs separated by rural lands in this district are Cold Springs, Coloma, Georgetown, and Auburn Lake Trails. I usually think of Greenwood and Garden Valley as being associated with Georgetown, although they are outside its CDP and Greenwood is closer to the Auburn Lakes Trails CDP.

- The western boundary of District 3 differs from any of the originally defined County alternatives as a result of attempting to focus Districts

-- 30 --


Proposed El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Districts Version 1
5/14/2010 edit by Paul Raveling
with thanks to the Sacramento Central Library
for access to redistrictring GIS services
01
02
03
04
05


Proposed El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Districts Version 1
5/14/2010 edit by Paul Raveling
with thanks to the Sacramento Central Library
for access to redistrictring GIS services
01
02
03
04
05


Proposed El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Districts Version 3
5/14/2010 edit by Paul Raveling
with thanks to the Sacramento Central Library
for access to redistricting GIS services
01
02
03
04
05


Proposed El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Districts Version 3
5/14/2010 edit by Paul Raveling
with thanks to the Sacramento Central Library
for access to redistricting GIS services
01
02
03
04
05


Proposed El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Districts Version 4
5/14/2010 edit by Paul Raveling
with thanks to the Sacramento Central Library
for access to redistricting GIS servicesm
03
04
05
01
02

E25 - 8 of 8


Proposed El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Districts Version 4
5/14/2010 edit by Paul Raveling
with thanks to the Sacramento Central Library
for access to redistricting GIS servicesm
01
02
03
04
05

Re: The real deal, 3 redistricting maps via GIS
Greg Prada
to:
Paul Raveling, Harry Norris, 'Rachel Michelin', 'Hal Erpenbeck', hidahl, rmroads, edh, DICKGOAP, coy, doctorjet, nanapapagibson, gskallan, 'John Raslear', Norman & Sue, Ray Myers, John W \(Mission Systems\)Hidahl, Linda Wright, Mike Applegarth
05/16/2011 06:04 AM
Cc:
"Paul Raveling", "Mike Roberts"
Show Details

All,

First of all, great work Paul!

Next, Variation 4 may be egalitarian from an EDH population standpoint, but is NOT good for either CP or EDH. CP hereby registers a "No" vote for Variation 4.

Between Variations 1 & 3, the EDH battle should be over which 6,000 EDH population "has to"/"gets to(ha!)" go with CP.

It is terrific that so many variations were developed...makes it more difficult for the BOS to "summarily dismiss" the whole citizen-generated excercise. But **it's critical that EDH/CP get behind just ONE of these Variations...then show up in force Thursday night, May 25th, 6pm at the Placerville redistricting meeting to show unity and resolve.**

Kind regards,

Greg Prada

----- Original Message -----
From: Paul Raveling
To: Harry Norris ; 'Rachel Michelin' ; 'Hal Erpenbeck' [redacted] ; 'John Raslear' ; Norman & Sue ; Ray Myers ; John W (Mission Systems) Hidahl ; Linda Wright ; Mike Applegarth
Cc: Paul Raveling ; Mike Roberts ; Paul Raveling
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2011 9:42 PM
Subject: The real deal, 3 redistricting maps via GIS

Folks, again borrowing a long list of email addresses from a more or less recent message on this topic, adding a couple more, doubtless omitting a couple too

Yesterday I finished working up 3 alternatives by means of the GIS support at the Sacramento Central Library. Thanks go to Robin Evans, the dauntless librarian who enabled the GIS session, and to Mike Roberts, source of the information about the Central Library's assistance for citizen access to GIS support for redistricting.

Notes and links to maps follow below. They're on www.sierrafoot.org again, and the notes below are added to them at ***http://www.sierrafoot.org/civics/bos_redistricting/pr_bos_redistricting_maps.html***. As before, there's still no reference to any of this in a sierrafoot web page.

-- Paul

Paul Raveling
[redacted]
Web site: http://www.sierrafoot.org

(916) [redacted] Home
(916) [redacted] Cell phone

BOS redistricting: 3 new variations

Each of these was produced on a GIS at the Sacramento Central Library, using 2010 Census redistricting data. Populations of each district were balanced to within 1% of the target of 26,212 people per district. The population balance may actually be within ~ ½% of target in all cases due to GIS-related technical factors.

Additional notes are below the table.

Variation	GIS-generated map renditions	Image Formats	Maps with color-filled districts	Image Format
1		*1 2 3 4*		*2 3 4*
2	Variation 2 superseded by Variation 3			

3		1 2 3 4		2 3 4
4		1 2 3 4		2 3 4

Variation 2 was superseded by variation 3. It is noted only to make sense of why the variations are numbered 1, 3, and 4.

Image formats are:

- 1: Full scale, highest resolution: jpeg image quality = 100%, file size ~ 4-6 megabytes
- 2: Full scale, lower resolution: jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~ 2 megabytes
- 3: Intermediate (scale & resolution): 800 pixels wide, jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~100K bytes
- 4: Small format : 400 pixels wide, jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~30K bytes

In the table, click on any Image Format number to retrieve the image at the corresponding scale and resolution.
Each map will open in a separate window or a separate browser tab.

The GIS images show shaded areas for all incorporated cities and Census Designated Places. The colored images overwrite that shading. That overwriting was only to conserve the time required to do a semi-manual shading process.

These maps attempt in part to collect like interests together and do so in two demographic domains: West county, with special attention to El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park in Districts 1 and 2; West Slope and Tahoe Basin in Districts 3-5.

All three alternatives have identical boundaries for Districts 3, 4, and 5 while looking at 3 approaches to Districts 1 and 2. **Also, all alternatives seek to keep Cameron Park and Shingle Springs together in District 2.** Alternatives 1 and 2 are entirely successful in doing that, Alternative 3 is close but erodes that objective slightly by needing to place perhaps 10% of the north-side CP/SS population in District 1.

The three alternatives for Districts 1 and 2 are:

- **Alternative 1 makes District 1 the area of maximum population density in El Dorado Hills. It does this by including** Serrano in the district while excluding areas with lower population densities. It excludes the Town Center and Business Park areas not because of population, but rather to make this a district with maximum focus on residential constituents. A cost is that it includes very little south-side population, including that which will develop in the Valley View and Carson Creek Specific Plan areas.

- (Alternative 2 was superseded by Alternative 3 and is not one of these 3 alternatives)

- **Alternative 3 makes District 1 the area of maximum residential land area in El Dorado Hills while also bringing in the Town Center commercial area and the Business Park.** It exchanges residential land area mainly on the east side, including part of Serrano, for additional land on the south side. Added south-side lands include Four Seasons, the remainder of the Carson Creek Specific Plan area, and the Valley View Specific Plan area.

- **Alternative 4 seeks to assign roughly equal portions of the El Dorado Hills population in each of Districts 1 and 2.** It appears that the most feasible way to do this is with an east/west boundary between the two districts. This is partly to encourage equal representation for EDH constituents, partly to anticipate the planned future growth on the south side of EDH. This concept is likely to be the most viable geometry for redistricting afterthe 2020 Census, with the border between Districts 1 and 2 almost certainly needing to move south at that time.

<u>Districts 3-5 are identical in these 3 alternatives but differ from the preliminary County-defined alternatives in these ways:</u>

- Placerville, Camino, and Pollock Pines are all grouped into District 4 instead of being split among separate districts. On a smaller scale, all of the City of Placerville is in one district.

- District boundaries in rural areas are drawn somewhat differently in order to balance population among districts and to make District 3 primarily an area of rural lands containing clusters of CDPs generally corresponding to Rural Centers as defined by the 2004 General Plan. This includes the developing area immediately west and south of Placerville in the Diamond Springs CDP. Smaller CDPs separated by rural lands in this district are Cold Springs, Coloma,

Georgetown, and Auburn Lake Trails. I usually think of Greenwood and Garden Valley as being associated with Georgetown, although they are outside its CDP and Greenwood is closer to the Auburn Lakes Trails CDP.

- The western boundary of District 3 differs from any of the originally defined County alternatives as a result of attempting to focus Districts

-- 30 --

E27

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/16/2011 10:44 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/16/2011 10:44:56 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Ripley M. Howe
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Hello, I am writing to provide my comments about the proposed redistricting of the Supervisor's Districts. Of all the proposed alternatives, I would suggest that Alternative #2 is used, HOWEVER, MODIFIED to include the community of Grizzly Flats within District 2, using North-South Road as the divider between Districts 2 and 5. The community of Grizzly Flats has area commonality with the proposed Alternative 2 Supervisor's District 2 and it makes clear sense to include Grizzly Flats in District 2. Grizzly Flats is legislatively phenomenally different from the South Lake Tahoe area (District 5 in Alternative 2). Grizzly Flats is on the west slope in a detached pocket far off of the Highway 50 corridor and there is a strong likelihood that Grizzly Flats would receive LITTLE REPRESENTATION from the District 5 Supervisor. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need further clarification on my comments. Respectfully, Ripley M. Howe Secretary, Pioneer Fire Protection District H: [redacted] C: [redacted]

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/16/2011 10:44:56 AM.

E28

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/16/2011 01:57 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/16/2011 1:57:49 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	John Richmond
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado Hills
State	CA
Zip	95762
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	We support proposed plan #3. It is the only one that appears to have all of El Dorado Hills represented by the same supervisor. Having the same supervisor represent the entire EDH area, will ensure our interests will not compete with those of the less populated, rural area. Those interests are not always the same.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/16/2011 1:57:49 PM.

E29

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/16/2011 02:43 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/16/2011 2:43:38 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	David B. Kunder and Jill Kunder
Address	[redacted]
City	Somerset
State	CA
Zip	95684
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Regarding the 2011 redistricting, We live in Supervisorial District #2, have seen the proposed alternative maps, and recommend that the Board adopt Redistricting Alternative #2. Yes, please keep us updated with e-mail alerts about redistricting information.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/16/2011 2:43:38 PM.

E30

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 08:08 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 8:09:00 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Terry Henderson
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I would like to provide my comments about the proposed redistricting of the Supervisor's Districts. Of all the proposed alternatives, I would suggest that Alternative #2 is used, WITH MODIFICATION to include the community of Grizzly Flats within District 2, using North-South Road as the divider between Districts 2 and 5. The community of Grizzly Flats has area commonality with the proposed Alternative 2 Supervisor's District 2 and it makes clear sense to include Grizzly Flats in District 2. Grizzly Flats is legislatively phenomenally different from the Lake Tahoe area (District 5 in Alternative 2). Grizzly Flats is on the west slope in a detached pocket far off of the Highway 50 corridor and there is a strong likelihood that Grizzly Flats would receive LITTLE REPRESENTATION from the District 5 Supervisor. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need further clarification on my comments. Thank you, Terry Henderson

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 8:09:00 AM.

E31

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 08:13 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 8:13:52 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Carol Anne Ogdin
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Alternative 1 is the only viable option, because it preserves integral representation from many of the POPULATED areas of the county. The citizens along US50 have interests that are vastly different from rural residents. That is preferable to, say, Alternative 3, which is an exercise in "logic" that ensures that rural and urban residents are lumped together, as if their interests were the same.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 8:13:52 AM.

E32

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 09:22 AM
Show Details

History: This message has been replied to.

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 9:22:32 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Laurie Lindenauer Brown
Address	[redacted]
City	Fair Play
State	CA
Zip	95684
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Do these alternatives have to be adopted as presented, or can they be tweaked a bit or combined to maintain conformity of population totals and still retain some cultural/historical continuity?

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 9:22:32 AM.

E33

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 11:09 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 11:09:27 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667-9494
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I like alternative #2 the best, it keeps communities that are close together in the same district.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 11:09:27 AM.

E34

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 04:45 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 4:46:03 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Georg Schmerholz
Address	[redacted]
City	Someset
State	CA
Zip	95684
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	After reviewing the various proposals of redistricting, I am strongly in favor of Alternative 2, as it reflects the demographic/cultural uniqueness of our area more accurately, than the other alternatives.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 4:46:03 PM.

E35

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 08:35 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 8:36:01 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	W. C. Neisius
Address	[redacted]
City	Somerset
State	CA
Zip	95684-9416
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I would choose map #1. 1) Districts 1&3 populations are slightly lower than other districts but, will probably grow much faster than the others in the next 10 years. 2) The county appears to be divided according to chosen life style of the population.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 8:36:01 PM.

E38

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 09:45 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 9:45:49 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Ward Greene
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado
State	CA
Zip	95623
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	If Rescue was not added to District 2 and Grizzly flat was retained in District 2 and these changes were made to Alternative 2, the commonality of the communities would be more in sync. The interdependence of the communities that share water sheds fosters neighborhoods which rely on those relationships. Please consider the change to alternative 2 and the increased effectiveness of the Supervisor who will be elected to represent the people in his or her community. Thank you, Ward Greene

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 9:45:49 PM.

E37

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/17/2011 10:22 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/17/2011 10:23:08 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Wayne & Jean Varozza
Address	[redacted]
City	Shingle Springs
State	CA
Zip	95682-9733
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Alternative Map #2 appears to be the best solution for now.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/17/2011 10:23:08 PM.

E38

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/18/2011 02:15 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/18/2011 2:16:14 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	waren mecham
Address	[redacted]
City	grizzly flats
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	530-[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	you want to put grizzly flats in with the south lake tahoe district.. why... we shop in placervile, get any needed service from placervile, have a local fire department. do not go to south lake tahoe.. you do this then we are with a district that is not off our needs... we like ray as our rep... this was the first time i voted for someone that lives by us... if my new district is south lake tahoe i guess i will shop in carson city when i go to reno 2 times a month, now shop in placervile my county.l the last supervisor only came up when an election, and only made promises..... thank youy warren mecham

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/18/2011 2:16:14 PM.

E39 1 of 2

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/18/2011 07:20 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/18/2011 7:20:27 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	james alderink
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	First considerations: 1 Must comply with 1 man 1 vote 2. It is in the county's interest to keep power as much as possible in rural, Ag, Resource, anti enviro, local jobs, and center of interest as far East as possible. #1 Green area - votes are in suberbia - rural loses influence. Rescue area has it's heart in suberbia and moving that direction - upscale - heart going to Sac. Shingle Springs and El Dorado will stay more rural, less affluent, heart goes to Placerville Yellow - heart in Sac and enviro, basic opposition to east county interests Purple Power in suburbia - rural won't count Orange - government center, central planning, government smarter than the folks (note Placerville redevelopment agency) Alt 2: District 5 lone wolf 4 - power in suberbia - would need strong supervisor to support rural interest 3 Government center - central plan 2 power in suberbia 1 heart in Sac, big govt, central planning Alt 3: Hopeless. all power in west county

E39 2 of 2

	Alt 4: 4&5 natural allies 2 enough rural south of 50 to balance EDH/Cameron Park 1&3 natural allies - heart in Sac?suburbia

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/18/2011 7:20:27 PM.

E40

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/19/2011 09:55 AM
Show Details

History: This message has been replied to.

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/19/2011 9:56:20 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Eric Rasbold
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizlly Flat
State	(Select)
Zip	
Business Phone	
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Alt 5 seems best: All districts will have one major city (relatively speaking, of course.) and does well to separate the various "lifestyles" in the county. Two questions, when was the last gerrymandering and who will make the decisions for this new one?

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/19/2011 9:56:20 AM.

E41

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/19/2011 08:00 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/19/2011 8:00:44 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Linda Ann Colombo
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado
State	CA
Zip	95623
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I hope the Board of SWupervisors will vote for Alt. #2 since it most closely retains teh current districts. I do not want to loose my supervisor Ray Nutting since he really represents how my neighbors and I live. Thanks for your consideration. LINDa

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/19/2011 8:00:44 PM.

E42

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/20/2011 06:53 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/20/2011 6:53:35 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Paula Peterson
Address	[redacted]
City	South Lake Tahoe
State	CA
Zip	96151
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	While South Lake Tahoe's population may be dwindling we are still unique from communities on the west shore and need to make sure our voice is heard. Nobody else is affected by road closures like the basin is. Nobody else is affected by tourism like the basin is. If we need to redistrict we need to NOT be included in the same district as the City of Placerville. I feel if that happens our voice is lost. Plans 2,3 and 4 would be okay (though far from perfect) but 1 and 5 will not be acceptable. Thank you.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/20/2011 6:53:35 AM.

E43

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/20/2011 06:53 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/20/2011 6:54:23 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Paula Peterson
Address	[redacted]
City	South Lake Tahoe
State	CA
Zip	96151
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	While South Lake Tahoe's population may be dwindling we are still unique from communities on the west shore and need to make sure our voice is heard. Nobody else is affected by road closures like the basin is. Nobody else is affected by tourism like the basin is. If we need to redistrict we need to NOT be included in the same district as the City of Placerville. I feel if that happens our voice is lost. Plans 2,3 and 4 would be okay (though far from perfect) but 1 and 5 will not be acceptable. Thank you.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/20/2011 6:54:23 AM.

E44

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/20/2011 08:58 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/20/2011 8:58:57 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Janill Gilbert
Address	[redacted]
City	South Lake Tahoe
State	CA
Zip	96150
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	None of the alternative proposed boundaries make any sense for South Lake Tahoe, only illustrative 2 makes sense. Going with any of the other choices will leave South Lake Tahoe unrepresented in my opinion, as we are too far removed from Placerville.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/20/2011 8:58:57 AM.

E45 1 of 3

Fwd: The real deal, 3 redistricting maps via GIS
Paul Raveling
to:
Mike Applegarth, John Knight, Ray Nutting
05/21/2011 12:56 AM
Cc:
Paul Raveling
Show Details

Mike, John, and Ray,

You weren't in the original distribution list for this message, that list was created by way of a Reply-all to one of many prior emails. This is to be sure you're aware of this and to add a couple comments mainly for the benefit of John and Ray. If you have a reply I won't be able to read it for a week, will be out of town and out of email contact in Arizona until Monday, May 30th.

As noted below, the 3 new maps created by GIS with district populations balanced within 1% represent 3 concepts from the EDH view, changing only Districts 1 & 2, and a single additional concept for Districts 3-5. If I were back in a professional role as system architect these would be highly preliminary for exploratory concept evaluation. In this case the project itself is far simpler than typical software system projects; I'd expect it to be possible to reach a final conceptual system design for redistricting in 2 to 4 weeks, given a working group of at most 4 well qualified professionals.

I have two main concerns, based especially on various emails in the flood of communication about redistricting.

- The County doesn't seem to be doing this. It's dismaying to see reports that the County is producing no additional maps beyond the first five.
- There has been a lot of talk about politics negating all other factors, especially regarding the question of existing supervisors keeping their seats. Everyone's focus should be on how to provide the best possible representation for all constituents in the County.

The second factor is especially important for El Dorado Hills because it's an actual city, with 2010 population 42,108, with County land use planning targeting it for at least 70,000. The largest corresponding deficits are lack of a city government and inadequate resources for road maintenance and road system development. EDH needs its own city council and the additional revenue stream at least for its Road Fund. Lacking that, it needs to have the strongest representation of any similarly sized geographic area in the County on the Board of Supervisors. The County as a whole also needs to recognize that its own best interests have been evolving toward the best interests of El Dorado Hills, and they are continuing to do so. Cameron Park is an additional factor, with the combination of EDH and Cameron Park at more than 60,000 population.

In the usually cited political considerations, Ray has the most difficult position. The westward shift in population balance makes it very difficult for a rural resident of District 2 to keep a seat. The most feasible solution is not to make that an influence on district definition but rather for Ray and possibly other candidates to move to El Dorado Hills. As Horace Greeley said, "Go west, young man." A more complete quote taking a liberty with just one letter is "Go West, young man, go West and grow up with the county." (Greeley said "country" instead of "county".) There's even a precedent for this, Helen Baumann.

After releasing these 3 maps I had several prompt requests for additional alternatives. I don't have the personal bandwidth to do this. Each variant that changes only the split between District 1 and District 2 takes 1 to 2 hours on the GIS. Larger-scale variants that move the boundaries of Districts 3-5, so far requiring corresponding changes in the District I & 2 boundaries, require about double that. Add 2 hours for each drive to Sacramento, parking, and walking to and from the Central Library.

The County has staff who can do these exercises -- My best contact in the Surveyor's office has been Linda Wright. I hope the BOS will give direction to staff to proceed with additional alternative maps and to do so without political bias. The question you need to answer is "How can we best serve the people of El Dorado County?". About 1/3 of them are already in the are of El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park, and those unincorporated areas need maximum attention.

-- Paul

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: The real deal, 3 redistricting maps via GIS
Date: Sun, 15 May 2011 21:42:15 -0700
From: Paul Raveling [redacted]
To: [redacted]

Folks, again borrowing a long list of email addresses from a more or less recent message on this topic, adding a couple more, doubtless omitting a couple too

Yesterday I finished working up 3 alternatives by means of the GIS support at the Sacramento Central Library. Thanks go to Robin Evans, the dauntless librarian who enabled the GIS session, and to Mike Roberts, source of the information about the Central Library's assistance for citizen access to GIS support for redistricting.

Notes and links to maps follow below. They're on www.sierrafoot.org again, and the notes below are added to them at *http://www.sierrafoot.org/civics/bos_redistricting/pr_bos_redistricting_maps.html*. As before, there's still no reference to any of this in a sierrafoot web page.

-- Paul

Paul Raveling
[redacted]

Web site: http://www.sierrafoot.org

(916) [redacted] Home
(916) [redacted]6 Cell phone

EXS 2 OF 3

BOS redistricting: 3 new variations

Each of these was produced on a GIS at the Sacramento Central Library, using 2010 Census redistricting data. Populations of each district were balanced to within 1% of the target of 26,212 people per district. The population balance may actually be within ~ ½% of target in all cases due to GIS-related technical factors.

Additional notes are below the table.

Variation	GIS-generated map renditions	Image Formats	Maps with color-filled districts	Image Formats
1		1 2 3 4		2 3 4
2	Variation 2 superseded by Variation 3			
3		1 2 3 4		2 3 4
4		1 2 3 4		2 3 4

Variation 2 was superseded by variation 3. It is noted only to make sense of why the variations are numbered 1, 3, and 4.

Image formats are:

- 1: Full scale, highest resolution: jpeg image quality = 100%, file size ~ 4-6 megabytes
- 2: Full scale, lower resolution: jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~ 2 megabytes
- 3: Intermediate (scale & resolution): 800 pixels wide, jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~100K bytes
- 4: Small format : 400 pixels wide, jpeg image quality = 85%, file size ~30K bytes

In the table, click on any Image Format number to retrieve the image at the corresponding scale and resolution.
Each map will open in a separate window or a separate browser tab.

The GIS images show shaded areas for all incorporated cities and Census Designated Places. The colored images overwrite that shading. That overwriting was only to conserve the time required to do a semi-manual shading process.

These maps attempt in part to collect like interests together and do so in two demographic domains: West county, with special attention to El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park in Districts 1 and 2; West Slope and Tahoe Basin in Districts 3-5.

E45 3 of 3

All three alternatives have identical boundaries for Districts 3, 4, and 5 while looking at 3 approaches to Districts 1 and 2. **Also, all alternatives seek to keep Cameron Park and Shingle Springs together in District 2.** Alternatives 1 and 2 are entirely successful in doing that, Alternative 3 is close but erodes that objective slightly by needing to place perhaps 10% of the north-side CP/SS population in District 1.

The three alternatives for Districts 1 and 2 are:

- **Alternative 1 makes District 1 the area of maximum population density in El Dorado Hills. It does this by including** Serrano in the district while excluding areas with lower population densities. It excludes the Town Center and Business Park areas not because of population, but rather to make this a district with maximum focus on residential constituents. A cost is that it includes very little south-side population, including that which will develop in the Valley View and Carson Creek Specific Plan areas.
- (Alternative 2 was superseded by Alternative 3 and is not one of these 3 alternatives)
- **Alternative 3 makes District 1 the area of maximum residential land area in El Dorado Hills while also bringing in the Town Center commercial area and the Business Park.** It exchanges residential land area mainly on the east side, including part of Serrano, for additional land on the south side. Added south-side lands include Four Seasons, the remainder of the Carson Creek Specific Plan area, and the Valley View Specific Plan area.
- **Alternative 4 seeks to assign roughly equal portions of the El Dorado Hills population in each of Districts 1 and 2.** It appears that the most feasible way to do this is with an east/west boundary between the two districts. This is partly to encourage equal representation for EDH constituents, partly to anticipate the planned future growth on the south side of EDH. This concept is likely to be the most viable geometry for redistricting afterthe 2020 Census, with the border between Districts 1 and 2 almost certainly needing to move south at that time.

Districts 3-5 are identical in these 3 alternatives but differ from the preliminary County-defined alternatives in these ways:

- Placerville, Camino, and Pollock Pines are all grouped into District 4 instead of being split among separate districts. On a smaller scale, all of the City of Placerville is in one district.
- District boundaries in rural areas are drawn somewhat differently in order to balance population among districts and to make District 3 primarily an area of rural lands containing clusters of CDPs generally corresponding to Rural Centers as defined by the 2004 General Plan. This includes the developing area immediately west and south of Placerville in the Diamond Springs CDP. Smaller CDPs separated by rural lands in this district are Cold Springs, Coloma, Georgetown, and Auburn Lake Trails. I usually think of Greenwood and Garden Valley as being associated with Georgetown, although they are outside its CDP and Greenwood is closer to the Auburn Lakes Trails CDP.
- The western boundary of District 3 differs from any of the originally defined County alternatives as a result of attempting to focus Districts

-- 30 --

E46

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/21/2011 12:03 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/21/2011 12:03:27 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Chrystie Mort Davis
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado
State	CA
Zip	95623
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I sould much prefer a modified Alternative 2 that has been proposed. I believe it in the best interest of the good of the all for as much as Pollock Pines to remain within the boundaries of District two. The individuals living in this area, along with those living in the bulk of the current boundaries are best served by an individual who knows the issues in these rural/suburban areas. I see no value in maintaining any part of El Dorado Hills, nor Rescue, in order to acheive the goals in equalizing the numbers represented by each Supervisor. I would hate to see El Dorado loose our current Supervisor to achieve this, but would do so for the good of the all.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/21/2011 12:03:27 PM.

E47

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/23/2011 12:23 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/23/2011 12:23:53 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Phillip James Dayton
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flat
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	In all of the new district maps shown, none of them have Grizzly Flat included in the area that has common interests or common watershed. Grizzly Flat and Tahoe have nothing in common for community interest, watershed or geographic slope? Grizzly Flat would be better served if the county used map #2 but moved the district line to include North South road, Mormon Imagrant to HWY 50, this would put Grizzly Flat back in a group it has common interests and common watershed with which include Summerset, Grizzly Flat, Happy Valley, Sly Park, Pollack Pines, Fairplay, Omo Ranch, Outingdale, River Pines, Mt Aukum, just to name a few in the Southern El Dorado county area.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/23/2011 12:23:53 PM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/23/2011 01:30 PM
Show Details

E48

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/23/2011 1:29:57 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	DAVID ZWECK
Address	[redacted]
City	CAMERON PARK
State	CA
Zip	95682
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I support alternative 2.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/23/2011 1:29:57 PM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/25/2011 08:40 AM
Show Details

E49

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/25/2011 8:40:18 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Ken Hasse
Address	[redacted]
City	El Dorado
State	CA
Zip	95623
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	A modified form of Alternative 2 would serve the south county residents best. Happy Valley and Grizzly Flat should be retained in District 2 because of similarities of topography, demographics and accessibility. Population balances could be achieved by adjustments in Pollock Pines or perhaps on the El Dorado hills end.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/25/2011 8:40:18 AM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/26/2011 06:59 PM
Show Details

E50

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/26/2011 6:58:58 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Craig R Cooper Wyble
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I believe that alternate 2 , if modified is the best choice. The modifications would be to put Pollock Pines, and Grizzly Flats back in to District 2. There is absolutely no commonality between the Grizzly Flats and Pollock Pines area and South Lake Tahoe. In addition, I believe that the areas of Grizzly Flats and Pollock Pines would not receive appropriate representation as the supervisor would not be able to allocate enough time and the travel time involved would preclude appropriate representation.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/26/2011 6:58:58 PM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/26/2011 07:03 PM
Show Details

ES1

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/26/2011 7:03:37 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Lawrence E Cooper-Wyble
Address	[redacted]
City	Placerville
State	CA
Zip	95667
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I have reviewed the redistricting maps and the only one that make any common sense is number two, but it needs to be "modified". To include Grizzly Flats and Pollock Pines in the same district as South Lake Tahoe is, in my opinion, ludicrous. Those three areas share no commonality and the result would be a major lack of representation for the lower slope areas. Let the supervisor for South Tahoe have a few less constituents and keep like area with like areas.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/26/2011 7:03:37 PM.

E52

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
05/27/2011 10:39 AM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 5/27/2011 10:39:17 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Janet Seidman-Domas
Address	[redacted]
City	South Lake Tahoe
State	CA
Zip	96150
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I have lived in El Dorado County for 34 years. I remember when South Lake Tahoe was divided in half with 2 supervisory districts. Although there is the opinion that this option would give Tahoe 2 votes, it was my experience that we had 2 representatives with little to no regard for Tahoe issues rather than 2 votes of support. I believe that Tahoe needs a supervisor who lives in Tahoe , knows the area and the residents and who will go to bat for them. The most viable option to ensure adquate representation for Tahoe is alternative # 2 as this will keep Tahoe in one distrist with the possibility of a locsl supervisor.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 5/27/2011 10:39:17 AM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
06/02/2011 09:57 AM
Show Details

E53
1 of 3

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 6/2/2011 9:57:31 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Karen Mulvany
Address	[redacted]
City	Lotus
State	CA
Zip	95651
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Thank you for taking community input on the redistricting process, and for holding community meetings, one of which I attended last week in Lotus. The following are comments and suggestions for redistricting that emphasize keeping contiguous communities of interests intact -- notably rural, suburban/bedroom, alpine and Placerville areas -- while also imposing the least change on districts that are closest to target. I. Keep District 4 Rural District 4, in which my family lives, today is an entirely rural district. Indeed, this district elected our supervisor for his "Keep Us Rural" position. As a community of interests, we would like District 4 to remain rural, with separate districts for suburban, business and rural center communities which have very different community interests than ours. In addition, the South Fork of the American River is a critical economic driver for the Lotus Coloma area within District 4, and we would argue the river from at least Slab Creek to Folsom Lake should remain within District 4. The entirely rural District 4, out of all the districts, has over the past 10 years grown at a rate most closely matching the growth of the county's population as a whole, and consequently it is only 1014 people, or 2.8%, below the new target district population of 36,212. It would therefore seem reasonable that District 4 should undergo the least amount of change in the redistricting process. At present, however, virtually all of the currently proposed

E53 2 of 3

redistricting maps impose the most geographical and population change upon District 4, rather than the least. Of special concern are Alternatives 1 and 2, which propose the new inclusion in District 4 of Cameron Park - a bedroom/suburban community of over 18,000 -- a scenario that would weaken and overwhelm the rural focus our community so values. A more fair redistricting, and one that would comply with current law, would be to leave District 4 entirely unchanged.

As previously noted, District 4 is currently only 1014 people, or 2.8%, below target; according to Edward Knapp, Chief Assistant County Counsel, this is within the valid range established by courts. If these 1014 people were equally divided among the remaining districts, with no change in boundary whatsoever District 4's population would be less than 3.5% below the population of any other district, meaning that District 4 could remain unchanged and in compliance legally.

To more closely approximate the target figure, adding another 1000 people to District 4 could be accomplished by moving to District 4 some of District 2's excess population in the rural Shingle Springs community south of 50 (which would mesh with the portion of Shingle Springs already in District 4 today).

II. To complete the picture for the rest of the county, we propose the following in order to keep rural, suburban/bedroom and alpine communities of interests intact:

1. District 5 (Tahoe Basin/Alpine). With respect to District 5, which is 5466 under target, we believe the special requirements of the Lake Tahoe region argue for keeping the lakeside area within one supervisory district. In order to keep the populated alpine areas of the county together, we propose extending the Tahoe Basin area of District 5 down the 50 corridor into the higher elevation areas of Polluck Pines and into other alpine sectors currently within District 2. (Note that Polluck Pines is now in District 2, which is 8222 over target; but with its population of 6871, Polluck Pines is too large to be added as one intact community to any other existing district.) Within this alpine community of interests, highway 50 is a vital lifeline.

2. District 3 (Placerville rural center). We propose keeping District 3 intact and moving 4200 people from District 2 -- up along the highway 50 and Newtown/Pleasant Valley Road corridors up to and including the lower elevations of the Polluck Pines area -- to District 3. This district would be characterized by a dependence upon Placerville as a hub, but would be less impacted by snow issues and Highway 50 dependence than the higher elevations of District 5.

3. District 1 (El Dorado Hills suburban/bedroom community). El Dorado Hills, although clearly a community of interests, with a population of 42108 is too large for one district but belongs in one district to the extent possible. We propose a new District 1 that a) includes all of the current areas of El Dorado Hills north of 50 currently within District 1, and b) adds areas of El Dorado Hills north of 50 that are now within District 2, and c) also includes as much of the suburban areas of El Dorado Hills south of 50 off Latrobe Road as possible. This will mean that Cameron Park with a population of 18277 moves to a new district (District 2) separate from El Dorado Hills.

4. District 2 (Cameron Park). At 8222 over target, it is already clear

ES3 3 of 3

	that District 2 must undergo the most redistricting change. This district would retain some of its existing rural territory to the south, and likely the El Dorado Hills business parks on Latrobe Road, but would exchange its current portion of the bedroom community of El Dorado Hills noth of 50 (which would go to District 1) for a largely intact Cameron Park community.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 6/2/2011 9:57:31 AM.

Comments - Redistricting

The BOSFOUR to: Mike T Applegarth, Edward L Knapp, William E Schultz, Richard L Briner

06/02/2011 11:19 AM

Sent by: Brenda J Bailey

Gentlemen,

I am forwarding the attached to you for your information and review. I do not recall if you want to see these comments as they are received. Better to be safe.

Thank you,
Brenda Bailey
Assistant to Supervisor Briggs
(530) 621-6513

----- Forwarded by Brenda J Bailey/PV/EDC on 06/02/2011 11:17 AM -----

Redistricting

Karen Mulvany to: bosfour

06/02/2011 10:13 AM

From: "Karen Mulvany" <[redacted]>

To: <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Dear Ron,

It was nice to see you at last week's redistricting meeting in Lotus.

FYI, attached are comments sent today to the county via the comment form on the redistricting website page. As we discussed last week, District 4 seems to be assuming more than its fair share of change in the proposal redistricting maps submitted to date, and the inclusion of the 18,277 Cameron Park residents as laid out in Alternatives 1 and 2 is of special concern to our currently rural district. We hope District 4 can retain its rural composition and key portions of the South Fork of the American River.

Thank you,

Karen Mulvany
530-[redacted]

2011 0602 Redistricting letter K Mulvany.pdf

Redistricting recommendation K Mulvany.pdf

ES4 2 of 6

[redacted]
Lotus, CA 95651
June 2, 2011

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane, Building A
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Redistricting

Thank you for taking community input on the redistricting process. The following are comments and suggestions for redistricting that emphasize keeping contiguous communities of interests intact -- notably rural, suburban/bedroom, alpine and Placerville areas -- while also imposing the least change on districts that are closest to target.

I. Keep District 4 Rural

District 4, in which my family lives, today is an entirely rural district. Indeed, this district elected our supervisor for his "Keep Us Rural" position. As a community of interests, we would like District 4 to remain rural, with separate districts for suburban, business and rural center communities which have very different community interests than ours. In addition, the South Fork of the American River is a critical economic driver for the Lotus Coloma area within District 4, and we would argue the river from at least Slab Creek to Folsom Lake should remain within District 4.

The entirely rural District 4, out of all the districts, has over the past 10 years grown at a rate most closely matching the growth of the county's population as a whole, and consequently it is only 1014 people, or 2.8%, below the new target district population of 36,212. It would therefore seem reasonable that District 4 should undergo the least amount of change in the redistricting process.

At present, however, virtually all of the currently proposed redistricting maps impose the most geographical and population change upon District 4, rather than the least. Of special concern are Alternatives 1 and 2, which propose the new inclusion in District 4 of Cameron Park - a bedroom/suburban community of over 18,000 -- a scenario that would weaken and overwhelm the rural focus our community so values. A more fair redistricting, and one that would comply with current law, would be to leave District 4 entirely unchanged.

As previously noted, District 4 is currently only 1014 people, or 2.8%, below target; according to Edward Knapp, Chief Assistant County Counsel, this is within the valid range established by courts. If these 1014 people were equally divided among the remaining districts, with no change in boundary whatsoever. District

4's population would be less than 3.5% below the population of any other district, meaning that District 4 could remain unchanged and in compliance legally.

To more closely approximate the target figure, adding another 1000 people to District 4 could be accomplished by moving to District 4 some of District 2's excess population in the rural Shingle Springs community south of 50 (which would mesh with the portion of Shingle Springs already in District 4 today).

II. To complete the picture for the rest of the county, we propose the following in order to keep rural, suburban/bedroom and alpine communities of interests intact:

1. District 5 (Tahoe Basin/Alpine). With respect to District 5, which is 5466 under target, we believe the special requirements of the Lake Tahoe region argue for keeping the lakeside area within one supervisory district. In order to keep the populated alpine areas of the county together, we propose extending the Tahoe Basin area of District 5 down the 50 corridor into the higher elevation areas of Polluck Pines and into other alpine sectors currently within District 2. (Note that Polluck Pines is now in District 2, which is 8222 over target; but with its population of 6871, Polluck Pines is too large to be added as one intact community to any other existing district.) Within this alpine community of interests, highway 50 is a vital lifeline.

2. District 3 (Placerville rural center). We propose keeping District 3 intact and moving 4200 people from District 2 -- up along the highway 50 and Newtown/Pleasant Valley Road corridors up to and including the lower elevations of the Polluck Pines area -- to District 3. This district would be characterized by a dependence upon Placerville as a hub, but would be less impacted by snow issues and Highway 50 dependence than the higher elevations of District 5.

3. District 1 (El Dorado Hills suburban/bedroom community). El Dorado Hills, although clearly a community of interests, with a population of 42108 is too large for one district but belongs in one district to the extent possible. We propose a new District 1 that includes all of the current areas of El Dorado Hills north of 50 currently within District 1, and adds areas of El Dorado Hills north of 50 that are now within District 2, and also includes as much of the suburban areas of El Dorado Hills south of 50 off Latrobe Road as possible. This will mean that Cameron Park with a population of 18277 moves to a new district separate from El Dorado Hills (District 2).

4. District 2 (Cameron Park + South County). At 8222 over target, it is already clear that District 2 must undergo the most redistricting change. This district would retain some of its existing rural territory to the south, and likely the El Dorado Hills business parks on Latrobe Road, but would exchange its current

portion of the bedroom community of El Dorado Hills (which would go to District 1) for a largely intact Cameron Park community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Karen Mulvany

K. Mulvany comments: Keep Rural, Suburban/Bedroom, Alpine and Rural Center Communities intact while imposing the least change on districts closest to target.

E54-5 of 6

Current Supervisorial District Boundaries

Population target for each district is 36,212.
Current Districts range from 22.7% over target to 15.1% under target.

Data Source:
Census 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-197)

Map last revised April 13, 2011



Summary of Comments on Redistricting recommendation K Mulvany.pdf

Page: 1

Author: Karen Subject: Text Box Date: 6/2/2011 9:54:03 AM

K. Mulvany comments: Keep Rural, Suburban/Bedroom, Alpine and Rural Center Communities intact while imposing the least change on districts closest to target.

Author: Karen Subject: Sticky Note Date: 6/2/2011 9:54:37 AM

Step 3. District 5 Alpine + Tahoe Basin.
Keep Tahoe Basin in District 5 intact and add 5500 people from high elevation (snow) areas of District 2, including the eastern portion of Hwy 50, a vital lifeline for these communities. This area would extend to snow affected areas of Grizzly Flat and some high elevation portions of Polluck Pines.

Author: Karen Subject: Sticky Note Date: 6/2/2011 9:50:19 AM

Step 4. District 3 Placerville Rural Center.
Keep District 3 intact and add 4200 people from District 2 along the Hwy 50 corridor and Newtown/Pleasant Valley Roads up to and including the lower elevations of Polluck Pines.

Author: Karen Subject: Sticky Note Date: 6/2/2011 9:50:57 AM

Step 2. District 4 Rural Northern District.
Keep District 4 largely intact but take from District 2 1000 people in rural Shingle Springs community south of 50.

Author: Karen Subject: Sticky Note Date: 6/2/2011 9:50:36 AM

Step 1. District 1 El Dorado Hills.
Remove Cameron Park from District 1, keeping El Dorado Hills, and take from District 2 as much of its El Dorado Hills area as possible to create a district of 36200 people spanning as much of El Dorado Hills as possible.

Author: Karen Subject: Sticky Note Date: 6/2/2011 9:55:16 AM

Step 5. District 2 Cameron Park + South.
Add Cameron Park to District 2. Subtract most portions of El Dorado Hills except those that do remain with District 1, and highway 50 corridor that goes to Districts 5 and 3 including Polluck Pines and Grizzly Flat, and the 1000 people in Shingle springs that go to District 4.

E55

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
06/04/2011 05:36 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 6/4/2011 5:35:39 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Winifred Bush
Address	[redacted]r.
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I believe that Grizzly Flats should be included in a revised 2nd district Alternative #2 The logical thing to do is to use North South Rd. as the eastern boundary for Distrrict 2. Grizzly Flats has nothing in common with the Lake Tahoe area. Alternative 2 as it stands removes us from all the small communities that are contigious and have a commonality to us. It would make more sense, using the Hwy 50 corrider, to provide the needed population numbers out of Pollack Pines area. Grizzly Flats is 45 minutes away from hwy 50...a long way for a Supervisor to drive from Lake Tahoe to visit constituents!!! Please, revise Alternative 2 to include Grizzly Flats area. Thank you, Winifred Bush

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 6/4/2011 5:35:39 PM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
06/04/2011 05:36 PM
Show Details

E56

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 6/4/2011 5:35:48 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Winifred Bush
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I believe that Grizzly Flats should be included in a revised 2nd district Alternative #2 The logical thing to do is to use North South Rd. as the eastern boundary for Distrrict 2. Grizzly Flats has nothing in common with the Lake Tahoe area. Alternative 2 as it stands removes us from all the small communities that are contigious and have a commonality to us. It would make more sense, using the Hwy 50 corrider, to provide the needed population numbers out of Pollack Pines area. Grizzly Flats is 45 minutes away from hwy 50...a long way for a Supervisor to drive from Lake Tahoe to visit constituents!!! Please, revise Alternative 2 to include Grizzly Flats area. Thank you, Winifred Bush

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 6/4/2011 5:35:48 PM.

E57

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
06/04/2011 09:00 PM
Show Details

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 6/4/2011 9:00:24 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Dennis Henderson
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	85636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	Grizzly flats has nothing in comman with the Tahoe area. The representative from Tahoe, would most likely not come to Grizzly Flats, it to far off the freeway. In that case we would not receive any representation. Please select alternative number 2 with modifications so that Grizzly Flats stays in distric 2. Thank You Dennis Henderson

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 6/4/2011 9:00:24 PM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
06/05/2011 10:12 AM
Show Details

E58

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 6/5/2011 10:12:06 AM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	KATHY CRIEL
Address	[redacted]
City	GRIZZLY FLATS
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I THINK OPTION MAP 2 WITH ALTERATIONS WOULD WORK BEST. WE NEED TO KEEP OUR COMMUNITY WITH OTHER COMMUNITIES WITH THE SAME INTERESTS AND CONCERNS IN COMMON. WE NEED A SUPERVISOR THAT IS CLOSE AND ACCESSIBLE TO OUR COMMUNITY, WHO CAN JOIN IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND MEETINGS TO HEAR OUR CONCERNS AND ACT ON THEM.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 6/5/2011 10:12:06 AM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
06/05/2011 04:02 PM
Show Details

E59

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 6/5/2011 4:01:42 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	James R. Hawkins
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flats
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I have reviewed all the proposals for redistricting and would like to keep Grizzly Flats in District 2. Geographic wise Lake Tahoe and the Supervisor would be too far away to respond or take care of issues affecting Grizzly Flats. I would prefer to remain with Happy Valley, Pleasant Valley, Omo Ranch, Fairplay, Somerset. We all have a close relationship and would not like to see this broken by carving us out of the area and sending us to Lake Tahoe almost 2 hours away.

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 6/5/2011 4:01:42 PM.

Redistricting Comment/Question
mike.applegarth
to:
mike.applegarth
06/07/2011 11:38 PM
Show Details

E60

Data from form "Comment Form" was received on 6/7/2011 11:38:04 PM.

Comment Form

Field	Value
Subject	Contact Form
Full Name	Nicholas Bowen
Address	[redacted]
City	Grizzly Flat
State	CA
Zip	95636
Business Phone	[redacted]
Email Address	[redacted]
Comment-Question	I like Alternative #2, however, I am concerned that as it is presented, my community of Grizzly Flat will be part of the Tahoe area and will be woefully under represented because the Supervisor will never make it here or even know who we are because of the geographic disparity. However, I would be in favor of Alternative #2 if it was modified to include Grizzly Flat within District 2, instead of District 5,using the North-South Road as the divider between Districts 2 and 5. That way, we the residents of Grizzly Flat can be assured of having a Supervisor who will be closer to our area and be able to properly represent us. Thank you. Nicholas Bowen

Email "Redistricting Comment/Question" originally sent to mike.applegarth@edcgov.us from mike.applegarth@edcgov.us on 6/7/2011 11:38:04 PM.