

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** AEMAdmin@sdcounty.ca.gov  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 31, 2021 4:55 PM  
**To:** Potter, Andrew; Fang, Angela; Donnelly, Liberty; Temple, Nicole; Flores, Lauren; COSD, Redistricting; Hall, David; Lau, Chim; Villa, Nicole; Van Wagner, Keith  
**Subject:** IRC eComment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

You've received a new form based mail from  
<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/redistricting/IRCEcomment.html>.

Values:

First\_Name :  
Larry

Last\_Name :  
Johnson

E-mail :  
[REDACTED]

Phone :  
[REDACTED]

eComment :

To the IRC Commissioners,

Oct. 31, 2021

Thank you for considering my comments on your difficult task. I will focus on the area primarily associated with the present District 2 Map represented by Joel Anderson. I am late to the process but these seem to me to be obvious valid points:

1. Why not start with the current map of District 2, get all the current census data needed and see where the problems are if any?
2. The current District 2 has been in existence for more than 40 years, generally encompassing the same large area. A web of social interconnections and support exist far and wide in the Backcountry that has developed over a long period of time and should not be destroyed.
3. Some of the key components of this large rural area are the School Districts, the Planning and Sponsor Group areas, the transportation routes, the nearest substantial towns and the Hospitals and Clinics. These are connecting social functions that tie this area together into a Mountain Empire collection of smaller communities. We are rural, necessarily independent and we like our space while appreciating the urban lifestyle.
4. If adjustments in the boundary are needed to compensate for population changes, then do it in compatible areas, without fracturing existing ties or trying to combine a very urban area with a very rural area.
5. When it comes to satisfying the requirements of the Voting Rights Act, Sections 2, 4 and especially 5, don't disenfranchise our rural area by combining us with a large urban area just to guarantee that the optimum percentage of a particular urban ethnic group is preserved. Our rural population is very diverse, many different ethnic groups, especially including the Native Americans. We need compatible representation also.

Now for some comments on the IRC Maps 5, 6, 7 and 8 now being considered by the Commissioners. My focus is identified now as District 1. It is a proposed horizontal swath of San Diego County going from the ocean to the Imperial County line along the US and Mexican Border.

1. Considering Map 5; District 1 has an “intrusion” to the south from District 4 above in the area of Descanso. From a social network standpoint, as noted in comment 3 above, this is very disruptive and makes no sense. Urban District 1 has now been forcefully connected to the very different rural south east part of the County. This is not compatible.
2. Considering Map 6; District 1 extends north above Interstate 8 which is good but it still ties the south coastal urban area to our rural area which is not good. Map 6 is slightly better than 5.
3. Considering Map 7; District 1 has a larger compatible area of rural countryside but there is still the incompatible connection between coastal urban and east rural. Map 7 is the best of all four maps in my opinion but needs lots of work.
4. Considering Map 8; District 1 is the least desirable. The rural area is smaller and still connected to the coastal urban area.

I would like to propose that the IRC assign, or identify, a person familiar with the Community Builder Tool to help us develop a draft proposed South-East Rural Community Map. That person could work with a group of east county citizens that are currently involved in this process. We could propose changes to try to meet the new requirements and present this to the IRC as another solution for our area.

Submit :

Submit