

From: [Cherry Diefenbach](#)
To: [COSD, Redistricting](#)
Cc: [Jeffrey Osborne](#); [Katrina Westley](#); [GREG CURRAN](#); [jacari cousins](#)
Subject: [External] JCSG comments on IRC 1/11/2021 draft maps
Date: Thursday, November 11, 2021 9:25:24 AM

Dear commissioners,

Below are the Jacumba Community Sponsor Group's (JCSG) comments on the IRC's draft maps dated November 1, 2021 plus a little background information about the Mountain Empire Region COI.

Jacumba Hot Springs (JHS) is a small disadvantaged rural community; our residents have an annual average income of less than 30K per year which is well below the State average. **JHS is part of the Mountain Empire region, a unique community of interest (COI) that is made up of the small rural communities of Boulevard, Campo, Descanso, Guatay, Mount Laguna, Pine Valley, and Potrero.** All share the same concerns: wildfire prevention, groundwater dependency, frequent "Red Flag" power shutdowns by SDG&E, limited transportation options within a geographically enormous unified school district, and almost no local retail opportunities. Since JHS has been part of District 2 for at least the past 20+ years, we also have strong ties to other rural communities like Alpine, Lakeside, Jamul, Julian, Dulzura, and Ramona.

Unincorporated communities have minimal political representation and very little political clout. **Our county supervisor is the only elected official who represents our interests and is elected to respond to our concerns.** Due to the unincorporated area's unique needs, it is in our best interest that as much of the existing District 2 be preserved under a single county supervisor.

After a review of the 11/1/2021 draft maps, the JCSG recommends the adoption of Map 11 because it represents the least changes to the unincorporated areas of the existing District 2. However, we request that the IRC and Flo Analytics also explore the feasibility of returning the communities of El Cajon and Rancho San Diego to the southeastern district identified on Map 11 as the new District 3. As one of the IRC commissioners so astutely pointed out at the November 1 public hearing, **"Most residents are generally content with their current districts and an IRC goal should be to recommend minimal changes to district boundaries so that less residents are impacted."** The JCSG wholeheartedly agrees with that goal.

The JCSG could support draft Map 9. However, this map makes some fairly significant changes to the boundaries of numerous rural communities and the rationale for doing so is not apparent to the residents of the existing District 2. **Draft maps 10, 12A, and 12B take a chainsaw to the Mountain Empire COI. Therefore, we do not support them!**

Thank you for including the names of rural communities on your draft maps. Thanks as well, for your continuing efforts to keep the existing District 2 together under a single county supervisor. **The voices of rural residents must not be drowned out by a much larger urban population who has little understanding or appreciation of life in the backcountry.**

Cherry Diefenbach

Chair, JCSG

