

From: [Preston Brown](#)
To: [COSD, Redistricting](#)
Subject: [External] Comments from East County, Jamul
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 2:20:40 AM

11/30/2021

IRC

Chair David Bame

My name is Preston Brown and I am Vice-Chair of the Jamul Dulzura CPG and I am speaking as an individual. I have served as a member on this CPG for 14 years and have been a resident of Jamul living on 5 acres in Lyons Valley near the 4 Corners since 2001.

I have attended 2 meetings and made comments. Early on many comments came in from the East County about how you ignored or were unaware of what bound us together in the rural backcountry. Your maps did respond to this and we felt much relief. Maps 13 A and B achieved this unity of our “rural communities of interest.” I am writing today in criticism of MAP 14.

I would like to go back to the comments of Commissioner Surban that took place in the late hours of your last meeting, when he referenced the public support for MAP 14 at that meeting. I estimate there were 15 or so members of the public that supported MAP 14, and I don't think one of them mentioned specific benefits for AAPI communities that Commissioner Surban advocates for. Also none of these speakers for MAP 14 could name any specific benefits for the southern area of Jamul Dulzura and Otay and others to the east. They did repeat the idea of a “**border district**” and how it would “unify the border”. This is a fantasy. No such border region or district exists. This idea and phrase is unknown to people that live in the border areas. We are connected as communities of common interest with the entire east County and NOT defined by a line that separates 2 countries.

I would like to comment on the group of 15 speakers who favored MAP 14. They all delivered the same “script”. They all closed with almost the exact same 2 lines. “*Map 14 is the only map that meets everyone's goals. I urge you to vote for Map 14 tonight.*” None of these speakers identified where they “lived” or what was their personal history with the area they were commenting on. The genuine voices that called in stated where they lived and testified to the history of their area. Listening to the transcript of the last meeting will make this clear.

My best guess is this rehearsed chorus of speakers represent the desires of a special interest group only and not specific communities of interest. In this case, they may very well have represented the developers of the south bay chula vista area who have goals to expand suburban housing of East Lake and Chula Vista to the east past the “hard line” between civilization and the wilderness conservation areas that have been forming for decades. Placing a southern strip of East County into Chula Vista would open the doors for expansion of housing development to the east, throwing 25 years of work into chaos. Chula Vista should have NO EXPANSION to the east for its new district. Almost all East County is in the VHFHSZ, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and the danger of wildfire and choked evacuation routes on small rural highways has shaped the goals and concerns of east County residents for future planning and has united us as a strong “community of interest” for survival.

As IRC meetings continue, the opportunity for special interest groups to “*game*” these public hearings with fake speakers will only grow. This is a typical tactic of developers before hearings at the Board of Supervisors. By flooding the field of speakers they can also reduce the overall time per person pushing out legitimate voices.

I commend you all for taking on a very trying and complex set of problems.

Thank You,

Preston Brown

PS: My e-comments still have not been published on your website. Other participants made mention of this situation at the last meeting. It would be good to have a complete record.

--

Preston Brown