Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110521_caviness	5222011	Joan Caviness	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma together but separate from San Francisco
8marin_20110522_distasio	5222011	Kathleen P DiStasio	no		Larkspur	Marin	yes	Do not put Marin with San Francisco
8marin_20110522_friefeld	5222011	Wendy Friefeld	no			Marin	yes	Keep Sonoma and Marin together
8marin_20110522_joint	5222011	Charles Kiene and Kathleen Doyle	no		Sausalito	Marin	yes	Separate Marin from San Francisco
8marin_20110522_prince	5222011	Nancy and Carleton Prince	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Include Marin with Sonoma and not with San Francisco
8marin_20110522_raeuber	5222011	Barbara Raeuber	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	Include Marin with Sonoma and not with San Francisco
8marin_20110522_thomas	5222011	William Thomas	no			Marin	yes	Link Marin to Sonoma, not to San Francisco

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110521_caviness	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma are adjacent, family oriented communities and share many activities and interests	
8marin_20110522_distasio	Marin, San Francisco			no	yes	Marin cares about 101 corridor to Santa Rosa, 37 to Napa, grass fires, light pollution, Mt. Tam watershed, Russian River resevoir, shopping in Novato	
8marin_20110522_friefeld	Sonoma, Marin			no	yes		Shared and burgeoning biotech industry
8marin_20110522_joint	Marin, San Francisco			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma supplied by a watershed, community planning, environmental concerns	
8marin_20110522_prince	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma are suburban, rural, older, entrenched. Share similar histories, family values, daily experiences	Marin and Sonoma have similar economic bases (agricultural)
8marin_20110522_raeuber	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma are family-oriented, suburban, many outdoor activities, significant rural area	
8marin_20110522_thomas	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma have low population density, suburban, family living areas, rural, topography	Marin and Sonoma are primarily agricultural

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110521_caviness			no				
8marin_20110522_distasio			no				
8marin_20110522_friefeld			no				
8marin_20110522_joint			no				
8marin_20110522_prince			no				
8marin_20110522_raeuber			no				
8marin_20110522_thomas			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110521_stedman	5222011	Gordon Stedman	no			Sonoma	yes	Line-drawing advice. My first choice is for entire counties to stand alone. Second choice two or more adjacent counties. Third if a county must be split then it should be as geometrically concise. No districts with arms sticking out.
8sonoma_20110522_davis	5222011	Tamara Chapman Davis	no			Sonoma	yes	Sonoma County be included in districts that have the same industries and interests, NOT WITH SF and Marin. SFMarin problems and solutions are not the same as ours.
8sonoma_20110522_rhymes	5222011	Heidi Rhymes	no				yes	Petaluma should not be separated from the rest of Sonoma County, particularly Cotati, Rohnert Park and Santa Rosa.
8sonoma_20110522_robb-wilder	5222011	Sukey Robb-Wilder	no				yes	establish districts that elect more than one member to the legislative body. Multi-member representation will give COIs a better chance of being represented in government than our current winner-take-all contests
8smateo_20110518_chapman2	5182011	Dave Chapman (2nd email that day with map of CD 15)	no				yes	Do not draw anything that looks like the current CD 15. (provides map of CD 15 to show what not to do)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110521_stedman				no	no		
8sonoma_20110522_davis				no	no		
8sonoma_20110522_rhymes				no	yes	Petaluma is far more a part of their northern sister towns than of Marin. They are more geographically, socially and politically connected and should share the same representative.	
8sonoma_20110522_robb-wilder				no	no		
8smateo_20110518_chapman 2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110521_stedman			no				
8sonoma_20110522_davis			no				
8sonoma_20110522_rhymes			no				
8sonoma_20110522_robb-wilder			no				
8smateo_20110518_chapman2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110516_williams	5162011	David Williams	no				yes	The Tri-Valley is comprised of Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon and Sunol with a total population of about 264,000. Our valley is located about 25 miles southeast of Oakland along the 580 and 680 freeways
7sclara_20110518_maxwell	5182011	Shirley Maxwell	no				yes	redistrict areas that were the last to join 95125 zip code. Why should homes that have been in zip code 95125 for more than 49 yrs be part of redistricting instead of newcomers to 95125 zip code?
8marin_20110515_arild2	5152011	Jon Arild	no				yes	draw the lines such that Sonoma County to the north is part and parcel of one district. Of all the counties that are possible partners, Sonoma most closely resembles the type of district that Marin would be by itself
8marin_20110516_anderson	5162011	Bruce Anderson	yes	Marinwood Community Services Board, Director. Personal opinion - not necessarily reflective of the entire CSD board		Marin	yes	The current CD 6 works very well for our residents. Make sure future districts include both Marin and Sonoma and no part of SF or Contra Costa.
8marin_20110519_clark	5192011	Sharon Clark	no			Marin	yes	Marin be combined with Sonoma as we have greater similarities with our northern neighbor than the east bay communities or San Francisco.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110516_williams				no	yes	major air and noise quality challenges, heavily traveled major route between the central valley and the bay area, labs are major national centers of defense and energy research, and homeland security is, of course, important, community college expanding	Originally our valley was agricultural and partially remains so with expanding wineries, healthy open land conservation and parks, school curriculum and a rodeo. Many companies have moved here
7sclara_20110518_maxwell				no	no		
8marin_20110515_arild2				no	yes	Hwy 101 which is the major artery through both counties	many joint interests such as the SMART project
8marin_20110516_anderson				no	no		
8marin_20110519_clark				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110516_williams			no				When the very wise California voters passed prop 11 in 2008 and prop 20 in 2010, your commission was established. What we Californians were really voting for was better governments
7sclara_20110518_maxwell			no				
8marin_20110515_arild2			no				
8marin_20110516_anderson			no				
8marin_20110519_clark			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110519_ferrell	5192011	John Ferrell	no			Marin	yes	As a Marin resident I do NOT want my districts to be lumped in with San Francisco.
8marin_20110519_genolio2	5192011	Marge Genolio	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma counties together
8marin_20110519_graber	5192011	Linda Graber	no			Marin	yes	Marin and Sonoma should be one district.
8marin_20110519_greer2	5192011	Leslie Greer	no			Marin	yes	Marin County should remain in the same district as Sonoma County
8marin_20110519_orton	5192011	Mick Orton	no			Marin	yes	Neither Marin nor Sonoma should be included as part of San Francisco.
8marin_20110516_boyce	5162011	N Edward Boyce, Jr.	no				yes	Marin and Sonoma counties must remain together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110519_ferrell				no	no		
8marin_20110519_genolio2				no	no		
8marin_20110519_graber				no	yes	Marin is much more middle class and family oriented than San Francisco is today.	Both merging into one economic unit agriculture, businesses in high tech, tourism, gastronomy, go urmet retail foods, lifestyle products related to wine country living, and business services related to the wine country. Do not put Marin with East County.
8marin_20110519_greer2				no	no		
8marin_20110519_orton				no	yes	SF is an urban environment with a largely adult population, losing families and children, with an altogether different character and different political interests than Marin and Sonoma; education, recreation	Marin and Sonoma share a corridor of business and economic interests along 101
8marin_20110516_boyce				no	yes	close common interests related to water, transportation,	close common interests related to agriculture, and rural suburban setting

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110519_ferrell			no				
8marin_20110519_genolio2			no				
8marin_20110519_graber			no				
8marin_20110519_greer2			no				
8marin_20110519_orton			no				
8marin_20110516_boyce			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110516_marshall	5162011	Shawn Marshall	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma counties together in the 6th District
8marin_20110516_matas	5162011	Barbara Matas	no				yes	Keep Sonoma and Marin together. Do not combine them with East Bay or San Francisco
8marin_20110516_mcdonnell	5162011	Berta McDonnell	no				yes	Keep Marin with Sonoma. Not with SF.
8marin_20110516_parr	5162011	Jeff Parr	no				yes	The 6th Congressional district should not be altered. There are communities of interest in Marin and Sonoma counties
8marin_20110516_stampfli	5162011	Lise Stampfli Torme	yes	Flood Mitigation League of Ross Valley, President			yes	retain the integrity of the 6th CD including Marin and Sonoma counties.
8marin_20110519_pfeifer	5192011	Linda Pfeifer	no			Marin	yes	District 3 should begin at the Golden Gate Bridge and extend through Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino and Humboldt Counties to create one new senate district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110516_marshall				no	yes	share many similar issues and, increasingly, shared resources with respect to transportation, suburban development and agricultural concerns	
8marin_20110516_matas				no	yes	Sonoma and Marin are both moderately populated. Both areas are considered a suburb of SF. We have a focus on maintaining our open space. We have similar transportation challenges and housing concerns	
8marin_20110516_mcdonnell				no	no		
8marin_20110516_parr				no	yes	Joint cooperation between the counties has been in evidence for years	labor and farming interests vital to the district.
8marin_20110516_stampfli				no	yes	share geographical, cultural, physical ties, share strong environmental values, tax themselves to provide better education and public amenities, share water sources	share economic ties
8marin_20110519_pfeifer				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110516_marshall			no				
8marin_20110516_matas			no				
8marin_20110516_mcdonnell			no				
8marin_20110516_parr			no				
8marin_20110516_stampfli			no				
8marin_20110519_pfeifer			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110520_britt	5202011	Joyce E. Britt	no			Marin	yes	Marin with Sonoma
8marin_20110520_burns	5202011	Susan Burns	no			Marin	yes	Marin and Sonoma, as we have so much more in common than for Marin to be tacked onto Contra Costa or San Francisco
8marin_20110520_geary_j	5202011	Joseph M. Geary	no			Marin	yes	join Marin County with Sonoma County in drawing district lines.
8marin_20110520_geary_s	5202011	Suzanne Geary	no			Marin	yes	Marin and Sonoma, not with SF
8marin_20110520_jang	5202011	Kernan Jang	no			Marin	yes	Leep Marin County whole within all three districts and to include it with portions of Sonoma County, and do not include Marin with any of Contra Costa or San Francisco.
8marin_20110520_mcgarry	5202011	Clement McGarry	no			Marin	yes	Combining Marin with something other than Sonoma (either the East Bay or SF) would orphan Marin to the urban problems of those regions.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110520_britt				no	yes	Marin is, in many respects, the playground of the Bay Area, a unique broken shore, a peninsula with a coast line of other peninsulas--a place of spectacular beauty which we seek to preserve.	
8marin_20110520_burns				no	no		
8marin_20110520_geary_j				no	yes	Transportation, business, residential and commuting interests join Marin and Sonoma counties more each year resulting in a diminishing focus on San Francisco as a focal point.	
8marin_20110520_geary_s				no	no		
8marin_20110520_jang				no	no		
8marin_20110520_mcgarry				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110520_britt			no				
8marin_20110520_burns			no				
8marin_20110520_geary_j			no				
8marin_20110520_geary_s			no				
8marin_20110520_jang			no				
8marin_20110520_mcgarry			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110520_monson	5202011	Julie Monson	no			Marin	yes	Marin feels an affinity with Sonoma County not with the urban areas of San Francisco or East Bay.
8marin_20110520_reynolds	5202011	Johnson Reynolds	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma together, perhaps include other counties to have adequate population for CA Assembly, Senate, U.S. Representative to represent.
8marin_20110520_waldt	5202011	Deb Waldt	no			Marin	yes	do not merge Marin County with the San Francisco district. Marin (especially northern Marin) has a long history of connectedness with southern Sonoma County
8marin_20110521_eller	5212011	Margy Eller	no			Marin	yes	Recommends a district with all of Marin and a gradual lifting north from the Marin County line to bring in the additional 200k needed. It appears that Santa Rosa may be excluded.
8napa_20110520_benvenuto	5202011	Michelle Benvenuto	yes	Winegrowers of Napa County, Executive Director		Napa	yes	counties of Lake, Napa, Mendocino, and Sonoma in one CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110520_monson				no	no		
8marin_20110520_reynolds				no	yes	common interests-Smart Train, Transporation,Immigration issues towns, cities with similarities, populations that relate together.	
8marin_20110520_waldt				no	yes		numerous agricultural industries (such as dairy, poultry, wineries)
8marin_20110521_eller				no	no		
8napa_20110520_benvenuto				no	yes		business and individuals in these counties are actively involved in grape growing and wine making that has significant regional, national and international economic and social benefits.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110520_monson			no				
8marin_20110520_reynolds			no				
8marin_20110520_waldt			no				
8marin_20110521_eller			no				
8napa_20110520_benvenuto			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110520_jackel	5202011	Dianne Jackel	no			Napa	yes	Counties contiguous to Napa County with similar interests are Sonoma, Yolo, Mendocino, Lake and the ruralagricultural part of Marin
7sclara_20110519_siliconvalleyleadershipgrp	5192011	Kirk Everett forwards letter; Carl Guardino signs letter	yes	Silicon Valley Leadership Group Kirk Everett, Vice President, Government Relations and Tax Policy Carl Guardino, President and CEO		Santa Clara	yes	recognize Silicon Valley region as a COI, that should remain in tact in state and federal legislative districts
8marin_20110517_adams	5172011	Susan L. Adams	no				yes	consider redrawing 6th CD to include Marin and Sonoma
8marin_20110517_guldman	5172011	Sandra Guldman	no				yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma in a CD. Do not include SF and Western Contra Costa.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110520_jackel				no	no		
7sclara_20110519_siliconvalleyleadershipgrp				no	yes	population of 3 million people	home to 1.3 million jobs, top research and development center in the world. Silicon Valleys innovation economy has been the economic regime for CA and the world. Total employment in five key green job sectors accounts for 14 of all jobs in the region
8marin_20110517_adams				no	yes	both counties share a contiguous border, Hwy 101, establishing intercounty transportation system SMART, same water source, growing Hispanic community, commute between counties for jobs	thriving agricultural economy, some family run farms and ranches are part of both counties
8marin_20110517_guldman				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110520_jackel			no				Thank you so much for doing what you are doing. We are very hopeful that each of Californias new districts will fairly reflect our citizens diverse populations and various interests so that everyone wins.
7sclara_20110519_siliconvalleyleadershipgrp			no				
8marin_20110517_adams			no				
8marin_20110517_guldman			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110517_mitchell	5172011	Bob Mitchell	no				yes	Marin County should not share a district with the East Bay or San Francisco.
8marin_20110517_pierce	5172011	Deanna Pierce	no				yes	Marin and Sonoma County Should Be in The Same Congressional District. Do not include SF or Western Contra Costa
8marin_20110517_spotswood	5172011	Dick Spotswood, columnist	yes	Marin Independent Journal			yes	Marin and Sonoma are a COI
8marin_20110517_wallace	5172011	William Wallace	no				yes	The MarinSonoma areas that encompass Senate District 3 need to be decoupled from those of San Francisco.
8marin_20110518_dorinson	5182011	Cathleen Dorinson	no				yes	Marin and Sonoma Counties need to be kept together because they have much more in common with each other than they do with SF, the East Bay or more northern counties.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110517_mitchell				no	yes	Marin has affinity is with Sonoma and the North Coast -- a generally rural setting and life style	
8marin_20110517_pierce				no	yes	share environmental concerns, significant suburban population, common water source, common transportation system with Sonoma	large agricultural economy, People in both counties shop in Marin and Sonoma counties.
8marin_20110517_spotswood				no	yes	share historic interest, suburban-rural culture, and most residents of 2 counties not commuting to SF but rather working in North Bay.	
8marin_20110517_wallace				no	yes		
8marin_20110518_dorinson				no	yes	The level of development, kinds of transportation issues, open space, agricultural lands, etc. are more similar to each other than other nearby counties	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110517_mitchell			no				
8marin_20110517_pierce			no				
8marin_20110517_spotswood			no				
8marin_20110517_wallace	Four San Francisco zip codes (94102, 94109, 94110, and 94133) have, in aggregate, a greater political voice in District 3 than all the District 3 voters of Sonoma County.		no				
8marin_20110518_dorinson			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110518_fairfaxtown council	5182011	Fairfax Town Council testimony, signed by Larry Bragman, Mayor	yes	Fairfax Town Council			yes	For ADCDSD, keep Marin County aligned with Sonoma County and not with SFContra Costa.
8marin_20110518_gaman	5182011	Barbara Gaman	no				yes	I would like you to consider maintaining the sixth district as it is, aligned with Sonoma County
8marin_20110518_jain_j	5182011	Jinendra Jain	no				yes	expand Marin north and not South to SF
8marin_20110518_jain_k	5182011	Katherine Jain	no				yes	Include Marin with North SF Bay towns. Do not combine with SF
8marin_20110518_mcentyre	5182011	Barbara McEntyre	no				yes	Keep Marin County in ONE congressional district and have that district be composed of Marin and Sonoma counties, NOT Marin-SF
8marin_20110518_pierce	5182011	Tom Pierce	no				yes	Marin and Sonoma County Should Be in The Same Congressional District
8marin_20110518_post	5182011	Penelope Post	no				yes	Marin belongs with Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110518_fairfaxtown council				no	yes	Marin shares with Sonoma watersheds, coastal regions, inland rural, agricultural, bay lands only with Sonoma County.	
8marin_20110518_gaman				no	yes	both are small rural districts with mutual interests.	
8marin_20110518_jain_j				no	no		
8marin_20110518_jain_k				no	no		
8marin_20110518_mcentyre				no	yes	If Marin is connected with SF, I am certain Marin concerns will simply be ignored. Current state senator appears to be only focused on SF.	
8marin_20110518_pierce				no	yes	geographically and politically linked together, common water source	economy of each county is based on agriculture and light manufacturing
8marin_20110518_post				no	yes		interdependent economic unit in every sphere--health care, common watershed, transportation, jobs and commutes, taxation, and land history,

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110518_fairfaxtown council			no				
8marin_20110518_gaman			no				
8marin_20110518_jain_j			no				
8marin_20110518_jain_k			no				
8marin_20110518_mcentyre			no				
8marin_20110518_pierce			no				
8marin_20110518_post			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110518_smirnoff	5182011	Victoria Smirnoff	no				yes	Keep Marin Sonoma Together
8napa_20110518_cuney	5182011	Dianne Cuney	yes	Lake Berryessa Chamber of Commerce, President			yes	Napa, is a Rural Ag. county that would be best joined with other Ag. Counties ie, Yolo, Sonoma, Lake and Mendo.
8sonoma_20110520_britton	5202011	Zachary Britton	no			Sonoma	yes	separate Sonoma and Marin counties, combine Sonoma with Napa. Add from Napa and Lake Counties to the east, and Mendocino County to the north if extra population is needed. Absorb Marin County (as a whole) into another congressional district.
8sonoma_20110520_durrett	5202011	Margot Durrett	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma County together including Cloverdale. We (Cloverdale) have more in common with Santa Rosa than areas to the north.
8sonoma_20110520_engblom	5202011	Katha Engblom	no			Sonoma	yes	keep Sonoma County whole. For more population, consider going north andor east, and DO NOT include us with the San Francisco and Marin County areas.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110518_smirnoff				no	yes	two counties have more in common with each other regarding population, transportation (Hwy, SMART Train) and water needs than Marin has with any other contiguous county.	two counties have more in common with each other regarding demographics, life style, business environment, non profit environment then Marin has with any other contiguous county.
8napa_20110518_cuney				no	yes		agricultural economies
8sonoma_20110520_britton				no	yes	We are both agricultural minded counties with strong urban centerstourist industries	
8sonoma_20110520_durrett				no	no		
8sonoma_20110520_engblom				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110518_smirnoff			no				
8napa_20110518_cuney			no				
8sonoma_20110520_britton			no				Thank you very much for your consideration and for this invaluable opportunity to voice my opinion,
8sonoma_20110520_durrett			no				
8sonoma_20110520_engblom			no				Thank you for the hard work you are doing on the commission. I know that you are making every effort to ensure fair representation for all of California.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110520_gatley	5202011	Elizabeth Gatley	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not combine Marin with Sonoma.
8sonoma_20110520_mcclusk ey	5202011	Annah McCluskey	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma County be kept as whole as possible and when more population is needed to meet requirements, we want to go north and east to find counties with common concerns..DO NOT link us to San Francisco.
8sonoma_20110520_owen	5202011	Elizabeth Owen	no			Sonoma	yes	It is very important to retain the connection of Sonoma and Marin counties. Please do not separate
8napa_20110518_kirtlink	5182011	Janet Kirtlink	no				yes	Napa County should be connected with Lake County,Sonoma and Mendocino, possibly Yolo too.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110520_gatley				no	yes	Marin folk do not come up to Sonoma. Sonoma has a much stronger connection with counties to the north, such as Mendocino and Humboldt, and from the east, such as Napa.	Marin residents are much more wealthy than Sonoma residents (see linked reports)
8sonoma_20110520_mcclusk ey				no	no		
8sonoma_20110520_owen				no	no		
8napa_20110518_kirtlink				no	yes	These counties are wine growing and tourism areas as well. People in these counties share hospitals, recreational activities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110520_gatley			no				Thank you for all the hard work you are doing and for taking the time to listen to all the citizens who have attended all your hearings. This is an amazing process and I feel lucky to be a part of this
8sonoma_20110520_mcclusk ey			no				
8sonoma_20110520_owen			no				
8napa_20110518_kirtlink			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8smateo_20110518_chapman	5182011	Dave Chapman	no				yes	The coastal areas from Pacifica to Capitola are one district. Silicon Valley proper is one district. The current CD 15 is a perfect example of what not to do. (see cities and streetsrivers columns for how to draw CD)
8smateo_20110518_cummings	5182011	Mark Cummings	no				yes	town of Atherton should be in the same district as Menlo Park, Stanford and Palo Alto.
8sonoma_20110516_basile	5162011	Elizabeth Basile	no				yes	Please keep Sonoma Countys Congressional district intact.
8sonoma_20110518_bissiri	5182011	Robert Bissiri	no				yes	Sonoma county is agricultural and should not be linked to Marin or San Francisco but with Mendocino, Lake and Napa.
8sonoma_20110518_healy	5182011	Mike Healy	yes	City of Petaluma, Councilmember			yes	use the Golden Gate Bridge as a natural break point for AD, CD, SD. Keep Marin and Sonoma together.
8sonoma_20110518_wickwire	5182011	Terri Wickwire	no				yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma together.
8ccosta_20110519_vonheeder	5192011	Georgean Vonheeder-Leopold	yes	Sallmann, Yang Alameda, An Accountancy Corporation			yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests, civic and business groups.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8smateo_20110518_chapman		(includes map showing the following) E SF could be added to District 8. Daly City could be made part of District 12, if they would rather not be part of the Coastal District. Continued in (streetsrivers)	Woodside, Atherton, Menlo Park, and East Palo Alto could be made part of District 15, if needed to adjust population. Los Gatos, Saratoga, and northern San Jose could be made part of District 16, if needed to adjust population.	no	no		
8smateo_20110518_cummings				no	no		
8sonoma_20110516_basile				no	no		
8sonoma_20110518_bissiri				no	no		
8sonoma_20110518_healy				no	yes	water systems interconnected, SMART only involves these two counties, upgrading Hwy 101 together	
8sonoma_20110518_wickwire				no	yes	water, transportation	agriculture, rural-suburban setting
8ccosta_20110519_vonheeder				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8smateo_20110518_chapman			no				
8smateo_20110518_cummings			no				
8sonoma_20110516_basile			no				
8sonoma_20110518_bissiri			no				
8sonoma_20110518_healy			no				Thank you for volunteering for this very important task in our democratic process.
8sonoma_20110518_wickwire			no				
8ccosta_20110519_vonheeder			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110520_barton	5202011	Linda Barton, Karen Stepper, Tim Sbranti, Marshall Kamena, Jennifer Hosterman, H. Abram Wilson	yes	Mayors of Town of Danville, Cities of Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Ramon			yes	Keep Tri-Valley together.
8ccosta_20110520_valadez	5202011	Monique Valadez	yes	Wally Parks NHRA Motorsports Museum, Education and Public Relations Manager	Chino	Contra Costa	yes	maintaining the composition of the 61st Assembly District, which includes the cities of Chino, Montclair, Ontario and Pomona.
8sonoma_20110522_katz	5222011	Rosalind Katz	no		Cloverdale	Sonoma	yes	retain our small (pop. approx. 8,500) citys mutually beneficial connectivity to the rural communities and counties (Cloverdale with northern Sonoma County(NoSoCo))
8sonoma_20110522_rozkatz	5222011	Roz Katz	no		Cloverdale	Sonoma	yes	retain our small (pop. approx. 8,500) citys mutually beneficial connectivity to the rural communities and counties (Cloverdale with northern Sonoma County(NoSoCo))

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110520_barton				no	yes	Residents of our five cities depend on the same transportation networks ,our children play in the same sports leagues, and local governments collaborate on a multitude of regional projects	we have similar demographics and sources of employment, businesses have formed partnerships throughout the area,
8ccosta_20110520_valadez				no	yes	When you peel back the outermost layers of a community, you begin to see very common threads the same dreams, hope and vision for a better life.	
8sonoma_20110522_katz				no	yes	strong natural and historical bonds of common business interests, goals, demographics	economic and environmental challenges is critical; reliance on each other for our economic development but also to retaining our place at the decision table
8sonoma_20110522_rozkatz				no	yes	strong natural and historical bonds of common business interests, goals, demographics	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110520_barton	all partners in the Tri-Valley Housing and Opportunity Center, Tri-Valley Transportation Council, Tri-Valley Community Television, Tri-Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau, Tri-Valley Business Council, I-GATE		no				We recognize the fact that the Citizens Redistricting Commission has a unique and challenging responsibility
8ccosta_20110520_valadez			no				
8sonoma_20110522_katz			no				
8sonoma_20110522_rozkatz			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110522_wagele	5222011	James Wagele	no		Cloverdale	Sonoma	yes	Cloverdale is a rural town on the Sonoma County side of the Mendocino-Sonoma border whose interests are much more closely aligned with the rural areas to our north, east and west. Little in common with population-centers of Santa Rosa-Petaluma and Marin
8marin_20110516_ravasio	5162011	Patricia Field Ravasio	no		Corte Madera		yes	Please keep Marin and Sonoma interlinked.
8marin_20110519_willis	5192011	Richard Willis	no		Corte Madera	Marin	yes	I write to ask you to clearly separate MarinSonoma from San Francisco. Politicians from SF do not care about MarinSonoma
8ccosta_20110518_chapman	5182011	Susan Chapman	no		Danville		yes	Tri-Valley cities of Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon and Pleasanton be kept together. If need more, include towns such as Walnut Creek and Lamorinda, by going north into valley along Hwy 680. See attached map

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110522_wagele				no	yes	Please keep us as part of the rural north.	
8marin_20110516_ravasio				no	yes	Marin has very little in common with San Francisco from any geopolitical standpoint, and with Sonoma we share our water, transportation, agriculture AND our ruralparkland characteristics	
8marin_20110519_willis				no	yes	Our two suburbansemi ruralopen space counties share many cultural and economic interests and have almost nohing in common with the city, which seems to fade into big city union dominated economic failures and corruption as each year goes by.	
8ccosta_20110518_chapman				no	yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests	civic and business groups

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110522_wagele			no				
8marin_20110516_ravasio			no				Regards to Jerry. Great work on San Quentin. Now turn it into public space
8marin_20110519_willis			no				
8ccosta_20110518_chapman			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110520_heinzer	5202011	Jim Heinzer	no		Danville	Contra Costa	yes	residents along the 680 Freeway corridor in San Ramon Valley should be in the same legislative and congressional districts,
8ccosta_20110521_pandell	5212011	Jerome C. Pandell	yes	Tri-Valley Coalition	Danville	Contra Costa	yes	Tri-Valley cities of Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon and Pleasanton be kept together. If need more, include towns such as Walnut Creek and Lamorinda, by going north into valley along Hwy 680. See attached map
8ccosta_20110521_link	5212011	Judy Link	yes	Tri-Valley Coalition	Diablo	Contra Costa	yes	Tri-Valley cities of Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon and Pleasanton be kept together. If need more, include towns such as Walnut Creek and Lamorinda, by going north into valley along Hwy 680.
8marin_20110516_mendenhall	5162011	Robert Miles Mendenhall	no		Forestville	Sonoma County	yes	The 6th Congressional district should not be altered except based on demographic changes documented by the last Census

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110520_heinzer				no	yes	there is a comminality of interests and concerns of residents of the San Ramon Valley that is different from residents of say San Francisco or Berkeley greater of home ownership, employment, culture, leisure time pursuits	
8ccosta_20110521_pandell				no	yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests (expansion of BART as well as urbansuburban growth)	shared civic and business groups
8ccosta_20110521_link				no	yes	This area and its citizens work well together and are dependent on each for business and future growth opportunities. The mayors and councils work together on issues and concerns for the greater good of the area.	
8marin_20110516_mendenhall				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110520_heinzer			no				
8ccosta_20110521_pandell			no				
8ccosta_20110521_link			no				
8marin_20110516_mendenhall	vital to all legitimate interests pubilc, economic, political, etc.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110520_appell	5202011	Allen Appell	yes	San Francisco State University, Professor of Business	Kentfield	Marin	yes	Marin should not be joined with East Bay districts
8marin_20110518_guehring	5192011	Ross Guehring	no		Larkspur		yes	Linking Marin to unrelated regions of Contra Costa or SF in a CD would be illogical. Keep it with Sonoma.
8ccosta_20110520_acuff	5202011	Mary Beth Acuff	no		Livermore		yes	Tri-Valley cities of Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon and Pleasanton be kept together. If need more, include towns such as Walnut Creek and Lamorinda, by going north into valley along Hwy 680.
7sclara_20110520_townoflosgatos	5202011	Joe Pirzynski	yes	Mayor, Town of Los Gatos	Los Gatos	Santa Clara	yes	Keep West Valley communities together Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Saratoga, Campbell, Cupertino

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110520_appell				no	yes	SF urban, renters, higher crime rates, single people. Marin suburban, homeowners (home maintenance, taxes), lower crime rates, wildlife and predators (gun usage), water rights and irrigation, families with children in school	
8marin_20110518_guehring				no	no		
8ccosta_20110520_acuff				no	no		
7sclara_20110520_townoflosgatos				no	yes	share geographic features NW slopes of Santa Cruz mountains and watersheds, common transportation network (Hwys 9, 85, 17), resident service delivery (sewer, water, fire, police), overlapping school districts, coordinate governances	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110520_appell			no				
8marin_20110518_guehring			no				
8ccosta_20110520_acuff			no				
7sclara_20110520_townoflosgatos			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110516_kleege	5162011	Joyce Kleege	no		Novato		yes	include Novato with Sonoma County, or if it must be with Marin County, so be it. But do not include Novato with SF.
8sonoma_20110522_young	5222011	Scott Young	no		Petaluma	Sonoma	yes	Marin should not be lumped together with San Francisco, Richmond or Vallejo.
8sonoma_20110520_renee	5202011	Tiffany Renee	yes	City of Petaluma, Councilmember	Petaluma	Sonoma	yes	maintain unified elected representation for Sonoma and Marin Counties north of the Golden Gate Bridge.
8alameda_20110517_laursen	5172011	Joan Laursen	yes	Pleasanton Unified School District, Member of Board of Trustees	Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Please draw our assembly boundaries to keep all Pleasanton residents within the same assembly district or, at the very least, keep us with other Tri-Valley cities
8alameda_20110517_limesand	5172011	Elizabeth Limesand	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	would appreciate it if Pleasanton, CA were all in one assembly district, rather than split between three assemblypersons

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110516_kleege				no	yes	Novato has farms and open space and are happy to keep it so they can visit the wide open spaces we pay for gladly, and want to keep it that way.	
8sonoma_20110522_young				no	yes	Marin County is closer to Sonoma County with no toll bridges to cross, less dangerous traffic, better parking options for meetings and has similar concerns as Sonoma county residents	
8sonoma_20110520_renee				no	no		
8alameda_20110517_laursen				no	yes	current assemblymembers have to divide their attention between their more populous home areas and us.	Pleasanton is part of the Tri-Valley area our businesses, charitable organizations, and educational partners work together with other Tri-Valley members - Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore, San Ramon. Much less in common with communities closer to Bay.
8alameda_20110517_limesand				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110516_kleege			no				
8sonoma_20110522_young			no				
8sonoma_20110520_renee			no				
8alameda_20110517_laursen	Pleasanton is a very distinct community, with one unified school district, excellent city management, and our motto is the city of planned progress. Very unified despite diversity		no				
8alameda_20110517_limesand	Pleasantons representation is so watered down by having it so fractured		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110517_piderit	5172011	Sandy Piderit	yes	Educate Pleasanton httpeducatepleasanton .wordpress.com Page	Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	include all of Pleasanton in a single district for the state assembly. If necessary to include more than 1 city within AD, the cities of Dublin and Livermore (known as the tri-valley area).
8ccosta_20110518_ravnik	5182011	Diane Ravnik	no		Pleasanton		yes	Tri-Valley cities of Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon and Pleasanton be kept together. If need more, include towns such as Walnut Creek and Lamorinda, by going north into valley along Hwy 680.
8ccosta_20110520_belding	5202011	Ward Belding	no		Pleasanton	Contra Costa	yes	Tri-Valley cities of Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon, Pleasanton be kept together in redistricting. Can include Walnut Creek, Lamorinda, Pleasant Hill, Concord, Martinez, Antioch, Pittsburgh along I-680 corridor
8marin_20110519_mason	5192011	Chris Neil Mason	no		San Anselmo	Marin	yes	Marin is much more closely affiliated with Sonoma County then parts of the City or the East bay

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110517_piderit			natural population boundaries around our city -- I 580 to the north, I 680 to the west, unpopulated hills to our south, and a large area to the east of our city that is sparsely populated, between Pleasanton and Livermore	no	yes	promote more effective working relationships between elected council members, our school districts elected trustees, and our representative in Sacramento, give our representative motivation to consider the needs of our city as a whole.	
8ccosta_20110518_ravnik				no	yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests,	civic business and labor and associations and most importantly our types of business and economic development our Tri-Valley communities engage in. We are neither agricultural nor rural communities
8ccosta_20110520_belding		Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon, Pleasanton, Walnut Creek, Lamorinda, Pleasant Hill, Concord, Martinez, Antioch, Pittsburgh		no	no		
8marin_20110519_mason				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110517_piderit			no				
8ccosta_20110518_ravnik			no				
8ccosta_20110520_belding			no				
8marin_20110519_mason			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110520_joint	5202011	Lisa A. Barone, Joseph R. Barone, Patrina F. Barone, James A. Pruit	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	redistricting our neighborhoods (Willow Glen) should not be done at all
8marin_20110516_duvall	5162011	John Duvall	no		San Rafael		yes	Marin and Sonoma
8marin_20110520_armanini	5202011	John Armanini	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Marin is heavily Democrat, so please redraw the district lines to reflect that.
8marin_20110517_stoll	5172011	Roger Stoll	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Sonoma is a natural part of Marin.
8ccosta_20110519_lau	5192011	Danny and Isabel Lau	no		San Ramon		yes	Tri-Valley cities of Danville, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon and Pleasanton be kept together. If need more, include towns such as Walnut Creek and Lamorinda, by going north into valley along Hwy 680.. See attached maps
8marin_20110520_judd	5202011	Jim Judd	no		Santa Rosa		yes	See 1. Marin County Report (httpwww.co.marin.ca.usEFilesdocsCDEconCom09_0115_RP_090108154314.pdf), 2. Attached Maps

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110520_joint				no	no		
8marin_20110516_duvall				no	yes	share geographical, cultural, physical ties, share strong environmental values, tax themselves to provide better education and public amenities, share water sources	share economic ties
8marin_20110520_armanini				no	no		
8marin_20110517_stoll				no	no		
8ccosta_20110519_lau				no	yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests, civic and business groups.	
8marin_20110520_judd				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110520_joint			no				
8marin_20110516_duvall			no				
8marin_20110520_armanini			no				
8marin_20110517_stoll			no				
8ccosta_20110519_lau			no				
8marin_20110520_judd			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110520_hunter	5202011	Gregory Hunter	yes	City of St. Helena, Former Councilmember	St. Helena	Napa	yes	AD1 all of Napa and northern Sonoma, AD2 all of Marin and southern Sonoma. SD Napa, Sonoma, Marin, maybe Lake
8sonoma_20110520_pierce	5202011	Lee Pierce	yes	City of Santa Rosa, former Vice Mayor	St. Helena	Sonoma	yes	Make Sonoma a standalone AD. If you must integrate any other counties with Sonoma, I suggest Napa County 1st, followed by Lake, then Mendocino
8solano_20110519_young	5192011	Roger Young	no		Vacaville	Solano	yes	redefine the current District so as to cover most of Solano County, portions of Napa and Yolo counties.
8solano_20110520_porter	5202011	Joey Porter	no		Vallejo	Solano	yes	Solano County should be in one Congressional district which should only include land north of the Sacramento River. Please do not ostracize us into the south bay with communities like Richmond and Martinezwith wine county.
8ccosta_20110518_husband	5182011	Nita Husband	no		Willow		no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110520_hunter				no	yes	largely rural Marin, Sonoma, and Napa counties have frequently been part of one or more overlapping legislative districts dating back to at least the early 1960s, complemented by tourism	San Francisco shares little in common economically with Marin, Sonoma, and Napa counties and its recent political representation is proof that the 2 areas are essentially worlds apart despite their proximity
8sonoma_20110520_pierce				no	no		
8solano_20110519_young				no	no		
8solano_20110520_porter				no	no		
8ccosta_20110518_husband				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110520_hunter			no				
8sonoma_20110520_pierce			no				I congratulate each of you for stepping up to help find a way to improve our political process in the Golden State. Renewed thanks and abundant respect
8solano_20110519_young			no				
8solano_20110520_porter			no				
8ccosta_20110518_husband			no				Would like to speak to Mrs. Malloy regarding redistricting

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110518_hangman	5182011	Kevin Hangman	no		Yountville	Napa	yes	Keeping Napa County whole and intact in the new ADSDCD. Metropolitanindustrial areas south of Napa County should not be included with Napa. Concerned with current high pop deviation (5)
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mary Helen Barro	yes	decades of serving on various local boards and commissions, as well as my experiences as a broadcaster in Kern County	Bakersfield	Kern	yes	(attached A map outlining COI) Keep COI together for districts
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kathy Russell	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Ridgecrest should remain in Kern County.
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	John Manion	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	do not move Ridgecrest and Indian Wells Valley from its current Congressional Disitrict in Kern County into one shared with Los Angeles County
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	Nancy J Autrey	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Ridgecrest makes the perfect corner to Kern County; do not put Ridgecrest in San Bernardino or L.A. Counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110518_hangman				no	yes	Agriculture is critical to Napas economy as seen by tax structurezoning laws. Residents involved indirectly through the associated wine industry or the tourist industry. One school district, community college, newspaper, airport, hwy 101	
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern		(proposed boundaries)North Columbus St. in Northeast Baskersfield, South below Arvin and Lamont cities, East El Tejon Mtns., West Highway 99	no	yes	Kern High School district boundaries, numerous cultural events and parades, Kern Regional Transit links all 3 cities, majority of residentsMexican American, Oaxacan, Puerto Rican, and Black (from Kern)	Extensive investments in commercial core and senior housing complexes, Primary employment is agriculture, majority of residents earn less than 30K annually
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern, San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Ridgecrest		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110518_hangman			no				
6kern_20110523_5pm	Keep COI intact under one congressional district so that they may work toward a stronger voice in the government		no				
6kern_20110523_5pm			no				
6kern_20110523_5pm	Melding with Los Angeles or San Bernardino County may well cause our voices to be lost in the crowd		no				
6kern_20110523_5pm	a long relationship with Bakersfield, in business and in many other facets of living		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	William Rogers	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	the interests of Ridgecrest, a rural community, relates more closely with those of Bakersfield and other communities in Kern County than in the more populated areas of San Bernardino and Los Angeles
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	Robert W. Campbell	no			Kern	no	
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	Paul Nugent	no			Kern	yes	Do not move Ridgecrest out of their current district and into a more populated district
6tulare_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kathryn Black	no		Springville	Tulare	yes	Put Tulare County in its own Assembly District and do not connect with valley counties for Senate districts; avoid linking Tulare with coastal or Southern California regions (San Bernardino, L.A., Ventura counties) to maintain rural characteristics of SJV

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern, San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110523_5pm				no	no		
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern			no	no		
6tulare_20110523_5pm	Tulare, Ventura, San Bernardino, Los Angeles			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110523_5pm			no				
6kern_20110523_5pm			no			comment to separating Eastern Kern County away from Kern County Seat (Bakersfield) redistricting should follow County lines as a first priority, but for highly populated counties, make the districts inclusive	
6kern_20110523_5pm	will result in the local citizens having a lesser voice in the governance of their area		no				
6tulare_20110523_5pm	Neither common areas of interest, nor geographic commonalities, nor economic similarities unite Tulare with coastal or Southern California		no			(spoke at Bakersfield meeting); maintain County unity wherever possible, and when needed, to link counties that share geographic, economic, and ethnic characteristics	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Elizabeth Silva	yes	serve Gonzales City Council Redevelopment Agency, Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority Board, as well as several other local non-profit boards.	Gonzales	Monterey	no	
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Martha Renard	yes	Renard Appraisal Company (real estate)	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Put Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties in one district and Santa Cruz County as an entirely separate district.
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	John Huston	no		Salinas	Monterey	yes	Put Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties in one congressional district; Monterey County has more in common with Santa Maria to the south than with Santa Cruz County to north

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110523_5pm				no	no		
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo			no	yes	Monterey and San Luis Obispo share agricultural water resources, military influences, the hospitality industry, the Highway 101 corridor and the Big Sur coastline	San Luis Obispo and Monterey Counties are more agricultural based; while Santa Cruz has more youth, students, and beach influences, and thus different needs
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo			no	yes	Monterey and San Luis Obispo Share the Highway 101 corridor, share recreational activities at Lake San Antonio and Lake Naciminto; many students seeking college for agriculture go to the same school (Cal Poly San Luis Obispo and Cuesta Junior College)	Monterey and San Luis Obispo both rural and dependent on agriculture, grow similar types of crops and therefore share similar industries, share a growing wine tourism corridor

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110523_5pm			no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm			no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm	keep our agricultural communities together so the agricultural way of life is protected and promoted.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Melanie Horwath	no			Monterey	yes	Combine the Monterey County with San Luis Obispo for a new agricultural based district that stresses the value of the rich water resource and rural agricultural communities that they share
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Teresa Wallace	no			Monterey	yes	Salinas Valley and its agriculture base do not share interests with Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk based economy.
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jeff Schwatz	no			Monterey	yes	keep the the cities of monterey park, alhambra, rosemead, together as much as poosible
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mary Jo Zenk	no			Monterey	yes	Keep Monterey, Santa Cruz San Benito counties together (read letter for detailed proposed districts for congressional, senate, assembly,)
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Brian Higgins	no		Salinas	Monterey	yes	Make Monterey Countys district more centralized - combine with SLO county instead of drawing the district north and south, or gerrymandered with Merced

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo			no	yes	Monterey and San Luis Obispo share the Salinas River Watershed, the 101 corridor, similar rural communities, and recreational opportunities	Monterey and San Luis Obispo share agricultural job base and types of tourism jobs
7monterey_20110523_5pm				no	no		different economies
7monterey_20110523_5pm		monterey park, alhambra, rosemead		no	no		
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Santa Clara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz San Benito counties	Morgan Hill, Gilroy, San Benito and Salinas		no	yes		Northern San Luis Obispo is closer in economic interests to southern Monterey County -both for agriculture and the coast
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Monterey, Merced, San Luis Obispo			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Santa Cruz Countys interests are strikingly different than Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties		no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm			no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm			no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm	focusing on the districts from this economic interest perspective will also not dilute the Latino population, who are mostly in the agricultural regions.		no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Robert Beck	no			Monterey	yes	Put Monterey and San Luis Obispo in one district and Santa Cruz, Silicon Valley and Santa Clara County in another district
7sclara_20110523_5pm	5232011	Thomas Wang	no			Santa Clara	yes	Do not split up Sunnyvale City between two districts
7sclara_20110523_5pm	5232011	J. Nakamura	no			Santa Clara	yes	do not place all of the Berryessa Union Elementary School District and all of the Alum Rock Union Elementary School District in the same congressional district (CD); Most or all of Berryessa School District area should be in a CD with Milipitas and others

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Santa Cruz, Monterey, Santa Clara, and San Luis Obispo			no	yes		Monterey and San Luis Obispo focus on agriculture and tourism; Silicon Valley, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz focused more towards technology, has different experience of factory outlets, other forms of shopping, sightseeing or mountainous park atmosphere.
7sclara_20110523_5pm		Sunnyvale		no	yes		
7sclara_20110523_5pm		(lists census tracts for proposed congressional district) Milipitas, others Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Fremont, Union City, (or Mtn. View, Santa Clara, and census tracts listed in letter)		no	yes	Milpitas and Berryessa School District has a majority of Asians, while San Benito County and parts of Santa Clara County, Santa Cruz County, and Monterey County is largely Latino; the two school districts differ in educational attainment and language	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Common issues and concerns are different between King City and Atascadero than high tech centers like Scotts Valley and San Jose		no				I am pleased to see that you have accepted the responsibility to address the needed changes in redistricting to ensure better alignment of voter districts as required in the California Constitution
7sclara_20110523_5pm	important for the City of Sunnyvale to be able to speak up with a unified voice on matters impacting them		no				
7sclara_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kenneth W. Carlson	no		Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	yes	district lines should re?ect our residents with their needs and lifestyle South Santa Clara County, is semirural, but many residents still commute into Silicon Valley for employment
7sclara_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sherry Quick	no		Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	yes	keep the City of Morgan Hill under one Congressional District and one State Assembly and Senate District
7sclara_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ann Price	no		Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	yes	Keep cities of Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy in one congressional district
7sclara_20110523_5pm	5232011	Beth Calvert	no			Santa Clara	yes	Keep South Santa Clara County together as one district, also keep cities of Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy together
7scruz_20110523_5pm	5232011	Robert Oen	no		Soledad	Santa Cruz	yes	Proposed district Counties of Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey and Cities of Gilroy, Morgan Hill, Paso Robles; Do not pair Central Coast and Central Valley in one district; If needed to divide, only separate the Central Coast from the Salinas Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110523_5pm	Santa Clara			no	no		
7sclara_20110523_5pm		Morgan Hill		no	no		
7sclara_20110523_5pm		Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy		no	yes	one large family oriented community	significant agricultural component
7sclara_20110523_5pm	Santa Clara	Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy		no	yes	one large family oriented community	significant agricultural component
7scruz_20110523_5pm	Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey	Gilroy, Morgan Hill, Paso Robles		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110523_5pm			no				hoping that a bipartisan commission will instead do a fair and equitable job. Please dont make it necessary for lawyers and judges to come in and clean up a mess
7sclara_20110523_5pm		Current lines were obviously done for political purposese to insure the election of one party	no				
7sclara_20110523_5pm			no				I am counting on this citizens commission to draw FAIR Lines. Please do not divide California on the basis of race, ethnic group, language, religion or income
7sclara_20110523_5pm			no				
7scruz_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jacqueline Elliot	yes	Communications Coordinator,Michael Chavez Center for Economic Opportunity		Contra Costa	yes	keep Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, if needed add similar towns such as Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek by expanding east and west along the main transportation routes of Highway 4 and 680.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jonathan Bair	no			Contra Costa	yes	(speaker 92 May 21 Oakland hearing), keep Oakland in one Assembly district, but if needed use City Council district lines (contains link in letter), use Western Contra Costa County Unified School District to see Richmond metropolitan area
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Bryan M. Balch	yes	Executive Director, Monument Community Partnership	Concord	Contra Costa	yes	keep Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, if needed add neighboring towns by expanding east and west along the main transportation routes of Highway 4 and 680.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill		no	yes		many links within Central Costa County including shared regional priorities,transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint e?orts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationships
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Oakland, Keep Pinole, Hercules, San Pablo, and Richmond together	If Oakland has to be divided, use Highway 580 in North Oakland,Lake Merritt, 23rd Ave, or High Street; e do not use Highway 980, or 13, or 580 in East Oakland	no	no		
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill		no	yes		many links within Central Costa County including shared regional priorities,transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint e?orts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationships

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				Thank you for all the work are doing to ensure fair representation for the people of California and for the opportunity to provide this input.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Alissa Friedman	no			Contra Costa	yes	Put Antioch with the Far East and East Contra Costa towns and communities. Add communities along Hwy 4 (through Concord, Martinez, Pinole, El Sobrante, Hercules and Richmond) and Central County to meet population constraints
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	David Pitman	no			Contra Costa	yes	keep Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, if needed add neighboring towns by expanding east and west along the main transportation routes of Highway 4 and 680.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	James Coffer	no			Contra Costa	yes	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	Contra Costa	Far East Brentwood, Oakley, Discovery Bay, Bethel Island; East Antioch, Pittsburg, Bay Point; along Hwy 4 Concord, Martinez, Pinole, El Sobrante, Hercules and Richmond		no	yes		Many links within East and Centra Costa Couty like shared regional priorities, transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint efforts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationship
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill		no	yes		many links within Central Costa County including shared regional priorities,transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint e?orts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationships
8ccosta_20110523_5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no			In the case of Contra Costa County, natural barriers were crossed to gerrymander district. Many people identify with the political, cultural and economic interests that are associated with county political lines.	When drawing districts, follow county boundaries to reduce confusion in the mind of the public as to what they are voting for and along with whom they have common interests

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Julio Correa	yes		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	keep Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, if needed add similar towns such as Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek by expanding east and west along the main transportation routes of Highway 4 and 680.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sandra Scherer	yes	Executive Director, Monument Crisis Center		Contra Costa	yes	keep Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, if needed add similar towns such as Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek by expanding east and west along the main transportation routes of Highway 4 and 680.
6fresno_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sara Mirhadi	no		northwest Fresno	Fresno	yes	add in the entire county of Madera (the city limits, etc.) and north Fresno portion north of Shaw Avenue to bring in the right amount of people rather than going north of Calaveras County and out of the Central Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill		no	yes		many links within Central Costa County including shared regional priorities,transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint e?orts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationships
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill		no	yes		many links within Central Costa County including shared regional priorities,transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint e?orts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationships
6fresno_20110523_5pm	Madera, Fresno, Calveras			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				Thank you for your time and dedication in listening to our voice as a community.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				
6fresno_20110523_5pm	Northeast and northwest portions of the Fresno city limits identify best with communities to the north, including the city of Madera and going up to the recreational areas of Madera County		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	Rebecca Niep	yes	News Review	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	keep Ridgecrest within the current boundaries for state legislatve and congressional districts and do not put it with San Bernardino County or with cities in North LA County
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	Barbie Nichols	no			Kern	yes	do not redistrict Kern County into Los Angeles County
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Gloria G. Garrettson	no		Pebble Beach	Monterey	no	there are important common links between Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties
7monterey_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ricki Brodie	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Put Coachella Valley and Imperial County in one district
6kern_20110523_5pm	5232011	(none)	yes	Antelope Valley Board of Trade, Greater Antelope Valley Economic Alliance		Kern	yes	(Same as 9sacramento_20110523_5pm)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern, San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Ridgecrest		no	yes	Kern issue preserving the Navy mission at China Lake; When Ridgecrest was lumped with San Bernardino County leaders, a constant challenge to educate them on this issue	work at China lake is an economic engine for Ridgecrest and play a critical role in US national security; current elected o?cials understand this
6kern_20110523_5pm	Kern, Los Angeles			no	no		
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Monterey and San Luis Obispo			no	yes	Hwy 101 connects Monterey and San Luis Obispo; CSU Monterey Bay, Cal Poly State University, Cuesta and others are top choices for students from Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties	Monterey and San Obispo Counties share agricultural industry and water use of Lake Naciemento and Lake San Antonio reservoirs, fishing industries are historic in Monterey Bay and Morro Bay
7monterey_20110523_5pm	Riverside, Imperial	Coachella, Mecca,Thermal, Brawley, Imperial		no	yes	towns are similar because of their dependence on agriculture and ethnic make-up of their populations	
6kern_20110523_5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110523_5pm			no				
6kern_20110523_5pm	voices and needs will not be addressed or represented well with this plan.		no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm			no				
7monterey_20110523_5pm			no				
6kern_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110523_5pm	5232011	David Misisco	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Separate Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties from the current district and combine Monterey with San Luis Obispo.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mike Van Hofwegan	yes	Executive Director, Michael Chavez Center for Economic Opportunity	Concord	Contra Costa	yes	keep Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, if needed add neighboring towns by expanding east and west along the main transportation routes of Highway 4 and 680.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sally Smith	no		Concord	Contra Costa	yes	keep Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, if needed add neighboring towns by expanding east and west along the main transportation routes of Highway 4 and 680.
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Matt Heavey	no			Contra Costa	yes	Concord should be split between Walnut Creek and Martinez at the Monument Corridor, the south side of Concord belongs in Walnut Creek and the north side of Concord is similar in nature and demographics to Martinez

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110523_5pm	Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo			no	no		
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill		no	yes		many links within Central Costa County including shared regional priorities,transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint e?orts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationships
8ccosta_20110523_5pm		Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Bay Point,Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill		no	yes		many links within Central Costa County including shared regional priorities,transportation interests, civic and business groups and many joint e?orts, including civic efforts, sporting communities, and work relationships
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	Concord	Walnut Creek, Martinez	The hills that separate Contra Costa from Alameda County (Caldecott Tunnel) also separate the large political differences of the two areas	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110523_5pm	Monterey County and Santa Cruz counties have very little in common with regards to political and economic interests		no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Becky J. Kolberg	no		San Ramon	Contra Costa	yes	Proposed district Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, the San Ramon Valley, the Tri-Valley (Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore) and Discovery Bay and Brentwood.
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kevin Krick	no		Fairfax	Marin	yes	Put Marin and Sonoma together in the same district, and not split Sonoma into Napa or splitting Marin with a county that is contiguous via water (San Francisco or Contra Costa)
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jay Harvey	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Keep Counties of Marin and Sonoma together under one district
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	David Russell	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Marin and Sonoma share many common interests and should be kept together under one district
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mary M. Isaacs	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Keep Counties of Marin and Sonoma together under one district, and do not redistrict Marin with San Francisco

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110523_5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Brentwood, Discovery, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore	boundaries (north entire San Ramon Valley, which includes Walnut Creek, Alamo, Danville, and San Ramon),(south and east Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore),(west East Bay Hills)	no	yes	Cities well-connected by I-580, I-680, Hwy 24. Community shares civic and cultural attractions, major retail and dining regions, natural geographic boundaries, major cooperation between local governments on issues like law enforcement, school districts.	
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, Contra Costa			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma share coastlines and have a similar rural and urban demographic	Marin and Sonoma have long been linked economically, socially, and politically
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin			no	yes	Concerns are the same	economic culture of the two counties is very unified
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin			no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco			no	yes	Marin and San Francisco are entirely different environments. Marin and Sonoma share similar lifestyles (agricultural, largely suburban)	Marin and Sonoma share economic interests, work together to promote recreational and agricultural tourism

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no			each county should be in its own district	thankful for your investment of time in this important work.
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Constance Berto	no		San Anselmo	Marin	yes	Keep Counties of Marin and Sonoma together under one district, and do not redistrict Marin with San Francisco or East Bay Counties
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	A. Ames	no			Marin	yes	Keep Counties of Marin and Sonoma together under one district, and do not redistrict Marin with San Francisco
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sherrie Faber	no			Marin	yes	Redraw Senate District 3, Proposed district begin at Golden Gate Bridge and include Marin, Sonoma Mendocino and Humboldt Counties
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kim Stoddard	no			Marin	yes	Redraw Senate District 3, Proposed district begin at Golden Gate Bridge and include Marin, Sonoma Mendocino and Humboldt Counties
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Chris Brown	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Combine Marin with Sonoma up to and including Santa Rosa, and do not combine them with San Francisco
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Janet Dean	no			Marin	yes	Marin is suburban and rural and does not have the same needs as San Francisco

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco			no	yes		
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco			no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pm	Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino and Humboldt			no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pm	Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino and Humboldt			no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco, Santa Rosa			no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pm	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco, Lake, Napa			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110523_5pm	Marin and Sonoma share many interests agricultural, economic, business, family-oriented social format, schools, tourism, railroad prospects, and topography		no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no			The current District 3 is not contiguous, does not respect city or county lines, and does not reflect a community of interest	
8marin_20110523_5pm			no			dont divide us by race or some other group	
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dotty E. LeMieux	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma (including entire Santa Rosa) together. Divide Sonoma County at a point to the west, plus a portion of northern part of Sonoma Coastline for a North Coast Congressional District. (continued in streetsriverother dividers)
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Douglas Martin	no			Marin	yes	Keep the current MarinSonoma senate distict. Marin voters share as much or more common interests with SF as with Mendocino or Humboldt counties
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Carolyn Ford	no		Sausalito	Marin	yes	redraw Senate District 3s lines to begin at the Golden Gate Bridge and include Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, and Humboldt Counties
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sherrie Faber	no			Marin	yes	redraw Senate District 3s lines to begin at the Golden Gate Bridge and include Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, and Humboldt Counties
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Donald F. Whistley, Jr.	no		Santa Rosa	Marin	yes	Proposed Assembly district as much of Sonoma and Marin Counties as possible in one district, Marin towns of Sausilito, Mill Valley, Bolinas. Stinson Beach, Iverness in a San Francisco dominated Assembly district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin	Santa Rosa	Senate Sonoma, Marin, and add northern counties or Napa and Lake, possibly joining 6th and 7th assembly districts helps with nesting. Maintain the San Francisco Bay with the Golden Gate Bridge to the South and the RichmondSan Rael Bridge to east	no	yes	Many people commute between Marin and Sonoma, which share many interests including transportation, watershed and water delivery systems, agriculture ethic, protection of open space around cities, media markets.	Also share economies of small businesses and a few larger employees
8marin_20110523_5pm	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco, Mendocino, Humboldt			no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pm	Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, and Humboldt			no	yes	Marin County has more in common with these counties than the urban county of San Francisco	
8marin_20110523_5pm	Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, and Humboldt			no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pm	San Francisco, Sonoma, Marin	Sausilito, Mill Valley, Bolinas. Stinson Beach, Iverness. If numbers high for Sonoma-Marin County, put Tiberon in the SF district	Put Mount Tamalpias in Sonoma-Marin district	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8marin_20110523_5pm			no			current District 3 is not continguous, does not respect city or county lines, and does not reflect a community of interest	
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8smateo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kristina Kiehl	no		Hillsborough	San Mateo	yes	Keep north part of San Mateo County from City of San Mateo north in the same congressional district as parts of the west and southern parts San Francisco County
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Elizabeth Gatley	no			Sonoma	yes	(Speaker 6 for May 16 Santa Rosa hearing - Keep Sonoma County whole); there are vast differences between Marin and Sonoma
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Joyce Garcia	no			Sonoma	yes	See attached maps SD 3 Sonoma County, Novato, Yolo County, Marin County, Petaluma; AD7 Follow 101; AD1 rural
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jack Swearengen	yes	SMART, Chair		Sonoma	yes	Put Sonoma with Marin
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Clay Mitchell	no		Windsor	Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma unified. Combine bulk of Sonoma into 1st CD, potentially shifting Napa into 6. Allow Windsor, Healdsburg, Cloverdale to be united with Sonoma. Keep Marin separate from Sonoma. Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake, Santa Rosa should be together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8smateo_20110523_5pm	San Francisco, San Mateo	San Mateo		no	yes		These communities are residential with mostly small businesses and retail (different from south San Mateo County), also many San Mateo residents work in SFO airport, so one representative for both counties is best
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes	Marin has constantly refused Sonoma to convert a freeway in northernmost Marin; freeway doesnt connect Sonoma and Marin	Marin and Sonoma are not similar in farming, Marin has way less acres than Sonoma (provides 2 links to Marin and Sonoma AG reports and winery acres between counties)
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Yolo	Petaluma, Novato	101	no	no		
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin			no	yes	a number of people who travel regularly between two counties	
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Mendocino, Lake	Healdsburg, Cloverdale		no	yes	Marin has fought against Sonoma to widen the freeway. Sonoma and northern counties smaller communities, transportation patterns, shopping	Sonoma and counties to north share agriculture

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8smateo_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma has nothing in common with Marin and San Francisco.		no				Do not let anyone get you down. You are all doing such a wonderful job. Mahalo.
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Nick Frey	no	Sonoma Winegrape Commission		Sonoma	yes	Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Yolo in one CD
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jennie Wasser	no			Sonoma	yes	Redraw District 3 to begin at Golden Gate and include Marin and Sonoma together
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sean Ginnodo	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma with areas to North and to east in Napa County. Do not put Sonoma with Marin.
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Richard Delucchi	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma with areas to North and to east in Napa County. Do not put Sonoma with Marin.
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Rose Lucchese	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma with areas to North and to east in Napa County. Do not put Sonoma with Marin.
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mary Maxwell	no		Sebastopol	Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma whole. Keep Sonoma with Mendocino and separate from Marin and San Francisco. Russian River and 101 are NOT dividers. SD1 Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Humboldt, Trinity, Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, North Placer
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mary Maxwell	no		Sebastopol	Sonoma	yes	SD2 Mendocino, Glenn, Butte, Lake, Colusa, Sutter, portions of Sonoma; AD2 Glenn, Butte, Lake, Sutter; AD6 Mendocino, Sonoma
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sally Hopkins	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma with Mendocino, Lake County, Napa. Not with Marin.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Yolo			no	yes	Common transportation facilities, access to same media outlets	All counties engaged actively in agriculture, grape growing and wine making, access to same job opportunities
8sonoma_20110523_5pm				no	no		
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Napa			no	yes	Sonoma is rural, like North and Napa. Marin is not.	
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Napa			no	no		
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Napa			no	no		
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Mendocino, Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Humboldt, Trinity, Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, North Placer			no	yes	Sonoma, Mendocino ruralsuburban, water rights and regulations; SD1 rural and suburban	Sonoma, Mendocino agriculture, farming, dairies, fishing, logging, manufacturing; SD1 farming, agriculture, watershed
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Mendocino, Glenn, Butte, Lake, Colusa, Sutter, Sonoma			no	no		
8sonoma_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Marin, Lake, Mendocino, Napa			no	yes		Marin is a not a COI with the northern counties in the wine industry.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				
8sonoma_20110523_5pm			no				Thank you so much for the hard work you are all doing to bring the drawing of district lines to the people and out of the hands of the political parties

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mark Wilson	yes	COB, Wilson Farms and Vineyards	Clarksburg	Yolo	yes	Congressional District 1 should keep Yolo, Solano, Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte Counties within its borders
9yolo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Don Morrill	no			Yolo	yes	Link Napa, Lake and Yolo counties in one district both at the state and federal level
9yolo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ann Brice	yes	former member of Yolo County Flood Control and Water Preservation District Board		Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County with current neighboring counties to its west, such as Lake and Napa
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Eric Parfrey	no		Stockton	San Joaquin County	yes	keep the major population centers of San Joaquin County in only one Assembly, Senate and Congressional district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110523_5pm	Yolo, Solano, Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte			no	yes	overlapping regional watershed issues that need consistent and coordinated attention and representation	general agricultural and natural resources centered economy of this region; wine grape growing, wine productionm marketing and support industries, and wine industry education and research (UC Davis)
9yolo_20110523_5pm	Napa, Lake and Yolo			no	yes	Growing and vital Viticulture Department at UCD	mutual agricultural economic base of the 3 counties is dependent on the watersheds of Putah and Cache Creek they share
9yolo_20110523_5pm	Napa, Lake and Yolo			no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pm		Stockton, Manteca, Lathrop, and Tracy would form a good Assembly district with about the right number of voters.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110523_5pm			no				
9yolo_20110523_5pm			no				
9yolo_20110523_5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pm			no				During the last redistricting of the city and county almost ten years ago, the entrenched powers shamelessly carved the city up like a Halloween pumpkin Attached 2002 column by Sacramento Bee columnist Dan Walters

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110523_5pm	5232011	Michael N. Kobseff	no	Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, District 3	Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Siskiyou County has the most in common with Shasta, and Tehama Counties
9shasta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jan Hanks	no			Shasta	yes	The coummunities along I-5 and Highway 99 should be kept together rather than joined with the coastal areas.
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	none	yes	Antelope Valley Board of Trade		Sacramento	yes	(Attached map of area they want preserved within a district), If there must be a division of the 2-country Antelope Valley, keep the LA County portion with Lancaster and Palmdale in the same district
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	Alissa Ko	no		Natomas	Sacramento	yes	Keep Natomas are in one assembly district
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	Adolfo Mercado	no			Sacramento	yes	The current city and county boundaries bifurcates a historic Latino community in the south Sacramento area
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kevin P. Nguyen	no			Sacramento	yes	Annex Sacramentos Finger into one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110523_5pm	Siskiyou, Shasta, and Tehama			no	yes	Watersheds, Natural Resource usage, USFS lands and transportation highways	
9shasta_20110523_5pm	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter Counties should remain together as one district.			no	yes	Water resources	
9sacramento_20110523_5pm		Lancaster and Palmdale		no	yes	fast growing hispanic community, Lancaster and Palmdale share many regional associations.	2 cities have been recognized as economic ties
9sacramento_20110523_5pm		Natomas		no	yes	Natomas faces issues of a failing school system and homes are on a flood plain	
9sacramento_20110523_5pm		Sacramento		no	no		
9sacramento_20110523_5pm				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110523_5pm	Coastal Counties and eastern Counties have different issues for decision making polices. While the counties to the east and west of Siskiyou are rural, that is all that we have in common		no				The 1 parity must not vary to 5. It will provide a negative election result scheme.
9shasta_20110523_5pm	The coastal mountains create a geographic divide.		no				As an independent commission please look at the plan drawn by independent judges in1990
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	Environmentally, demographically, geologically, socially and economically distinct from areas outside of our mountain boundaries		no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	Lessen confusion for many businessed and residents when it comes to contacting the appropriate elected official		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9placer_20110523_5pm	5232011	Claudia Taylor	no		Lake of the Pines	Placer	yes	keep the current district II lines, if alteration is needed, add Colfax and Shady Glen. Also put Lake Combie entirely within District II instead of in two different districts
8marin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Michelle Belfor Kralovec	no			Marin	yes	The two counties that share the most common interests are Marin and Sonoma, not with San Francisco or East Bay
8smateo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Hugo Rafael Mora	no		South San Francisco	San Mateo	yes	His community in South San Francisco is similar to Mission, Excelsior, Hunters Point, Bay View, and Tenderloin districts of San Francisco and East Palo Alto, East Side Redwood City, East Side San Mateo, Daly City and San Bruno areas. (cont. in cities)
8smateo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Matthew D. Cucuzza	no		San Bruno	San Mateo	yes	(Submitted the Powerpoint presentation that Carole Groom gave at the May 21 Oakland hearing (Carole President of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors)
9placer_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sheila McConnachie	no			Placer	yes	Keep the rural towns of Loomis, Penryn, and Newcastle with neighboring rural areas of Auburn

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9placer_20110523_5pm		Colfax and Shady Glen		no	yes	Current district lines are geographically compact and lifestyle compact, Colfax and Shady Glen has similar lifestyles; a north-south district would respect transportation corridors (Hwy 49) so legislators can be accessible to communities.	
8marin_20110523_5pm	San Francisco, Sonoma, Marin			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma share family-oriented lifestlye, coastline, schools	agriculture and tourism
8smateo_20110523_5pm	San Francisco	Not with Castro, Sunset, Marina, other affluent districts of San Francisco (usually on west side of peninsula), Brisbane, Burlingame, Hillsdale area of San Mateo, Hillsborough, Foster City, Atherton, Half Moon Bay, Palo Alto, and Milbrae		no	yes	Low income, socioeconomically disadvantaged communities depend on social services and protection from racism and suffered from similar socio-economically issues.	
8smateo_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9placer_20110523_5pm	Placer	Auburn, Loomis, Penryn, and Newcastle		no	yes	These rural towns do not identify with urban areas and would benefit from being together with the other rural areas of Placer County	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9placer_20110523_5pm			no			do not deviate any more than 1.5-2 in numbers in each district that must be altered	The work that you all are doing is very important and its success is dependent upon your collective integrity, wisdom and discernment in the process
8marin_20110523_5pm			no				
8smateo_20110523_5pm			no				
8smateo_20110523_5pm			no				
9placer_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Johnnie Hathcock	no			Lake	yes	Keep the current district lines for Lake, Humboldt, Mendocino
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Lynette Matthews	no		Lucerne	Lake	yes	Keep current district lines for Lake County
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Adckinjo Esutoki	no			Lake	yes	Leave the districts as they are now
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Marta William	no		Middletown	Lake	yes	Maintain geographic integrity and communities of interest intact when drawing districts for the coastal communities (Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt Del Norte) and counties such as Lake and Napa
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Denise Rushing	yes	District 3 Supervisor		Lake	yes	Put Lake County with the other premium wine counties of Napa, Mendocino and Northern Sonoma Counties and not with districts east or north such as Colusa and Glenn
9humbolt_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kevin Collins	yes	Vice President, Humboldt Fishermens Marketing Association		Humboldt	yes	Have the1st congressional district remain remain contiguous along the north coast from Bodega Bay to Crescent City.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9lake_20110523_5pm	Lake, Humboldt, Mendocino			no	no		
9lake_20110523_5pm	Lake			no	no		
9lake_20110523_5pm				no	yes	To insure the beauty and attraction for tourism, water ways, lakes and parks	
9lake_20110523_5pm	Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt Del Norte			no	yes	wine, tourism, transportation corridors (Caltrans District 1) parks, lakes.	
9lake_20110523_5pm	Colusa, Glenn, Lake, Napa, Mendocino and Northern Sonoma			no	yes	Lake has watershed ties with Yolo County	Wine countries share same industries and on federal level, the counties share geothermal industry interests. Humboldt has received recommendation from the State to join Napa on workforce and economic issues
9humbolt_20110523_5pm		Bodega Bay, Crescent City		no	yes		Coastal communities share fishing interests for maintaining healthy fish populations and habitat and maintaining economic infrastructure

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no			In determining district lines, maintain the geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, local neighborhood, orlocal community of interest	
9lake_20110523_5pm	Lake has no affinity with Colusa or Glenn since they are seperated by a mountain range and do not share significant community or economic ties		no				
9humbolt_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Donald McArthur	no	Member, Board of Trustees for Del Norte County Unified School District		Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte County back in the 2nd State Senate District prior to 2000 census
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ralph Johansen	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	The interests in Del Norte County are more common with other coastal counties (from Sonoma northward) and not at all with inland regions
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Patricia McCleary	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Keep coastal districts intact. Put Del Norte in same congressional district as Humboldt and Mendocino, and same assembly and senate district as Sonoma, Humboldt and Mendocino. Del Norte is not similar to Monterey, Fresno, Santa Barbara, Kern, Del Norte
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Cindy Fox	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	no	Draw the district lines for coastal communities from north to south, not from west to east. Put Del Norte with Lake and Napa Counties in the same district
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jerry Cochran	yes		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Del Nortes interests rest with Humboldt, Mendocino and Sonoma Counties, not with Sacramento Valley or foothills of the Sierra Nevada

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte			no	yes	proximity to other Local Educational Agencies within the region involves both resource sharing and strategic targets for regional improvements	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte, Sonoma			no	yes	preservation and enhancement of the many coastal assets	tourism industry, fisheries and forests, habitat for fish and wildlife
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Monterey, Fresno, Santa Barbara, Kern, Del Norte, Siskiyou			no	yes	coastal counties share management of harbors and beaches, tourism, recreation and ?shing and the redwoods. State and federal agencies oversee land or administer across northern coastal counties	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Sonoma, Lake, Napa, Del Norte			no	yes	transportation, delivery services, and tourism travel mostly from north to south on Hwy 101 from Del Norte to Sonoma	Caltrans District 1 covers the north counties and includes Lake County. Coastal communities rely on each other to promote tourism, agriculture, wine industry, dairy industry, fishing, state and federal parks
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino and Sonoma			no	yes	transporation corridor is shared between those 4 counties	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Shares same economic, social and educational issues		no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ralph Johansen	yes		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Del Nortes interests lie most commonly with the other coastal counties, from Sonoma northward, and not with the inland regions
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Martha McClure	no	Supervisor of Del Norte County		Del Norte	yes	keep Del Norte County in the 1st Congressional District,the 1st Assembly District and return to the 2nd Senate District because Del Norte is a small coastal community and shares interests with coastal counties to the South
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dean Wilson	no	Sheriff of Del Norte County		Del Norte	yes	Del Norte has strong links with South Humboldt, Siskiyou, Modoc. Also include Trinity, Shasta, and Lassen Counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte, Sonoma			no	yes	preservation and enhancement of the many coastal assets	tourism industry, fisheries and forests, habitat for fish and wildlife
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte			no	yes	Transportation network runs primarily North and South, the Coastal Range limits our ability to ability to travel West to East and travel is difficult in the winter. Some issues of interest tribal governments, state and federal agency regional oversight	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte, South Humboldt, Siskiyou, Modoc,Trinity, Shasta, and Lassen			no	yes	Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc share same issues dealing with national and state properties; Del Norte also shares ties with counties along the 199 corridor leading to I-5	Del Norte and Humboldt share economic interests, logging, fishing, tourism

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	These mentioned counties share more with the community than a district of coastal communities		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Barry Wendell	no			Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte County in a district with Humboldt
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Joseph Aliott	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Keep Del Norte, Humboldt, and Mendocino Counties together
8napa_20110523_5pm	5232011	David Beckstoffer, Jim Verhey	yes	Napa Valley Grapegrowers, President		Napa	yes	Keep counties of Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo continuous
8napa_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kathleen Heitz Myers (14 copies for Commissioners)	yes	The Napa Valley Vintners, President		Napa	yes	Keep counties of Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo continuous
20110504_boranian	542011	Jennie Boranian	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte, Humboldt	Eureka		no	yes	Only land connection to California is US 101 heading south. Del Norte shares with Humboldt Coastline, Yurok Tribe, Redwood National and State parks, religious buildings.Mountains separate Del Norte from Siskiyou County and there are no land connections.	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	Del Norte, Humboldt, and Mendocino			no	yes	The 3 counties share common transportation issues, similar geography, a campus of College of Redwoods, many tribal affiliations and cooperate ith the tribes on many economic decisions	3 counties share fishing industry and economical issues
8napa_20110523_5pm	Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo			no	yes		wine, tourism, recreation, and agricultural industries
8napa_20110523_5pm	Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo			no	yes		
20110504_boranian				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
8napa_20110523_5pm			no				
8napa_20110523_5pm	agricultural community of interest, grape growing and wine making, share transportation, economic interests, and access to the same media outlets		no				
20110504_boranian			no				Agree with redistricting as stated in CRCs report

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110515_landi	5152011	Alex Landi	no				no	
20110516_greenberg	5162011	Charles Greenberg	no				yes	Do not divide Coast. Hwy 1101 corridors.
20110516_heaton	5162011	Alfred Heaton	no				no	
20110516_olson	5162011	B H Olson	no				no	
20110516_ward	5162011	Ed Ward	no				yes	District 2 make changes by adding or deleting counties on the southern portion rather than incorporating any counties from eastwest.
20110517_anonymous	5172011	Anonymous	no				no	
20110517_casey	5172011	Sue Casey	no				yes	Do not change district (does not state which district)
20110517_clark	5172011	Larry Clark	no				yes	Does not want to be a part of LA (does not state residence)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110515_landi				no	no		
20110516_greenberg				no	yes	Coastal communities depend on fishing, logging, farming, wine, dairy, poultry, and visitor serving facilities for a living. Environmental protections that would not make sense to other areas. Unified by geography and culture.	
20110516_heaton				no	no		
20110516_olson				no	no		
20110516_ward				no	yes	coastal living v. inland living	
20110517_anonymous				no	no		
20110517_casey				no	no		
20110517_clark				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110515_landi			no				Draw district lines in a rational, regional, logical manner; do not gerrymander in respect of voters
20110516_greenberg			no				
20110516_heaton			no				No more gerrymandering
20110516_olson			no				Give a balance in the legislature by making districts competitive amongst competing interest groups. No safe elections for one group.
20110516_ward			no				
20110517_anonymous			no				No gerrymandering
20110517_casey			no				
20110517_clark			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110517_dorich	5172011	Tom Dorich	no				no	
20110517_joint	5172011	Rosalind Gold	yes	African American Redistricting Collaborative; Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC), California Forward, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), National Association of Latino and Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO)Edu Fund			no	
20110517_larive	5172011	Bob Larive	no				no	
20110517_stewart	5172011	Coulter Stewart	no	Chairman, Government Relations Committee, Sun City Palm Desert HOA			no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110517_dorich				no	no		
20110517_joint				no	no		
20110517_larive				no	no		
20110517_stewart				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110517_dorich			no				Modernize redistricting process via geographersmappers, etc. Diminish gerrymandering.
20110517_joint			no				Extend deadline beyond May 23 for public comment for first round drafts
20110517_larive			no				Let redistricting be done by a computer so it will be impartial. Do not input info like gender, political affiliation, race,etc.
20110517_stewart			no				What do you want to know about geothermal energy? Wrote and shephereded Geothermal Power Plant Siting Act into law in 1978

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110518_arsenault	5182011	Edward Arsenault	no				yes	Leave the district the way it is (does not state which district)
20110518_hernandez	5182011	Gene Hernandez	no				yes	CDs of Brad Sherman and Howard Berman must be drawn so as to give boost to candidacy of a Latino
20110518_mccready	5182011	John McCready	no		South El Monte	Los Angeles	no	
20110518_nemeth	5182011	Stephen Nemeth	no				no	
20110518_scheuermann	5182011	Karen Scheuermann	no				yes	Have one person who represents entire North State
20110518_venn	5182011	Frances Venn	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110518_arsenault				no	no		
20110518_hernandez				no	no		
20110518_mccready				no	no		
20110518_nemeth				no	no		
20110518_scheuermann				no	no		
20110518_venn				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110518_arsenault			no				Believes this is another political scheme to redistribute wealth of people
20110518_hernandez			no				Third parties must be taken into account when drawling lines for legislative districts
20110518_mccready			no				Discriminate in favor of actual voters, instead of in favor of those who are not U.S. Citizens, cannot speak English (and thus cannot vote)
20110518_nemeth			no				Do a poll on the suggested method use squaresrectangles across the state from north to south or vice versa, draw lines strictly in geometric style with regard to any other criteria. Would create diverse districts, better representation
20110518_scheuermann			no				
20110518_venn			no				Make sure no safe districts. CRCs work very important. Thanks for giving time and energy to fairly redistricting California.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110517_west	5172011	Catherine West	no				no	
20110519_brown	5192011	Marlin Brown	yes	The Bugle Group	Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Combine Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties where possible. If dividing, divide Central counties with lines that go East-West rather than lines that go North-South
20110519_de_carlo	5192011	Francis De Carlo	no				no	
20110519_delosrios	5192011	Estela DelosRios	yes	Center for Social Advocacy, Executive Director	El Cajon	San Diego	yes	See attached letter8 maps

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110517_west				no	no		
20110519_brown	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo			no	no		
20110519_de_carlo				no	no		
20110519_delosrios				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110517_west			no				Draw districts with equal population. Ensure minority voters have an equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice.
20110519_brown			no				Downgrade to last priority canard of communitycommonality of interest and cultural diversity
20110519_de_carlo			no				Believes current system set up by elected officials to further their entrenchment into their jobs and is contrary to the democratic process. Drawing of new lines should be a simple one based upon geographic principals.
20110519_delosrios			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110519_fonda-bonardi	5192011	Mario Fonda-Bonardi	no				no	
20110519_goeppner	5192011	Tim Goeppner	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	no	
20110519_grenke	5192011	Teresa Grenke	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110519_fonda-bonardi				no	no		
20110519_goeppner				no	no		
20110519_grenke				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110519_fonda-bonardi			no				Districts should be 1. geographically compact, ecologically compact, congruent where possible with other jurisdictional boundaries and districts, free of racialethnic ghettosfragmentation (ignore classethnic clusters), free of previous voting patterns
20110519_goeppner			no				Make sure the CRC is fair and unbiased in drawing district lines. Eliminate special interest group influence (MALDEF, NALEO, Greenlining Institute). Do not divide by raceethnicityreligionlanguageincomepolitical party. Counting on CRC for fair electio
20110519_grenke			no				California should use county lines. Each county winner should equal one vote so every area of the state counts.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110519_kalinowski	5192011	Waldemar Kalinowski	no				no	
20110519_kelly	5192011	Josie Kelly	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Cannot afford to lose Fran Pavley
20110519_mcavoy	5192011	Mark McAvoy	no		Modesto	Stanislaus	no	
20110519_rowbotham	5192011	Robert Rowbotham	no				yes	Mr. Waxmeans 30th congressional district is too lage.
20110519_stone	5192011	Catherine Stone	no		Bayside	Humboldt	yes	Keep coast separate from inland. Current first AD addresses concerns.
20110519_zingarelli2	5192011	Gene Zingarelli	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110519_kalinowski				no	no		
20110519_kelly				no	no		
20110519_mcavoy				no	no		
20110519_rowbotham				no	no		
20110519_stone				no	yes	Demographics, transportation concerns, approaches to resource use, infrastructures, climate, and geology	Economies
20110519_zingarelli2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110519_kalinowski			no				An avg. citizen canNOT participate in the redistricting process. Info provided on website is inadequateconfusing. Big gap between receiving comments up till May 23, but releasing plans July 7. Provide a well-spelled out plan and process on website.
20110519_kelly			no				Do not mess with voting rights.
20110519_mcavoy			no				Please do not split communities. Respect community boundaries, not political affiliations.
20110519_rowbotham			no				
20110519_stone			no				Have a public input meeting farther north-in Eureka, perhaps Redding
20110519_zingarelli2			no				This job is the most important in years for CA. Stay true to intentions of voters. Avoid influences from politicianspeople who want to gain financially. Relying on CRC to improve representation and nature of politics.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110520_anonymous	5202011	G C	no				yes	Keep District 2 as is. If change, make them in southern part by moving boundary north or south. Nothing in common with those to the west.
20110520_britton	5202011	Collen Britton	no		Vacaville	Solano	no	
20110520_cucuzza	5202011	Matt Cucuzza	no	McGovern Consulting, Account Executive	San Bruno	San Mateo	yes	Have at least one Senate District predominantly within county lines. See attached maps
20110520_joyce	5202011	Tony Shel Joyce	no				yes	Does not want to be redistricted into LA or SB (does not state where from)
20110520_morse	5202011	Robert Morse	no				no	
20110520_petersen	5202011	Marylin Petersen	no		Eureka	Humboldt	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110520_anonymous				no	no		
20110520_britton				no	no		
20110520_cucuzza	San Mateo County, San Francisco			no	yes	Both districts presented are minority majority districts, respect geographic boundaries. 2 ADs can easily nest in each district.	
20110520_joyce				no	no		
20110520_morse				no	no		
20110520_petersen				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110520_anonymous			no				
20110520_britton			no				Stop gerrymandering to protect politiciansspecial interest groups. Keep districts fair, equal population, connected, maximum compactness. Use open software computer to mathematicallyimpartially draw districts
20110520_cucuzza	Ethnically diverse, major employment centers, common transportation links, common gegoraphical features, shared infrastructure, compact districts, give each county a population majority in each District		no				
20110520_joyce			no				
20110520_morse			no				Please do not create any safe districts.
20110520_petersen			no				Urges the CRC to hold at least one meeting in Eureka to better understand the north Coast area.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110520_woolbert	5202011	Cherri Woolbert	no				yes	Opposed to East-West redistricting of 1st district.
20110521_langellier	5212011	Brent Langellier	no				no	
20110521_mcisaac	5212011	Hugh McIsaac	no				no	
20110521_teate	5212011	George Teate	no				yes	Please leave us in the district we are currently located (does not mention where current location is)
20110521_van_meter	5212011	Peter Van Meter	no		Sausalito	San Francisco	no	MyCRE LLC
general_20110521_mills	5212011	Cecile Mills	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110520_woolbert				no	yes	Coastl counties have different vital interests than inland counties	
20110521_langellier				no	no		
20110521_mcisaac				no	no		
20110521_teate				no	no		
20110521_van_meter				no	no		
general_20110521_mills				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110520_woolbert			no				
20110521_langellier			no				Hopes CRC will see its role in this process to provide info such as DVC(density-variiationcompactness) scores relevant to those of of us who see redistricting process as a key ingredient to policymaking in education.
20110521_mcisaac			no				To achieve important mission, existing citiescommunities need to be included in patterns respecting integrity of community, not according to creating safe districts for partisan advantage.
20110521_teate			no				
20110521_van_meter			no				Marin Supervisor Susan Adams probably disagrees with Peter Van Meter and his suggestion of having all districts start north of the Golden Gate
general_20110521_mills			no				Do not divide zip codes.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110521_schechter	5212011	Gary Schechter	no	Gary Associates, Inc.	Woodland Hills		no	
general_20110522_berry	5222011	Charles Berry	no				yes	In rural districts, avoid dividing a district by mountain range (e.g., Coastal Mountain Range that divides Mendocino County)
general_20110522_friar	5222011	John Friar	no				no	
general_20110522_giddens	5222011	Richard Giddens	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110521_schechter				no	no		
general_20110522_berry	Mendocino County		Coastal Mountain Range	no	no		
general_20110522_friar				no	no		
general_20110522_giddens				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110521_schechter			no				Redistricting should be done by zip code and adjacent zip codes. Zip codes should not be dividedsplit into political districts to help re-elect anyone.
general_20110522_berry			no				Create compact districts that enable convenient travel for a legislator within a district.
general_20110522_friar			no				Create districts without party influences. Use a computer-based redistricting that creates districts based on principle of attempting to approach a square (or circle) as closely as possible for all districts.
general_20110522_giddens			no				Must end practice of ending gerrymandering. Any drawing of a district must embrace constitutionally correct attributes of equal population representation, connectedness, and be compact.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110522_petlock	5222011	Kyle Petlock	no				no	
general_20110522_robinson	5222011	LaJoyce Robinson	no		Rancho Bernardo	San Diego	yes	Bad example of gerrymandering RBPoway4S RanchPenasquitosScripps Ranch
1sdiego_20110608	692011	Michael Griffith	no				yes	New districts should be based on geography and population density, not racial and sexual demographics
7sclara_20110608	692011	Huong Truong (duplicate)	no				yes	Happy with June 2 district lines for Little Saigon
7sclara_20110608	682011	Kalyana Kattamuri	no				yes	Keep Fremont in the district with Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county, do not split Fremont among two districts
8alameda_20110608	682011	Sushil Warrier	no				yes	Keep Fremont with the Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county, do not split Fremont between congressional and legislative districts
8alameda_20110608	692011	James Wallsten	no				yes	Keep Fremont with Alameda county
8alameda_20110608	692011	Moina Shaiq Siddiqi	no				yes	Do not divide Fremont into two congressional districts
8alameda_20110608	692011	Vasudeva Kamath	no				yes	Keep Fremont in Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county, do not split Fremont between congressional and legislative districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110522_petlock				no	no		
general_20110522_robinson	San Diego County	Poway		no	no		
1sdiego_20110608				yes	yes		
7sclara_20110608				yes	yes	Little Saigon is a cohesive community	
7sclara_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110522_petlock			no				Stop corrupt, special interest, and corporate-backed redistricting. In need of a process which puts peoples interests ahead of corporations and special interests
general_20110522_robinson			no				Stop gerrymandering. Draw lines by population numbers, not by race.
1sdiego_20110608			no			Districts should not reflect racial or sexual demographics	
7sclara_20110608			no				
7sclara_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no			Concerned whether Q2 Consulting is listening to their directive	
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110608	692011	Mary Trounstine	no				yes	Keep San Leandro in one district
8alameda_20110608	692011		no				yes	Wants city to stay as one district, does not specify which city
8alameda_20110608	692011	Sushil Chandra	no				yes	Keep Fremont as one district, as it currently is
8alameda_20110608	692011	Jeff Nibert	no				yes	Do not split along AlamedaContra Costa county lines; keep Danville, San Ramon, Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore together
8alameda_20110608	692011	Kaushik Hathi	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Do not split Fremont into two Congressional districts, common identity of southern Alameda county; Do not make Fremont part of the eastern San JoseSanta Clara district
8alameda_20110608	692011	Joyce Gross	no				yes	Keep San Leandro in one district
8alameda_20110608	692011	Karthikeyan Kandasamy	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one Congressional district
8alameda_20110608	692011	Vivek Srinivas	no				yes	Do not split Fremont into two Congressional districts
8alameda_20110608	692011	Tricia Reichert	no				yes	San Leandro should be in one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110608				no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	yes		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda, Contra Costa	Danville, San Ramon, Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore		no	no	Common identity and spirit, common transportation networks, similar demographics, common childrens sports leagues, local governments collaborate together	common sources of employment, buisnesses in the area have formed partnerships
8alameda_20110608	Alameda, Santa Clara	Fremont, San Jose		no	yes	Fremont has a common identity	
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110608	City should be kept together so that city has a unified voice in the legislature		no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608	These cities identify as a single community		no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608	Fremont is a small city and should not be split between two districts		no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608	It unfairly disadvantages a city to split it into two districts		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110608	682011	Curtis W Denisar	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Do not split Fremont into two districts
8alameda_20110608	682011	Ashok Desai	no				yes	Do not split Fremont into to Congressional districts
8alameda_20110608	682011	Jane Bethard-Tracy	no				yes	Keep San Leandro in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Michael Keiser	no				yes	Keep San Leandro as one district, Fremont should not share representatives with Oakland
8alameda_20110608	682011	Marvin Wexler	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Do not split Fremont into two Congressional districts, splitting would dilute Fremonts voice on local issues
8alameda_20110608	682011	Mkhalland	no				yes	Keep San Leandro in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Sherman Williams	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Linda Moczkowski	no				yes	Keep San Leandro in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Anand Sethuraman	no				yes	Keep Fremont with Tri-Cities and sounthern Alameda county, do not split Fremont between Congressional and Legislative districts
8alameda_20110608	682011	Jan Leimert	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont with Tri-Cities and sounthern Alameda county, do not split Fremont to partially be with Santa Clara county
8alameda_20110608	682011	Jean A Holmes	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district with Tri-City area of Fremont, Newark and Union City

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro, Oakland		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda, Santa Clara	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont, Union City, Newark		no	yes	These cities have many issues and agencies in common, have worked together historically	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110608	Fremont has done well as one district		no			Politicians should not interfere with local politics, does not want to pay for an additional political position	
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608	San Leandro is very different from Oakland		no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608	City representatives would have to work with two different congressional offices if Fremont is split		no				
8alameda_20110608			no				Thank you for your service on the Redistricting Commission

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110608	682011	Mary Minor	no				yes	Do not split San Leandro between the Oakland and HaywardUnion City districts
8alameda_20110608	682011	Henry Hutchins	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	George Winsted	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Pavan Vedere	no				yes	Keep Fremont with Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county, do not split Fremont between Congressional and legislative districts
8alameda_20110608	682011	Douglas Tinney	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Rose Works	no		Oakland	Alameda	no	
8alameda_20110608	682011	Vidya Pradhan	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one district, do not combine Fremont with San Jose
8alameda_20110608	682011	Sampath Ravindhran	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Sunil Chhabra	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro, Hayward, Union City, Oakland		no	yes	San Leandro is a cohesive and active community	
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	yes		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	yes	Fremont has a diverse population	
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608				no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont, San Jose		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	yes	Fremont has a unified, cohesive community	
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110608	No city should be split between districts		no				
8alameda_20110608	Fremont is a large city, long history of being in one district		no			The commission should have had a hearing in Fremont to gage residents opinions	
8alameda_20110608	Splitting Fremont would dilute local political influence		no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				When do the redistricting lines become effective? When will elected officials be considered in the new districts? How many public hearings have been held as of 682011?
8alameda_20110608	Splitting Fremont would dilute the citys political influence		no				
8alameda_20110608	Splitting Fremont would be dentrimental to the citys development, culture and economy		no				
8alameda_20110608			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110608	682011	Rameet Kohli	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district, with the Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county
8alameda_20110608	682011	Sherry Blackman	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one district, do not combine Fremont with San Jose
8alameda_20110608	682011	Milan Thanawala	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district, with the Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county
8alameda_20110608	682011	Marilyn M Campbell	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one district, with Alameda county
8alameda_20110608	682011	Cindy Corrello Hilke	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont with Alameda county
8alameda_20110608	682011	Joel Freid	no				no	
8alameda_20110608	682011	Gerald McFaull	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8alameda_20110608	682011	Aref Aziz	yes	Fremont in Alameda County Coalition, Chair			yes	Do not split up Fremont, create a North-South Alameda county district along I-880 from Hayward to Fremont, mirroring the state SD; keep Newark with Alameda county, suggest putting San Leandro with Oakland, or Fremont with Tri-Cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont, San Jose		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608	Alamdea	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608				no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	yes	Fremont has cohesive social identity, historic roots and cultural diversity	
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont, Hayward, Newark, Union City, Oakland, San Leandro		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				We have great respect for the Commissioners, but are concerned whether Q2 consulting is listening to their directive
8alameda_20110608			no			Nest two ADs in each SD to make it easier for voters to know who their respresentatives are, simplify the political map, facilitate organizing, canvassing, campaigning, and educating; follow the approach CA has taken to redistrict courts	
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110608	682011	Margery Leonard	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8ccosta_20110608	682011	Bruce Harter	yes	Contra Costa Unified, Superintendent			yes	Keep Richmond in George Millers congressional district, do not split the West Contra Costa school district among three legislative districts
8marin_20110608	682011	Barbara Gaman	no		Inverness	Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma in district 6, as it is, not with northern counties, San Francisco, or East Bay
8marin_20110608	692011	Joan Farrell	no				yes	Do not redistrict Marin county
8marin_20110608	682011	Julia Bartlett	no			Marin	yes	Do not redistrict Marin county
8napa_20110608	682011	John Dorenbecher	no				yes	Do not put Napa county with Sacramento valley counties such as Glenn, Colusa, Yuba, and Sutter
8napa_20110608	682011	Dennis Makemson	no				yes	Do not put Napa or American Canyon with Glenn, Butte, and Sutter counties
8alameda_20110608	692011	Mithlesh Chandra	no				yes	Do not split Fremont
8alameda_20110608	692011	Sushil Chandra	no				yes	Do not split Fremont
8alameda_20110608	692011	John Kaplan	no				yes	Do not split San Leandro into different Senate and Assembly districts
8alameda_20110608	692011	Doug Ford	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one district, with Union City, Newark, and Hayward
8alameda_20110608	682011	Martha Mahuron	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8ccosta_20110608	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes	West Contra Costa School District should stay in George Millers district because he has been a champion of public education	
8marin_20110608	Marin, Sonoma	San Francisco		no	yes		
8marin_20110608	Marin			no	no		
8marin_20110608	Marin			no	no		
8napa_20110608	Napa, Glenn, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter			no	no		
8napa_20110608	Napa, Glenn, Butte, Sutter	American Canyon		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110608		Fremont, Union City, Newark, Hayward		no	yes	Fremont has a large ethnic population which should be kept together, Fremont shares similar concerns and problems as Union City, Newark, and Hayward	
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110608			no				
8ccosta_20110608			no				
8marin_20110608	Marin and Sonoma have more in common than Marin does with north coastal counties		no				
8marin_20110608			no				
8marin_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110608	682011	Charles R Rivas	no				yes	Keep Napa with Sonoma and Mendocino counties
8napa_20110608	682011	David Mendelsohn	no			Napa	yes	Do not change district one; do not put Napa with central valley counties; keep Napa with Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake and Solano; keep American Canyon with the rest of Napa and not with Vallejo
8napa_20110608	682011	John Lansingh	no				yes	Keep all of Napa county in one district, with Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino
8napa_20110608	682011	Evan Wilson	no			Napa	yes	Do not put Napa with central valley counties, keep Napa with Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino counties
8napa_20110608	682011	Sandy Elles	yes	Napa County Farm Bureau, Executive Director		Napa	yes	Keep Napa with north coast winegrowing areas; do not split American Canyon from the rest of Napa
8napa_20110608	692011	Barbara Pahre	yes			Napa	yes	Keep Napa with winegrowing areas; do not split American Canyon from the rest of Napa
8napa_20110608	682011	Marita Dorenbecher	no				yes	Keep Napa with Sonoma, Mendocino, and other in the first district; keep American Canyon with Napa; do not put Napa with Yolo and Sacramento
8napa_20110608	682011	Janet Gotch	no				yes	Keep Napa with Lake, Mendocino, and Sonoma counties; keep American Canyon with Napa; do not put Napa with Sacramento valley counties such as Glenn, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter
8napa_20110608	682011	Dottie Rentschler	no			Napa	yes	Keep Napa with counties that have similar agriculture and interests
8napa_20110608	682011	Genji Schmeder	no		Napa	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110608	Napa, Sonoma, Mendocine			no	yes	Napa, Sonoma and Mendocino share interests and concerns	
8napa_20110608	Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake Solano	American Canyon, Vallejo		no	yes	Keep wine country counties together	Shared local economy in wine industry
8napa_20110608	Napa, Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino			no	yes	Keep wine country counties together	Shared local economy in wine industry
8napa_20110608	Napa, Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino			no	yes	Wine country counties share culture	Shared local economy in wine industry and wine country tourism
8napa_20110608	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes		Shared local economy in wine industry and wine country tourism
8napa_20110608	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	Shared local idenity as premium wine regions	
8napa_20110608	Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Yolo, Sacramento	American Canyon		no	yes		Shared local economy in wine industry
8napa_20110608	Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake, Glenn, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter	American Canyon		no	yes		Shared local economy in wine industry and wine country tourism
8napa_20110608	Napa			no	no		Shared agriculture and interests
8napa_20110608	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	Napa county has spirit of coperation and should be kept together	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8napa_20110608	Napa county has spirit of coperation and should be kept together		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110608	682011	Kathryn Winter	no				yes	Keep Napa with Marin, Mendocino, and Sonoma; keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110608	692011	Ryan Raes	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa county
8smateo_20110608	682011	Adam	no				no	
8sonoma_20110608	682011	Claire May	no				no	
9humboldt_20110608	682011	Humboldt Fishermans Marketing Association	yes	Humboldt Fishermans Marketing Association, Board of Directors		Humboldt	yes	Keep Humboldt countys representation as it is, with two congressional members, one closer to San Francisco and one farther north
9mendocino_20110608	682011	Spencer Brewer	no			Mendocino	yes	Mendocino should be with Napa, Sonoma and Lake
9siskiyou_20110608	692011	Mark Baird	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110608	Napa, Marin, Mendocino, Sonoma	American Canyon		no	yes	Napa has historical and political affinity with coastal and wine-growing counties	Shared local economy in wine industry
8napa_20110608	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8smateo_20110608				no	no		
8sonoma_20110608				no	no		
9humboldt_20110608	Humboldt, San Francisco			no	no		
9mendocino_20110608	Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Lake			no	yes		Shared local economy in wine industry
9siskiyou_20110608				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110608	Counties should never be split up		no				
8napa_20110608			no				
8smateo_20110608			no			Will Sierra Avenue, Mountain View, CA 94041 be included in the 11th SD or the 13th SD?	
8sonoma_20110608			no			Do not create district lines based on political parties, outside influence had have bad effects on communities, communities should not be subject to special interests	
9humboldt_20110608			no				
9mendocino_20110608			no				
9siskiyou_20110608			no			Siskiyou county should not be re-districted after only one meeting; one meeting is not enough to determine the social and economic character of the community	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110608	682011	Sunil Sethi	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district, with Newark and Union City, do not put Fremont with San Jose
8alameda_20110608	682011	Surendra Kunwar, Manju Sharma, Manish Sharma, Aditi Sharma	no				yes	Keep Fremont in one district, with Alameda county
1imperial_20110521	5212011	Peter Nelson	no	-	-	Imperial	yes	Keep East County separate from Imperial County
1imperial_20110528	5282011	Pamela Pence	no	-	Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley
1sdiego_20110525	5252011	Steve Clapp	no	-	-	East	yes	Do not combine East County and Imperial County
1sdiego_20110531	5312011	Rick Bova	no	-	Escondido	San Diego	yes	Keep Escondido in one state assembly district
2riverside_20110524	5242011	Carol Haskell	no	-	Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial County
2riverside_20110526	5262011	Ronald O. Loveridge	yes	mayor, city of Riverside	Riverside	Riverside	yes	Keep city of Riverside within the county of Riverside
2sbernardino_20110530	5302011	Carole Beswick	yes	president and CEO, Inland Action, Inc.	-	-	no	-
2sbernardino_20110531	5312011	Daniel Palacios	no	-	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	yes	The city of San Bernardino should be represented by a single Assembly District

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110608		Fremont		no	yes	Fremont has more in common with Newark and Union City than it does with San Jose	
8alameda_20110608	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
1imperial_20110521	Imperial, East	-	-	no	no	-	different economic interests
1imperial_20110528	-	-	-	no	no	-	different economic interests
1sdiego_20110525	Imperial, East	El Centro	-	no	no	-	different industries
1sdiego_20110531	San Diego	Escondido, Ramona, San Marcos, San Diego, Rancho Bernardo	-	no	yes	schools, stores, restaurants	urbansuburban culture
2riverside_20110524	San Diego, Orange, Imperial	Palm Springs	-	no	yes	older, diverse population	different industries
2riverside_20110526	Riverside, San Diego, Orange	Riverside, Corona, Norco	Santa Ana River, March Air Reserve Base, Joint Power Authority	no	yes	shared social idenity	-
2sbernardino_20110530	Riverside, San Bernardino	-	-	no	yes	-	-
2sbernardino_20110531	-	San Bernardino, Bloomington, Rialto, Colton, Muscoy	-	no	yes	Ensures the voice of the citizens are heard	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110608			no				
8alameda_20110608			no				
1imperial_20110521	-		no				
1imperial_20110528	-		no				
1sdiego_20110525	-		no				
1sdiego_20110531	shared public institutions, stores		no				
2riverside_20110524			no				
2riverside_20110526	shared transportation system, educational facilities, financial fund matching grants		no				
2sbernardino_20110530	-	They ensured compliance with the VRA	no			They drew maps for the State Senate, State Assembly, and Congress districts for the Inland Empire	
2sbernardino_20110531	-		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110525	5252011	Nancy Rikel	yes	mayor, city of Yorba Linda	Yorba Linda	Orange	yes	Make Yorba Linda one assembly district
3orange_20110525	5272011	Peggy Eckroth	no	-	-	Orange	yes	Do not split up South Orange County or attach us to Oceanside
3orange_20110525	5272011	Diane D. Coffin	no	-	San Clemente	Orange	no	
3orange_20110525	5262011	Jan Ballestracci	no	-	San Clemente	Orange	yes	Keep San Clemente in the same districts as coastal cities
3orange_20110525	5262011	Donna Carter	no	-	San Clemente	Orange	yes	Do not lump South Orange in same district as San Diego and Riverside
3orange_20110527	5292011	Peni Woehrman	no	-	San Clemente	Orange	yes	Keep San Clemente, Dana Point, and San Juan Capistrano together
3orange_20110527	5292011	Ed Schlegel	no	-	Capistrano Beach	Orange	yes	South Orange County should be south of Irvine or Lake Forest, bordered by Cleveland National Forest on the east, on the south by Camp Pendleton, the ocean to the west, and Laguna Beach
3orange_20110527	5272011	Bettye Hayes	no	-	San Clemente	Orange	yes	Keep San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, Laguna Beach together and not with San Diego County or Riverside County
3orange_20110527	5272011	R.A. Ergas	no	-	San Clemente	Orange	yes	Keep the beach cities of South Orange County together
3orange_20110527	5272011	Hal Forsen	no	-	-	Orange	yes	Do not include Riverside with San Clemente, Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano
3orange_20110527	5272011	Dwayne Phillips	no	-	-	-	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110525	Orange	Yorba Linda, Los Angeles	-	no	yes	Shared history	-
3orange_20110525	Orange, San Diego	Oceanside	-	no	yes	Cohesive community, excellent schools, good weather	-
3orange_20110525	San Diego, Riverside, Orange	San Clemente, Dana Point, Laguna, San Juan Capistrano	-	no	no		
3orange_20110525	Riverside, South Orange, San Diego	San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan Capitrano, the Lagunas	-	no	yes		
3orange_20110525	San Diego, South Orange, Riverside	San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point, Newport Beach, Mission Viejo, Oceanside	Camp Pendleton	no	yes	Shopping centers and recreational facilities	
3orange_20110527	Orange, Riverside, San Diego	San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano	Santa Ana Mountains, Cleveland National Forest, Camp Pendelton	no	yes	Shared geography, living standards, media	Shared industries
3orange_20110527	Orange, Irvine	Dana Point, San Clemente, Capistrano Beach, Laguna Beach, Mission Viejo, Aliso Viejo	Lake Forest, Cleveland National Forest, Camp Pendleton, the Pacific Ocean, Laguna Beach	no	yes	dining, good schools, recreational facilites	-
3orange_20110527	Orange, Riverside, San Diego	San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point, Laguna Beach	-	no	yes	similar interests	similar interests
3orange_20110527	Riverside, San Diego, Orange	San Clemente	Pacific Ocean, Camp Pendleton	no	yes		
3orange_20110527	Riverside	San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano	-	no	yes		
3orange_20110527				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110525	-		no				
3orange_20110525			no				
3orange_20110525			no			San Clemente lacks adequate political representation	
3orange_20110525			no				
3orange_20110525			no				
3orange_20110527			no				
3orange_20110527			no				
3orange_20110527	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110527			no				
3orange_20110527			no				
3orange_20110527			no				Draw up fair districts

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	5232011	Alex Sanchez	yes	Executive Director, Homies Unidos	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the constituents of Mid-City, South L.A., Pico UnionWestlake, Korea Town together.
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	5232011	Creasie James	no	-	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the 37th Congressional District lines
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	5232011	Carrie Scoville	no	-	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pendro, Harbor City, Wilmington, Terminal Island together and not with Long Beach; keep Los Angeles together; keep the Port of Los Angeles within the Los Angeles community. Keep the Port of Long Beach in Long Beach community
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	5232011	Stephen Burleigh	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the communities around Santa Monica Mountains together in a legistlative district; return to the 1991 legislative boundaries
4la_20110523_5pmafter_3	5232011	Francisco Rivera	yes	president, National Central America Roundtable	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep community unified
4la_20110524	5232011	Lula Davis-Holmes	yes	councilwoman, City of Carson	Carson	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the 37th Congressional District together, and include Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and Wilmington

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Mid-City, Pico UnionWestlake	101 Freeway, Griffith Park, L.A. Zoo, North Hollywood, Century Blvd Hollywood Park Casino, 110 Freeway, USC, Exposition Park, Dodgers Stadium, Boyle Heights, The Avenues, Lincoln Heights, Cypress, North East L.A., La Ceinega Blvd, Fairfax Blvd	no	yes	Cultural diversity, public safety, welfare programs	Similar socioeconomic status
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	Los Angeles	Carson, Compton, Long Beach, Signal Hill, Los Angeles, WattsWillowbrook, Wilmington	110, 710, 405 Freeway	no	yes	Cultural diversity	40 of U.S. cargo passes through these cities
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	Los Angeles, Long Beach	San Pendro, Harbor City, Wilmington, Terminal Island, Long Beach	-	no	yes		Ports are places of employment for the local communities
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu		no	yes	shared interest in preserving the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreations Area,	
4la_20110523_5pmafter_3	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	cultural events, shared ethnicity, restaurants,	
4la_20110524	Los Angeles	Carson		no	yes		oil-refining industry

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2			no				Homies Unidos supports the redistricting of the district
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter_2			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter_3	prevent political fragmentation		no				
4la_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110524	5242011	Colleen Holmes	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the communities around Santa Monica Mountains together in a legistlative district
4la_20110524	5242011	Raynean Barker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Dont include us into Los Angeles County
4la_20110524	5242011	Ursula Huber-Rea	yes	relocation specialist, Alain Pinel Realtors	Danville	Contra Costa	yes	Congressional district should include Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, San Ramon Vallye, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore
4la_20110524	5242011	Alan Dymond	yes	president, Studio City Residents Association	Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City and Sherman Oaks part of the 23rd Senate district
4la_20110524	5242011	Connie Galambos-Malloy	no		Canoga Park	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Canoga Park together
4la_20110524	5242011	Steve Varalyay	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	New Assembly District should include Palos Verdes, PV Estates, Rolling Hills Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, Torrance, Carson, Harbor Gateway, Gardena
4la_20110524	5242011	Juanita Ardavany	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Include Culver City, Airport, Beach Cities, Pacific Palisades to Santa Monica and West LA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110524	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu		no	yes	shared interest in preserving the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreations Area,	
4la_20110524	Los Angeles			no	yes	Good community now	
4la_20110524	Contra Costa	Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, San Ramon Vallye, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore		no	yes		
4la_20110524	Los Angeles, Ventura	West Hollywood, Malibu, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City, Valley Village, North Hollywood, Encino, Tarzana, Woodland Hills	Toluca Lake, 101 Ventura Freeway	no	yes	Shared freeways, cultural centers, shopping and recreational districts, Santa Monica Mountains	
4la_20110524	Los Angeles	Canoga Park	De Soto Avenue, Topanga Cayon, Nordoff, Victory	no	yes		
4la_20110524	Los Angeles	Palos Verdes, PV Estates, Rolling Hills Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, Torrance, Carson, Harbor Gateway, Gardena		no	yes		No industry
4la_20110524	Los Angeles	Culver City, Airport, Beach Cities, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, West LA		no	yes	Common interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110524			no				
4la_20110524			no				
4la_20110524			no				
4la_20110524			no				
4la_20110524			no				
4la_20110524			no				
4la_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110524	5242011	James Lau	no			Orange, Los Angeles	yes	Recommend four districts of San Gabriel Valley, East San Gabriel, San Gabriel Valley and Mountain, East San Gabriel; see pdf for all cities (approx 40 in all)
4la_20110525	5252011	Cyndi and Dan Signett	no		San Clarita	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110525	5252011	Elizabeth Helm	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Make the High Desert area separate region from Santa Clarita
4la_20110525	5252011	Karen L. Kenny	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110525	5252011	Karen Darr	yes	administrative analyst, Antelope Valley Transit Authority	Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster, Palmdale and desert communities together, keep Lancaster and Palmdale in the same districts
4la_20110526	5262011	John Monsen	yes	Citizens for the San Gabriel Mountains		Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110526	5262011	David Hall	no		Panorama City	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110528	5282011	Diana Dixon-Davis	no		Chatsworth	Murray	no	
4la_20110528	5282011	Glenn Bailey	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110524	Orange, Los Angeles			no	no		
4la_20110525	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4la_20110525	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Lancaster, Palmdale, Three Points, Lake Elizabeth, Llano, Pearblossom, Lake Los Angeles		no	yes	High Desert area is rural and agricultural, seaons and snow	
4la_20110525	Los Angeles	Van Nuys		no	no		
4la_20110525	Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Kern	Lancaster, Los Angeles, High Desert, San Bernardino, Palmdale		no	yes	shared high school, water, hospital district	
4la_20110526				no	no		
4la_20110526	Los Angeles	Panorama City		no	yes		
4la_20110528	Murray	Chatsworth		no	no		
4la_20110528				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110524			no				
4la_20110525			no			Dont divide Santa Clarita	
4la_20110525			no				
4la_20110525			no				Draw lines not by zipcodes, but by entire cities, use nesting
4la_20110525			no				
4la_20110526			no				The web address of San Gabriel Mountains vistor monitoring results is listed
4la_20110526			no			Do not split up Panorama City	
4la_20110528			no			Give Chatsworth one representative in each district to keep it whole	
4la_20110528			no			Bell Canyon is adjacent to West Hills, North Hills is divided by the 405	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110528	5282011	Erica Teasley Linnick	yes	coordinator, African American Redistricting Collaborative	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	AD 47 Culver City, Ladera Heights, Baldwin Hills, Crenshaw; AD48 Florence-Graham, Watts, Westmont; AD51 Inglewood, Lennox, West Athens, Gardena, Carson; AD52 Willowbrook, Compton, North Long Beach
5slo_20110526	5262011	John Uebersax	no	-	Paso Robles	San Luis Obispo	no	
5ventura_20110525	5252011	John Absmeier	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Conejo Valley, Simi Valley together
6kern_20110523_5pm_2	5232011	Jerry Taylor	yes	vice mayor, Ridgecrest	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest part of Kern County
6kern_20110524	5242011	Raynean Barker	no			Kern	yes	Do not include Kern with Los Angeles
6kern_20110525	5252011	Concetta Andersen	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest in same district as Bakersfield in Kern County
6kern_20110528	5282011	Erick Byarushengo	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster, Palmdale, and Antelope Valley together
6madera_20110527	5272011	Tim Farrell	no			Madera	yes	Keep Madera County whole
6stanislaus_20110531	5312011	John Lazar	yes	mayor, City of Turlock	Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Keep Turlock with other Highway 99 communities like Ceres and Livingston and not with rural communities or mountain communities like Waterford or Calaveras

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110528	Leimert Park, Crenshaw District, Broadway-Manchester, View Park, Oakland	Los Angeles		no	yes		
5slo_20110526	San Luis Obispo	Paso Robles		no	no		
5ventura_20110525	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Conejo Valley, Simi Valley		no	yes	Shared community events	
6kern_20110523_5pm_2	Kern, Los Angeles	Lancaster, Ridgecrest, Victorville		no	yes		Live and work in surrouding areas
6kern_20110524	Kern, Los Angeles			no	no		
6kern_20110525	Kern, Los Angeles	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield		no	yes	Shared interests	Shared interests
6kern_20110528	Los Angeles, Kern	Lancaster, Palmdale, San Clarita, Victorville, Bakersfield, Ridgecrest, Rosamond, Mojave, Boron, California City		no	yes	Shared history, media, television and radio stations	
6madera_20110527	Madera			no	yes	Need political representation	
6stanislaus_20110531	Stanislaus	Turlock, Ceres, Livingston, Hughson, Waterford, Oakdale, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Mariposa	Highway 99	no	yes	Shared hospitals, education system, freeways	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110528			no				
5slo_20110526			no			Irregularity in borders of the 22nd and 20th Congressional District	
5ventura_20110525			no				
6kern_20110523_5pm_2			no				
6kern_20110524			no				
6kern_20110525			no				
6kern_20110528			no				
6madera_20110527			no				
6stanislaus_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110524	5242011	Michael Romero	no		Salinas	Monterey	no	
7monterey_20110525	5252011	Regina Gage	no		Prunedale	Monterey	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito together, do not include Santa Barbara or San Luis Obispo counties
7monterey_20110526	5262011	James W. Bogart	yes	president and general counsel, Grower-Shipper Association of Central California	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Keep Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz together
7monterey_20110527	5272011	Joyce Yates	no			Monterey	yes	Keep Monterey together
7sbenito_20110524	5242011	Mickie Solorio Luna	no		Hollister	San Benito	yes	Keep Hollister, San Juan Bautista, Salinas, Castroville, Salinas, Watsonville together
7sclara_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Carol Kirkland	yes	art teacher, St. Joseph Elementary School	Mountain View	Santa Clara	no	
7sclara_20110524	5242011	Patricia E. Sausedo	yes	vice president, San Jose Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Silicon Valleys community of interest together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110524	Monterey	Salinas		no	no		
7monterey_20110525	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Prunedale		no	no		
7monterey_20110526	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	Salinas		no	yes	shared political views	shared watersheds, zoning, environment
7monterey_20110527	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo			no	yes	unique demographics	agricultural community
7sbenito_20110524	Monterey	Hollister, Salinas, Watsonville, San Juan Bautista, Castroville		no	yes	Shared demography, educational facilites, transportation systems	rural agricultural community
7sclara_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
7sclara_20110524	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	yes		shared technological community

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110524			no				Vandenberg Air Force Base is not part of Senate District 15. Do not include considerations of it in Senate District 15
7monterey_20110525			no				
7monterey_20110526			no				
7monterey_20110527			no				Do not gerrymander or give into political pressures
7sbenito_20110524			no				
7sclara_20110523_5pmafter			no				Keep the process fair and open, do not divide by race and ethnicity
7sclara_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110531	5312011	Heidi Kennedy	no				no	
7scruz_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Rebeca Villafana	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey together
7scruz_20110530	5302011	Jared Rutledge	no		Salinas	Monterey	no	
8alameda_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dyamond Keith Littlefield	no		Oakland	Alameda	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110531	San Joaquin	Oakland, Milpitas, San Leandro, Richmond, El Cerrito, Union City, Pleasanton, Northridge		no	no		
7scruz_20110523_5pmafter	Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey	San Jose, San Francisco		no	no	shared community agencies, transportation services, media, geography	agriculture and tourism industries
7scruz_20110530	Monterey	Salinas		no	no		
8alameda_20110523_5pm	Alameda	Oakland		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110531		Sierra Club Bay Area plan violates Voting Rights Act	no				I oppose the Sierra Club Bay Area plan, San Joaquin County Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting plan, Latino Policy Forum maps, California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education, Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR
7scruz_20110523_5pmafter			no				
7scruz_20110530			no			Monterey and the Bay Area counties have huge socioeconomic disparities, the district are not representative and need to be redrawn	
8alameda_20110523_5pm			no				West Oakland has inequality, lack of jobs, lack of affordable housing, pollution. Please fill the community with supportive businesses who prize equality and environmnetal justice

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jason A. Bezis	no				yes	Nest 1st and 2nd Assembly Districts in 1st Senate district. Nest 3rd and 5th Assembly districts into the 2nd Senate district
8alameda_20110523_5pm	5232011	James B. McMillan	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond with Contra Costa County
8alameda_20110523_5pm	5232011	Tracy Bagnall-Lloyd	no		Orinda	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Oakland, Berkeley, and Emeryville apart from Lafayette, Moraga, and Orinda; Other COIs are (Pittsburg, Antioch, Brentwood, Bethel Island, Discovery Bay, Knightsen, Byron)
8alameda_20110523_5pm	5232011	Lorraine Humes	no			Contra Costa	yes	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110523_5pm				no	no		
8alameda_20110523_5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes	Local issues are addressed	
8alameda_20110523_5pm	Contra Costa	Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville, Lafayette, Moraga, Orinda, Walnut Creek, Acalanes Ridge, Saranap, Castle Hill, Reliez Valley, Clayton, Pleasant Hill, Martinez, Concord, San Ramon, Alamo, Danville, Diablo, Blackhawk, Camino Tassajara, Norris Canyon	Oakland hills	no	no		
8alameda_20110523_5pm	Contra Costa		San Francisco Bay, San Pablo, Briones Reservoirs, Pinole, Kensingston	no	no	Shared school system, diverse ethnic communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110523_5pm			no				Do not let the CRC be influenced by special interest groups, the 1990s district maps are a good model for the 2010s district maps. Be open minded about cross-county legislative districts. Draw and anticipate city bounty changes over the next decade
8alameda_20110523_5pm			no				
8alameda_20110523_5pm			no				
8alameda_20110523_5pm			no			CD 7 is poorly drawn, AD 1 is well drawn.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110528	5282011	Carol Stepman	no		Oakland	Alameda	no	
8alameda_20110529	5292011	David Pastor	no				no	
8alameda_20110529	5292011	Elisabeth J. Hendricks	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110528				no	no		
8alameda_20110529				no	no		
8alameda_20110529				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110528			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
8alameda_20110529			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
8alameda_20110529			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110529	5292011	James Keefer	no				no	
8alameda_20110529	5292011	Jesus Padilla, Jr.	no				no	
8alameda_20110530	5302011	Sharon Mobley	yes	Realtor, PMZ Real Estate			no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110529				no	no		
8alameda_20110529				no	no		
8alameda_20110530				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110529			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
8alameda_20110529			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
8alameda_20110530			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110531	5312011	Shalini Shahani	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Newark, Union City, and Milpitas together
8alameda_20110601	612011	Traci Reilly	yes	Combine Lafayette, Orinda, Moraga with Walnut Creek and not with BerkeleyOakland			no	
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Santos Lopez	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, and joined with Antioch, Hercules, Pincole and walnut Creek if necessary
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Katia Reges	yes	Community Health Educator, La Cinicas de La Raza, Inc	Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, and joined with Antioch, Hercules, Pincole and walnut Creek if necessary
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jenna Carlsson	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, and joined with Antioch, Hercules, Pincole and walnut Creek if necessary
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Luz E. Palomera-Sierra	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, and joined with Antioch, Hercules, Pincole and walnut Creek if necessary
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Bruce Lycon	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, and joined with Antioch, Hercules, Pincole and walnut Creek if necessary

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110531	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City, Milpitas		no	yes	Shared history, shopping and entertainment	
8alameda_20110601				no	no		
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, Plesant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek	Highway 4 and 680	no	yes	shared transportation system	developed work relationship, community civic efforts
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, Plesant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek	Highway 4 and 680	no	yes	shared transportation system	developed work relationship, community civic efforts
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, Plesant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek	Highway 4 and 680	no	yes	shared transportation system	developed work relationship, community civic efforts
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, Plesant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek	Highway 4 and 680	no	yes	shared transportation system	developed work relationship, community civic efforts
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, Plesant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek	Highway 4 and 680	no	yes	shared transportation system	developed work relationship, community civic efforts

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110531			no				
8alameda_20110601			no				Draw fair districts and with attention to natural barriers
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter			no				Thanks for listening
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Brodie Hilp	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, and joined with Antioch, Hercules, Pincole and walnut Creek if necessary
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Betty Vargas	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill together, and joined with Antioch, Hercules, Pincole and walnut Creek if necessary
8ccosta_20110529	5292011	Clair and Joan Weenig	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110530	5302011	Joan S. Hamblin	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, Plesant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek	Highway 4 and 680	no	yes	shared transportation system	developed work relationship, community civic efforts
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, Plesant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, Walnut Creek	Highway 4 and 680	no	yes	shared transportation system	developed work relationship, community civic efforts
8ccosta_20110529				no	no		
8ccosta_20110530				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8ccosta_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8ccosta_20110529			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
8ccosta_20110530			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110531	5312011	Bruce Palmer	yes	Lieutenant Colonel, US Army			no	
8ccosta_20110531	5312011	Alice Croft	no				no	
8ccosta_20110531	5312011	Carol M. Hehmeyer	no				no	
8marin_20110521	5212011	Allen Appell	no				yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma Counties together
8marin_20110524	5242011	Richard Locke	no				yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma Counties together in same congressional district
8marin_20110525	5252011	Roger Peters	no				yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma Counties together in same congressional district
8napa_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Sonya DeLuca	yes	program director, Napa Valley Grapegrowers	Napa	Napa	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110531				no	no		
8ccosta_20110531				no	no		
8ccosta_20110531				no	no		
8marin_20110521	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes	Shared community values	
8marin_20110524	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes	Shared community values	agricultural interests
8marin_20110525	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco	San Francisco	Golden Gate Bridge	no	yes	Shared transportation challenges	
8napa_20110523_5pmafter	Napa	Napa		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110531			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
8ccosta_20110531			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
8ccosta_20110531			no				Do not gerrymander
8marin_20110521			no				
8marin_20110524			no				
8marin_20110525			no				
8napa_20110523_5pmafter			no				See email about my public comment on congressional districts

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Paul Dolan	yes	owner, Paul Dolan Vineyards			yes	Keep Napa, Sonoma, and Mendocino together
8napa_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Anne Steinhauer	yes	Community Relations Manager, Napa Valley Vintners			no	
8napa_20110524	5242011	Marjorie Preston	no			Napa	yes	Combine Napa, Sonoma, Lake, Yolo, Mendicino counties together
8sfrancisco_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Chin Lo	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Keep Sunset district in a different congressional district
8sfrancisco_20110529	5292011	Barry P. Boothe	no				no	
8sfrancisco_20110531	5312011	Zesara Chan	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Keep northern San Mateo County and southern San Francisco County in one congressional district
8sfrancisco_20110531	5312011	Sheryl Land	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Keep San Francisco as one district
8sfrancisco_20110531	5312011	Richard Dolores Muratore	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Do not combine Marin with San Francisco
8sfrancisco_20110531	5312011	Hugo Rafael Mora	no		South San Francisco	San Mateo	yes	Keep my community together
8smateo_20110525	5252011	Yvonne Ryzak	no		Foster City	San Mateo	yes	Do not change San Mateo County borders

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110523_5pmafter	Napa, Sonoma, Medocino			no	yes		Interconnectedness of wine community
8napa_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
8napa_20110524			Freeways 101, 5	no	yes	Shared rural community, freeways	
8sfrancisco_20110523_5pmafter	San Francisco	San Francisco		no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110529				no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110531	San Francisco, San Mateo	San Francisco, Daly City		no	yes	Similar cultural interests	Similar economic interests
8sfrancisco_20110531	San Francisco, Marin, San Mateo	San Francisco, San Mateo		no	yes	Asian community	
8sfrancisco_20110531	San Francisco, San Mateo	San Francisco		no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110531	South San Francisco	San Mateo		no	yes	Low income community, shared need for improved educational opportunities	
8smateo_20110525	Foster City, Palo Alto, Mountain View, Santa Clara	San Mateo		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8napa_20110523_5pmafter			no				See the attached letters
8napa_20110524			no				
8sfrancisco_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8sfrancisco_20110529			no				Do not gerrymander based on race
8sfrancisco_20110531			no				
8sfrancisco_20110531			no				
8sfrancisco_20110531			no				
8sfrancisco_20110531			no				
8smateo_20110525			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8smateo_20110526	5262011	Dawn Holley	no				no	
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Vanessa Safoyan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in SD.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Charles Gill	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110616	6162011	James D. Hicken	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Susan Christopher	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Scott Wilk, Jr.	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Joyce Shulman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Vanessa Safoyan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Marshall Rutter	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Pasadena or South Pasadena
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Deborah Blethen	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita in ADSDCD. Add Aqua Dulce to SCV AD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8smateo_20110526				no	no		
4langeles_20110616	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes	Coastal v. inland	
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena, South Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8smateo_20110526			no			Sierra Club plan is OK only if it doesnt cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. I reject the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR and MALDEF plans.	I support the California Conservative Action Group maps
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Scott Wilk	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Donald Seligman	no	Los Feliz Improvement Association, President		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Los Feliz with Hollywood Hills and Glendale
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Peter Brier	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Altadena from Pasadena
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Pat Koscheski	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole Valencia, Saugus, Newhall, Canyon Country.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	David Uranga	yes	Pasadena City College, Professor	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	See attached maps. Combine Glendale, Burbank. Combine Altadena, Pasadena. Connect all whole cities from La Canada to Claremont along 210 corridor
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Sandra Figueroa Villa	yes	El Centro del Pueblo, Executive Director	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Echo ParkSilverlake, Temple BeaudryPico Union separate from West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Pacific Palisades, Beverly Hills, Calabasas
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Bill Bogaard	yes	City of Pasadena, Mayor	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena in one CD by moving southern Pasadena from E. San Gabriel Valley-Diamond Bar into San Gabriel Mountains-Foothill. Move most of Upland from SGMF district into Ontario district. Move SE portion of Chino Hills from Ontario into ESGV-DB district
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Leron Gubler	yes	Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, President and CEO	Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hollywood together. Boundaries N-Mulholland, E-Hyperion, S-Melrose, W-City of West Hollywood
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Jeanette Mann	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena and Altadena together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	yes	Coastal v. inland	
4langeles_20110616		Glendale		no	yes		High property values
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena		no	yes	Community, historical experience	Public services
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	yes	Do not split college and high school districts politically	
4langeles_20110616		Burbank, Glendale, La Canada, Claremont	210	no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Echo ParkSilverlake, Temple BeaudryPico Union, West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Pacific Palisades, Beverly Hills, Calabasas		no	yes	Different social characteristics	Different economic characteristics; working poor v. primarily wealthy
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena, Upland, Chino Hills		no	yes		
4langeles_20110616		Hollywood, West Hollywood	Mulholland	no	yes	unique interests	
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena		no	yes	common history, cultural affinity	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616		Preserve Voting Rights Act status of Ontario district	no				Thank you for opportunity to present views on impact of recently announced districts
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks	6162011	Irwin Goldring	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Sherman Oaks in half.
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks	6162011	Jane D Anna	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks	6162011	Andrew Achen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks	6162011	Karen Cini	yes	Prudential, Realtor		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Boundary should be at Mulholland Drive
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks	6162011	Gail Reisig	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks	6162011	Candise Kovacevich	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks into two CDs
5sbarbara_20110616	6172011	Elizabeth Schmiidt	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110616	6152011	Ron Fink	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Put Lompoc as a whole with Vandenberg Village, Mesa Oaks, Mission Hills
5sbarbara_20110616	6142011	Terence Dressler	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Good job on Santa Barbara (AD 35, SD 19).
5sbarbara_20110616	6142011	Paul Rosso	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Good job on SLOSB. Put Lompoc into SLOSB AD. Combine SLOSB and SBWVEN ADs into one SD.
5sbarbara_20110616	6142011	Eileen Anthony	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Isla Vista should be included with city of Santa Barbara
5sbarbara_20110616	6152011	Rosie Chandler	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110616	6152011	Debra Jewell	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110616	6152011	Ashley	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks				no	yes	Do not combine Sherman Oaks with Westside neighborhoods as they have different interests	
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks				no	yes	Close-knit, strong community interests	
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	same schoolschurchestemples	shop at same supermakets
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110616_shermanoaks				no	no		
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	yes	Rural	
5sbarbara_20110616				no	yes	Coastal	
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110616		Santa Barbara		no	yes	College students	
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	yes	of same mind	
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	yes	Small town	
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	yes	Isolated geography	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110616_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110616_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110616_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110616_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110616_sherma noaks			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				Request that public record be corrected to reflect that population of Lompoc is 42,434.
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110616	6162011	Justin and Ann Ruhge	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110616	6172011	William Mullins	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Put Lompoc into one district
5sbarbara_20110616		Barry K. Ashby	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in half
5sbarbara_20110616	6172011	Todd and Laura Miz	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5ventura_20110616	6172011	S. Trivedi	no			Ventura	no	
5ventura_20110616	6142011	Gary Esser	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Do not put Moorpark and Simi Valley with Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys. Put with Ventura County
5ventura_20110616	6132011	Victoria Johnson	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo need to stay together. Keep this entity separate from Santa Clarita, Palmdale, Los Angeles
5ventura_20110616	6132011	Joana Smith	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	See attached letter
5ventura_20110616	6132011	John and Louis Helliwell	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not split Thousand Oaks
5ventura_20110616	6132011	Cherie Doherty	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks in one ADSd
5ventura_20110616	6152011	Joe Piros	no		Santa Paula	Ventura	yes	Do not let Gallegly represent Santa Paula
5ventura_20110616	6162011	Pamela Pecarich	no			Ventura	yes	Good job on Ventura County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	yes	Lompoc not a part of any other urban area	
5sbarbara_20110616				no	no		
5sbarbara_20110616		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110616				no	no		
5ventura_20110616				no	no		
5ventura_20110616	Ventura	Moorparks, Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110616		Santa Clarita, Palmdale, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo		no	no		
5ventura_20110616				no	no		
5ventura_20110616				no	no		
5ventura_20110616				no	no		
5ventura_20110616				no	no		
5ventura_20110616				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5sbarbara_20110616			no				
5ventura_20110616			no				Wants numbers used to create three districts in Ventura County
5ventura_20110616			no				
5ventura_20110616			no				
5ventura_20110616			no				
5ventura_20110616			no				
5ventura_20110616			no				
5ventura_20110616			no				
5ventura_20110616			no				Done good job in meeting tests of population, communities of interest, keeping cities in one district

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110616	6172011	Jim Yarbrough	no			Ventura	yes	Do not split Oxnard
5ventura_20110616	6132011	Joana Smith	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks whole in Ventura County
7sclara_20110614_2	6142011	Carol Ashman	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	See attached lettermaps Put Evergreen community in San Jose together
7sclara_20110614_3	6142011	Carol Ashman	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Attached maps
7sclara_20110615_3	6162011	Kerri Dunlay	no			Santa Clara	no	
7sclara_20110615_3	6152011	Carol Piros	no			Santa Clara	yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark should be shifted to LA County
7sclara_20110616	6142011	Betty Devalcourt	no			Santa Clara	yes	Thank you for putting coastal communities like Santa Cruz and Monterey together while farming communities are in separate districts.
7sclara_20110616	6162011	Ronald Bourret	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Do not put Felton with Silicon Valley. Put Felton with Santa Cruz.
7sclara_20110616	6132011	Herbert Fogel	no		Scotts Valley	Santa Cruz	yes	Scotts Valley does not belong in 14th CD
7sclara_20110616	6132011	Marsha Hill	no			Santa Cruz	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110616		Oxnard		no	yes	Latinoimmigrant	
5ventura_20110616				no	yes	Similar demographicdensity make-up	Similar economic makeup
7sclara_20110614_2		San Jose		no	yes	Common concerns with traffic, environment, schools, quality of life	
7sclara_20110614_3				no	no		
7sclara_20110615_3				no	no		
7sclara_20110615_3		Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
7sclara_20110616	Santa Cruz, Monterey			no	yes	Coastal	
7sclara_20110616	Santa Cruz			no	yes	Mountainous communities	
7sclara_20110616		Scotts Valley		no	no		
7sclara_20110616				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110616		Placing Oxnard in a district hostile to Latinosimmigrants is possibly illegal relative to 1965 Voting Rights Act	no				
5ventura_20110616			no				
7sclara_20110614_2			no				
7sclara_20110614_3			no				
7sclara_20110615_3			no				Too many Democrats serving on the Commission
7sclara_20110615_3			no				
7sclara_20110616			no				Thank you for being a truly citizens commission
7sclara_20110616			no				
7sclara_20110616			no				Cannot read maps
7sclara_20110616			no				Cannot read maps. Want a map which includes streets or other identifying markers

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110616_2	6152011	Duplicates Betty Devalcourt, Ronald Bourret, Herbert Fogel, Marsha Hill	no				no	
7scruz_20110615_3	6152011	James Van Houten	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Watsonville should be part of Santa Cruz County-Monterey County district
7scruz_20110616	6152011	Duplicates Betty Devalcourt, Herbert Fogel, Marsha Hill	no				no	
8ccosta_20110615_2	6132011	Susan Wittenberg	no			Contra Costa	yes	George Miller needs to stay with Richmond
8ccosta_20110615_2	6162011	Paul Abelson	no			Contra Costa	yes	Reassign an area in West Contra Costa County to an adjacent area in northern Alameda County. Or, reassign an area in South Contra Costa County to an adjacent district in eastern Alameda County
8ccosta_20110615_2	6152011	Carol Hehmeyer	no			Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110615_2	6152011	Bob Caughron	no			Contra Costa	yes	Leave districts the way they were before first drafts.
8humboldt_20110616	6162011	Sue Pierce	no			Humboldt	yes	Put Humboldt in a district with Del Norte, Siskiyou, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc
8humboldt_20110616	6162011	Maggie Carey	yes	Briceland Winery		Humboldt	yes	Put Humboldt with Mendocino, Lake

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110616_2				no	no		
7scruz_20110615_3	Santa Cruz, Monterey	Watsonville		no	yes	Closely tied to Santa Cruz and Monterey	
7scruz_20110616				no	no		
8ccosta_20110615_2		Richmond		no	yes	Miller knows Richmonds strengths, weaknesses, profound problems	
8ccosta_20110615_2	Contra Costa, Alameda			no	no		
8ccosta_20110615_2				no	no		
8ccosta_20110615_2				no	no		
8humboldt_20110616	Humboldt, Del Norte, Siskiyou, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc			no	yes	Small town, rural	agricultural
8humboldt_20110616	Humboldt, Mendecino, Lake			no	yes	School district, athletic league	Wine industry

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110616_2			no				
7scruz_20110615_3			no				
7scruz_20110616			no				
8ccosta_20110615_2			no				
8ccosta_20110615_2			no				
8ccosta_20110615_2			no				Do not stop producing transcripts of hearings
8ccosta_20110615_2			no				
8humboldt_20110616			no				
8humboldt_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110615	6152011	Alan Klumpp	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	First draft maps for Marin are OK.
8marin_20110616	6162011	Sarah Cameron Lerer	no			Marin	yes	North Coast district is a gerrymandered district
8marin_20110616	6132011	Jeanne Lese	no			Marin	yes	Do not combine Marin with Mendecino and Humboldt
8marin_20110616	6162011	Peter Van Meter	no	MyCRE LLC	Sausalito	Marin	yes	See attached letter, maps
8marin_20110616	6162011	Sarah Cameron Lerer	no			Marin	yes	Put American Canyon with Napa. Put Sebastopol with Marin.
8napa_20110615_2	6152011	Ed Estin	no			Napa	yes	Put American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110615_2	6172011	Alma J. Gross	no			Napa	yes	Put American Canyon in Napa
8napa_20110615_2	6162011	Patricia and William Etchison	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Put American Canyon with Napa
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Lee Shulman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Calvin Hedman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Danielle Smith	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Terry Miller	no			Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110615	Marin			no	no		
8marin_20110616				no	no		
8marin_20110616	Mendecino, Humboldt, Marin			no	no		
8marin_20110616				no	no		
8marin_20110616	Marin	American Canyon, Sebastopol		no	no		
8napa_20110615_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	Rural	
8napa_20110615_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8napa_20110615_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	High School does not want Vallejo encroaching into that system	Gateway to biggest Wine Country and Tourism
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110615			no				
8marin_20110616			no				
8marin_20110616			no				
8marin_20110616			no				
8marin_20110616			no				
8napa_20110615_2			no				
8napa_20110615_2			no				
8napa_20110615_2			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				Need copies of redistricting maps in San Gabriel Valley area

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616	6162011	John McCready	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Ed Masterson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	David Gauny	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Brian Smith	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Vanessa May	no			Los Angeles	yes	Put Lake View Terrace with Burbank, Glendale, La Crescenta
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Normajean Jonz	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Barbara Morden	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not lump different socioeconomic areas together
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Crystal J. Smith-Boon	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Clemi Boubli	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Los Feliz.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Steve Teeman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Burbank, Glendale		no	yes	Common concerns horses, foothills, Angeles National Forest, environment, fire dangers	
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	yes	Demographic living in heart of Los Angeles	
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616			no				Can commission prove any objective boundaries were used? The boundaries seem convoluted, gerrymandered
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				Maps hard to read
4langeles_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Scott Wilk	no			Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in SD.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Brian Koegle	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole in CD. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Janet Evans	no			Los Angeles	yes	New plans for CD to include Claremont look good
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Phil Reyes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Split too many cities in San Gabriel Valley
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Chris Fall	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Claire Spothelfer	no	City of La Habra Heights, former Mayor	La Habra Heights	Los Angeles	yes	Link La Habra Heights with La Mirada, Downey, Whittier
4langeles_20110615_3	6152011	Ellen Bagelman	no			Los Angeles	yes	405 separates east and west portion of San Fernando Valley. Put Lake Balboa with Encino, Northridge, Reseda.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Jean-Louis Gonfard	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive, not Ventura Blvd.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Arnold Newman	yes	Oak Forest Canyon Homeowners Assn, President		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Alan Rosen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Steven Bromberg	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Anonymous	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes	Coastal v. inland	
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Claremont		no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		La Habra Heights, La Mirada, Downey, Whittier		no	yes	Similar problems and interests	
4langeles_20110615_3			405	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association. Strong, tightly-knit community	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Close community	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				In general, believe you have violated Federal law.
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110615_3			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Sherry Rendel	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Bettina Hirsch	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Mary-Ann Neri	no			Los Angeles	yes	Sherman Oaks is a single entity from Mulholland Drive to Van Nuys
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Virginia Frederick	yes	Castillion Homeowners Association, Vice President		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Jeffrey Grausam	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Phyllis Serene	no	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Andrew Apfelberg	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Leslye Kasoff	yes	Castillion Homeowners Association, President		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Stephen Jacobsen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Edward Korbel	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Sean McGroarty	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Charles and Ann Schnaid	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	James Kubik	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Close-knit	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Tight, devoted, involved	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	close community	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Cohesive and cognizance of important issues that face citizens of Sherman Oaks	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Happy, cohesive	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				Thank you for your hard work in the public interest.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Michael Binkow	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Mark F. Samuels	no				yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Lisa Luna	no				yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Barbara Kaye	no				yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks at Ventura Blvd.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Bill Brandt	no				yes	Keep Sherman Oaks in one SDCD
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Darold Shirwo	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association			yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Joseph Neustein	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association			yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Angela Bardowell	yes	Sherman Oaks			yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Suzanne and Michael Kahane	no				yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Jay Weitzler	yes	Law Office of Jay C. Weitzler		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Elaine Pearce and Arnold Weiner	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Susan Guaneli	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Mari Grimaud	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	yes	Close knit	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	yes	Many in community support and promote citys interests and goals	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks				no	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association takes care of issues of concern, governance, etc.	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Similar interests	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no	Close-knit	
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Close-knit	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_sherma noaks			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Larry Kaster	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Dan Rolf	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Gaye Barnes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Barbarar Asadorian	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Susan Garber	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Barbara Murad	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Debbie Robiglio	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep current boundaries surrounding Sherman Oaks in place
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Zsev Gqrber	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Adrienne Altman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Quentin Clark	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Michael DeTemple	yes	DeTemple Guitars		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Faith Yang	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks into two CDs. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks	6152011	Carol and Terry Becker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Make southern boundary Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Richard Smoak	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Pasadena. Keep Altadena and Sierra Madre with Pasadena.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks				no	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association	
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Close-knit	
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	annual street fair	
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes		
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Close-knit	
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena, Sierra Madre		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Elaine Brown	no			Los Angeles	yes	Supports new map which put Sunland, Tujunga with Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale, Burbank.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Sue Castillo	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City, Port of Los Angeles, Rancho Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Rolling Hills Estates, together
4langeles_20110616		Lynn Parkinson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Wendy Cobleigh	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Altadena with Pasadena
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Linda and Thomas Stern	no		Tarzana	Los Angeles	yes	Put parts of Santa Monica, west Los Angeles, west Hollywood, Hollywood, Studio City with Tarzana
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Cheryl Jamerson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Altadena from Pasadena
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Edith Taylor	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena whole in a CD, keep Pasadena and Altadena in one AD, keep South Pasadena united
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Paul Polakoff	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not make changes to current lines surrounding Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Erik Yesayan	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	See attached mapletter Keep Pasadena, Altadenta together. Fix Rancho Cucamonga city split. Make Angeles Forest District, add Pasadena. Put La Canada and La Crescenta into BurbankGlendale district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616		Sunland, Tujunga, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale, Burbank.		no	yes	Open space, rural lifestyles, care for environment	
4langeles_20110616		San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City, Rancho Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Rolling Hills Estates		no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena		no	yes	One school district	Workshop
4langeles_20110616		Santa Monica, Los Angeles, Hollywood, Studio City, Tarzana		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena		no	yes	Share same school district	Both are facing financial constraints
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	yes	Same school district, same newspaper	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Kathy Matsumoto	no				no	
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Christine Rowe	no	West Hills Neighborhood Council, Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Redraw lines for West San Fernando Valley CDSDAD based upon Neighborhood Council Lines. Draw West San Fernando Valley lines north-south. Keep together West Hills, Woodland Hills Warner Center, Chatsworth, Winnetka, Canoga Park
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Alex Ringe	no			Los Angeles	yes	Unify Northridge and Reseda in West Valley district. Meet certain population requirements by gathering more population from Valley Glen and North Hollywood. Do not cross 405 boundary to east.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Michael McGrath	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Thank you for the redistricting boundaries of Long Beach
4langeles_20110616	6172011	John Bowman	no		Inglewood	Los Angeles	yes	Incorporate Inglewood into a CD around LAX and not shifted to include areas fruther east.
4langeles_20110616		Dale McLean	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole.
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Kris Calvin	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Georgina Lopez	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole and separate from Los Angeles City
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Karen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	yes	Share 101118, Orange line, Metrolink, Amtrak, residents attend schools in these communities, childrens soccer and softball leagues, BoyGirl Scouts	
4langeles_20110616			405	no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Inglewood		no	yes		Many residents work at LAX, many airport related businesses
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	yes	Close-knit	
4langeles_20110616		South Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita, Los Angeles		no	yes	Santa Clarita not influenced by L.A. city	
4langeles_20110616				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616			no				Are public meetings in a particular Region allowed to accept comments from citizens of another region?
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				Thank you for all your work. Would like to clearly determine which district a person is in
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Sonia Zaldivar	yes	Zaldivar Legal Services	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westlake, Pico-Union, Latino Quarters, Downtown, the financial district, Figueroa Corridor, Historic west-Adams together.
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Frank Rosen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Remove Burbank from Pasadena AD and put into district with Silver Lake, the Hollywood Hills, and Los Feliz. Make East LA district a more balanced district for Latino community. Pasadena AD includes Altadena and La Canada.
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Lonne Hunt	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester and Playa del Rey in coastal regions
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Alexandra Hopkins	no			Los Angeles	yes	Thank you for putting La Crescenta with Burbank and Glendale.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Gemma Boykin	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita separate from Los AngelesSan Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110616	6172011	Anita Konto	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not link Silver Lake and East LA, San Marino and South Gate, Malibu and Castaic
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Joan Byrd	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley as one unit
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Alice Siegen	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Marsha McLean	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Put City of Santa Clarita and majority of surrounding Santa Clarita Valley within single SDADBOE. Put it also into one CD.
4langeles_20110616	6162011	Tamela Messina	no			Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in SD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616				no	yes	Latino, Central Americans live here	Latino and Central Americans work here
4langeles_20110616		Pasadena, La Canada, Burbank,		no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110616				no	yes	Similar residentially	Shop in these areas
4langeles_20110616		Los Angeles, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Own history, traditions. Most people moved here to get away from L.A. city	
4langeles_20110616		Silver Lake and East LA, San Marino and South Gate, Malibu and Castaic		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110616	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes	Coastal v. inland	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616			no				Thank you for attention given to us during first public hearing held at City Hall
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110615	6152011	Robert Herrera	no			Imperial	yes	Keep Imperial and Coachella Valley together. Do not put Eastern San Diego with Imperial.
1imperial_20110615	6152011	Josue Mercado	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Draw CD so that California gains three districts (45, 51, 52) to represent border communities
1imperial_20110615	6152011	Efrain Guerrero	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Draw CD so that California gains three districts (45, 51, 52) to represent border communities
1imperial_20110615	6152011	Daniel Fitzgerald	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Draw CD so that California gains three districts (45, 51, 52) to represent border communities. Put the whole of Imperial County with east Riverside rather than with east San Diego.
1sdiego_20110616	6152011	Marie Waldron	no		Escondido	Imperial	yes	Have a coastal and separate inland district. Unify Escondido into one district
1sdiego_20110616	6162011	Valerie Sanfilippo	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Do not slash Linda Vista. Put north central San Diego with South Central San Diego
1sdiego_20110616	6152011	Marcella Bothwell	no			San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110616	6152011	Tom Reid	no			San Diego	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110615	San Diego			no	yes	Share Salton Sea restoration efforts, New River and threat to public health, poor air quality due to high particulate matter in shared air basin, limited options for higher educational institutions, cultural ties between families	Potential hub for Renewable Energy generation potential, Enterprise Zones and other incentive programs for businesses, agricultural based economies
1imperial_20110615				no	yes	Close to border, need more people to help solve border problems	
1imperial_20110615				no	yes	Close to border, need more people to help solve border problems	
1imperial_20110615	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	yes	Border issues	
1sdiego_20110616		Escondido		no	yes		Agricultural
1sdiego_20110616	San Diego	San Diego		no	yes	urban lo	
1sdiego_20110616				no	no		
1sdiego_20110616				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110615			no				
1imperial_20110615			no				
1imperial_20110615			no				
1imperial_20110615			no				
1sdiego_20110616			no				
1sdiego_20110616			no				
1sdiego_20110616			no				How can I get a more detailed map of district 50? Is it getting much larger to encompass La Jolla?
1sdiego_20110616			no				Show map legend. Want to contrast old lines with new lines.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110616	6132011	Ssandra McHale-Renk	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Do not lump Chula Vista with Imperial County. Put Chula Vista with more like communities along coast
1sdiego_20110616	6132011	R.D. Hernandez	no			San Diego	yes	Create Coastal districts separate from inland areas.
1sdiego_20110616	6142011	Rudy Sovinee	no			San Diego	yes	Reexamine pinched forcedness around Del Mar, National City, Rancho Bernardo
1sdiego_20110616	6162011	Joe Mackey	yes	San Diego East County Chamber of Commerce, Chairman of Board of Directors	El Cajon	San Diego	yes	Keep Alpine, Borrego Springs, El Cajon, La Mesa, Lakeside, Lemon Grove, Jamul, Santee together
1sdiego_20110616	6162011	Mark Maestrone	no			San Diego	yes	Do not extend Escondido, Rancho Bernardo, Poway area to include areas west of I-805.
2riverside_20110615	6152011	Nick Jones	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Hemet separate from Palm Springs. Put Hemet with Calverts district
2riverside_20110616	6152011	Nick Jones (repeated)	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Hemet separate from Palm Springs. Put Hemet with Calverts district
2riverside_20110616	6162011	Richard Roth	yes	Monday Morning Group, President		Riverside	yes	1st draft lines are good for Riverside.
2riverside_20110616	6162011	Eugene Montanez	yes	City of Corona, Mayor Pro Tempore	Corona	Riverside	yes	Assembly Corona, Norco, Eastvale, Trilogy, Glen Ivy, Sycamore Creek. Senate Extend further westsouth into Temescal Canyon area by taking out of Perris area. CD add Norco and Eastvale, keep Temecula in Rivereside County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110616	Imperial County	Chula Vista		no	yes	Chula Vista should be with other coastal communities	
1sdiego_20110616				no	yes	Coastal v. inland	
1sdiego_20110616		Del Mar, National City		no	no		
1sdiego_20110616		Alpine, Borrego Springs, El Cajon, La Mesa, Lakeside, Lemon Grove, Jamul, Santee		no	yes	Major transportation networks, school districts, public safety, fire protection	water and energy infrastructure, economic development programs
1sdiego_20110616			I-805	no	yes	Escondido, Rancho Bernardo, Poway are inland, while area west of I-805 are coastal.	
2riverside_20110615		Hemet, Palm Springs		no	no		
2riverside_20110616		Hemet, Palm Springs		no	no		
2riverside_20110616	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110616	Riverside	Corona, Norco, Eastvale, Trilogy, Glen Ivy, Sycamore Creek, Temecula	Temescal Canyon	no	yes	Police and fire services	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110616			no				
1sdiego_20110616			no				
1sdiego_20110616			no				Competition healthy and vital for preservation of effectively functioning representative democracy
1sdiego_20110616			no				
1sdiego_20110616			no				
2riverside_20110615			no				
2riverside_20110616			no				
2riverside_20110616			no				
2riverside_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110616	6162011	Ralph Young	no			Riverside	yes	Draw lines at Banning and Beaumont city lines. Keep Windy PointSan Jacinto Cove in 80th AD with Palm Springs
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Benjamin Gamboa	no		Highland	San Bernardino	yes	SD 1 combine San Bernadino and Rancho Cucamong and FontanaRialto ADs. SD2 Pomona, Chino, Ontario, Corona, Norco, Riverside. SD3 Moreno Valley, Perris, Murietta, Temecula. SD 4put ADs COACH and MORONGOBAN
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Debora Biddick	no			San Bernardino	yes	Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland, Mentone, Yucaipa together. With lesser importance, combine with San Bernardino, mountains to north, BanningBeaumont area to east
2sbernardino_20110616	6172011	Ed Graham	yes	City of Chino Hills, Mayor		San Bernardino	yes	See attached maps Put entire Chino Hills with Chino within a single CD with other San Bernardino County, in OntarioPomona district
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Larry Anderson	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Chino Hills political districts
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Dan Stipp	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110616	Palm Springs, Banning, Beaumont			no	yes	People in Windy PointSan Jacinto Cove have Palm Springs address	People in Windy PointSan Jacinto Cove shop in Palm Springs
2sbernardino_20110616		San Bernadino, Rancho Cucamong, Fontana, Rialto, Pomona, Chino, Ontario, Corona, Norco, Riverside		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110616		Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland, Mentone, Yucaipa, Banning, Beaumont		no	yes	Geographically, culturally	
2sbernardino_20110616		Ontario, Pomona, Chino		no	yes	Chino Hills with San Bernardino County Sherrifs department, local emergency operations in San Bernardino. San Bernardino Library system. Adequate transportation system, San Bernardino Association of Governments. Chino Valley Unified School District	Chino Valley Independent Fire District
2sbernardino_20110616				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110616				no	yes	Share school district, roadway (Hwy 18, 330)	Share business interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Fran Wemerskirchen	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Twine Peaks, Running Springs
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Christine Jarreau	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Chino Hills.
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Peter Giacoletti	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put Crestline with Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, Big Bear
2sbernardino_20110616	6152011	Gene Hinds	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Take out Rancho Cucamonga from 63rd AD and include Calimesa.
2sbernardino_20110616	6142011	Steven Palacios	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put Upland with Ontario, not with Claremont
2sbernardino_20110616	6142011	David Raley	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not put Rancho Cucamonga with Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110616	6142011	Anonymous	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not put Rancho Cucamonga with Redlands, San Bernardino, Highland
2sbernardino_20110616	6142011	Phil and Terry Wolloch	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put all San Bernardino Mountain Communities together
2sbernardino_20110616	6142011	Jim and Dora Huff	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put all San Bernardino mountain communities together, from Green Valley Lake to Cedarpines Park
2sbernardino_20110616	6142011	Robert Ward	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put eastern Inland Empire with Redlands, Loma Linda, and cities west.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110616				no	yes	Share same roadsparksfrequent establishments, mountain residents	
2sbernardino_20110616				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110616				no	yes	Rural community	
2sbernardino_20110616		Rancho Cucamonga, Calimesa		no	yes	Rancho Cucamonga associated with Pomona Valley and not eastern part of Inland Empire	
2sbernardino_20110616		Upland, Ontario, Claremont		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110616		Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands		no	yes	I10, I-215. High speed bus from North SB to Loma Linda, shopping facilities, school districts, water sources	
2sbernardino_20110616		San Bernardino, Highland, Redlands, Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes	I10, I-215. High speed bus from North SB to Loma Linda, shopping facilities, school districts, water sources	
2sbernardino_20110616				no	yes	mountain communities kept apart from urban areas.	
2sbernardino_20110616				no	yes	mountain community	
2sbernardino_20110616				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110616	6152011	Jay Ebersohl	no			San Bernardino	yes	Follow the CA-30 freeway that splits San Bernardino in half. Put east Highland with IMNSB district and keep west Highland with SB.
2sbernardino_20110616	6152011	Joseph Schroer	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put Chino Hills with Chino. To balance population, move Pomona into E. San Gabriel ValleyCovina area.
2sbernardino_20110616	6152011	Sal Carlos, Jr.	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Chino Hills
2sbernardino_20110616	6162011	Larry Anderson	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not break up Chino Hills
2sbernardino_20110616	6152011	Gary Ovitt	no			San Bernardino	yes	Chino Hills should be included in proposed Ontario-Pomona CD.
3orange_20110615_2	6152011	George Cooke	yes	City of La Habra Heights, past Mayor	La Habra Heights	Orange	yes	In CD, put La Habra Heights with cities it is with in ADSD.
3orange_20110615_2	6152011	Freda Gail Holmes	no			Orange	yes	Keep South Orange County in with Orange County
3orange_20110615_2	6152011	Nicole Stygar	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange whole
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Renee Cox	no		San Clemente	Orange	yes	Put San Clemente with Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, Laguna Beach
3orange_20110615_2	6172011	Penny Maynard	no			Orange	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110616		San Bernardino		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110616		Chino		no	yes	Cultural commonalities. Share same newspaper	Agricultural
2sbernardino_20110616				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110616				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110616				no	yes	shares County supervisor, school district, fire protection district, community college district, water agency	Shares chamber of commerce
3orange_20110615_2				no	yes	City councils involved with each other	
3orange_20110615_2	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110615_2	Orange			no	yes	Orange International Street Fair, diverse community	
3orange_20110615_2		San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, Laguna Beach		no	yes	Shop, recreation	
3orange_20110615_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
2sbernardino_20110616			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				Would like a detailed copy of boundaries in ADSDCD containing Dana Point

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Larry Crandall	yes	City of Fountain Valley, Council Member	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Put Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley together. Keep Fountain Valley in Congressman Rohrabachers district
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Steve Nagel	yes	City of Fountain Valley, Mayor	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Put Huntington Beach with Fountain Valley
3orange_20110615_2	6172011	Mondragon Miguel	no			Orange	yes	Keep Anaheim, Garden Grove, Santa Ana together
3orange_20110615_2	6152011	Mark McCurdy	yes	Fountain Valley City Council	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Put Fountain Valley with Huntington Beach
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Alan Boinus	no		Laguna Beach	Orange	yes	Put Laguna Woods with Laguna Beach
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Pamela McVicar	yes	La Habra Heights County Water District, Vice President	La Habra Heights	Orange	yes	CD put La Habra Heights with Los Angeles County cities such as La Mirada (cities La Habra Heights is included with in proposed ADSD)
3orange_20110615_2	6152011	Jim Murphy	no			Orange	yes	Do not join Rossmoor and Los Alamitos with Long Beach
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Everett Knell	no			Orange	yes	Put Rossmoor with Long Beach. Leave Rossmoor in CD served by Ed Royce
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Emily Knell	no			Orange	yes	Put Rossmoor with Long Beach. Leave Rossmoor in CD served by Ed Royce

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110615_2		Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley		no	no		
3orange_20110615_2		Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley		no	yes	Share school districts, service organizations, neighborhoods	
3orange_20110615_2		Anaheim, Garden Grove, Santa Ana		no	yes	Food, shopping	
3orange_20110615_2		Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach		no	yes	share same Orange Couny Sanitation District, sam school districts, cultural and community service clubs, sports leagues, teams	
3orange_20110615_2		Laguna Woods, Laguna Beach		no	yes	Laguna Beach integral part of Laguna Woods community, and vice versa	
3orange_20110615_2	Los Angeles	La Habra, La Mirada		no	no		
3orange_20110615_2		Rossmoor, Los Alamitos		no	no		
3orange_20110615_2		Long Beach		no	yes	Ed Royce trule represents views of people of Rossmoor	
3orange_20110615_2		Long Beach, Los Alamitos		no	yes	Ed Royce trule represents views of people of Rossmoor	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Wendy Grose	no			Orange	yes	Do not put Los AlamitosRossmoor with Long Beach
3orange_20110615_2	6102011	J. Scott Schoeffel	no	City of Dana Point, Mayor	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Put Dana Point with cities it is with in ADSD (South Orange County)
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Joanne Knell	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Do not put Los AlamitosRossmoor with Long Beach
3orange_20110615_2	6162011	Steve Nagel	yes	City of Fountain Valley, Mayor	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Put Fountain Valley with Huntington Beach
3orange_20110616		Same as 3orange_20110615_2	no				no	
4langeles_20110614_2	6142011	Christine Rowe	no			Los Angeles	yes	Put a CD in West San Fernando Valley. Use natural boundary of Santa Susana Mountain range. Make West San Fernando Valley district to include area W. of 405 in W. San Fernando Valley CD. Include Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Oxnard, Malibu
4langeles_20110614_2	6142011	Bipasha Shom	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not link San Fernando Valley with Santa Clarita-put with Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110614_2	6142011	Karen Haber Camp	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Studio City
4langeles_20110614_2	6142011	Elva Yanez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Los Angeles city boundaries like that of first draft

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110615_2		Long Beach, Los Alamitos		no	yes	Nothing Los Angeles does benefits Los AlamitosRossmoor	
3orange_20110615_2	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Ocean water quality, regional transportation at both local (Orange County Transportation Authority) and state (Caltrans) levels, regional land use planning	Affordable housing
3orange_20110615_2		Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110615_2		Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach		no	yes	Share school districts, service organizations, neighborhoods, coastal	
3orange_20110616				no	no		
4langeles_20110614_2				no	yes	ethnic diversity, minority populations, geographic boundaries, traffic patterns	
4langeles_20110614_2		Santa Clarita, Studio City		no	no		
4langeles_20110614_2		Studio City		no	yes	Vibrant, participants in political process, volunteer, schools	
4langeles_20110614_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110615_2			no				
3orange_20110616			no				
4langeles_20110614_2			no				
4langeles_20110614_2			no				
4langeles_20110614_2			no				
4langeles_20110614_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6162011	Bob Anderson	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association, Chair of Redistricting Committee		Los Angeles	yes	See attached maps Do not split Sherman Oaks into two CDs, move southern district boundary to Mulholland Drive
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	Jonathan Kern	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	Paul Gamberg	no			Los Angeles	yes	Put Bel Air with Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	Dori Semenov	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Sherman Oaks. Make Mulholland southern border
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6152011	Janet and Wayne Holtzman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	Rhona Gordon	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Sherman Oaks into two
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	Katherine Callan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Put boundary at Mulholland.
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	David Gordon	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Southern border at Mulholland Drive.
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6152011	Charise Mitchell	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Southern boundary at Mulholland Drive
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	Paul Beck	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks. Southern boundary should be Mulholland Drive
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks	6142011	Judith Grant	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615_3	6152011	Dan Stewart	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks using Ventura Blvd. Put boundary on Mulholland Drive, combining Sherman Oaks and Studio City.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Can participate in politics as an integral unit	
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks				no	yes	Strong community of families	Strong community of businesses
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks				no	yes	Well-established, older suburb with residents actively involved in local issues	
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Do not drive out of town to do local business.	
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	work, play	patronize local business operators
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			Mulholland Drive	no	yes	Well-organized, active, engaged	
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_3		Studio City	Mulholland Drive	no	yes		Ventura Blvd is major Commercial thoroughfare of Sherman Oaks and Studio City

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				Please send me a draft map
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110614_shermanoaks			no				
4langeles_20110615_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615_3	6152011	Cynthia Raville	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	In districts drawn, there is a mountain range between Newhall and San Fernando Valley. Put Santa Clarita Valley in the same district as majority of Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110615_3	6102011	Joe Aguilar	yes	City of Commerce, Mayor	Commerce	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Commerce in a single ADCDSD
4langeles_20110615_3	6152011	Robert Prager	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together
4langeles_20110615_3	6152011	Joe Piros	no			Los Angeles	yes	Let Gallegly represent only Simi Valley
1sdiego_20110615_1	6152011	Tom Reid	no				no	
1sdiego_20110615_1	6152011	Marcella Bothwell	no				no	
1sdiego_20110615_1	6132011	Sandra McHale-Renk	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Do not put Chula Vista in the same district as Imperial county, Chula Vista should be grouped with communities along the coast
1sdiego_20110615_1	6132011	R.D. Hernandez	no				yes	Coastal communities in San Diego should be grouped together, not with inland communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615_3		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110615_3		Commerce		no	yes	Health and environmental matters related to railroad and truck traffic diesel pollution	
4langeles_20110615_3				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_3		Simi Valley		no	no		
1sdiego_20110615_1				no	no		
1sdiego_20110615_1				no	no		
1sdiego_20110615_1		Chula Vista		no	yes	Coastal communities have like interests	
1sdiego_20110615_1				no	yes	Coastal communities share similar interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615_3			no				
4langeles_20110615_3			no				
4langeles_20110615_3			no				Thank you for bringing Long Beach together
4langeles_20110615_3			no				
1sdiego_20110615_1			no				Appreciates the ability to drill down into various draft maps, wants to know if the technology allows users to display the map legent on each page to facilitate comparison of new maps with old ones
1sdiego_20110615_1			no				Wants to know how to get a more detailed map of district 50, and would like to know if that district will encompass La Jolla
1sdiego_20110615_1			no				
1sdiego_20110615_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110615_1	6142011	Rudy Sovinee	no				yes	District lines around Del Mar, National City and Rancho Bernardo look forced
1sdiego_20110615_2	6152011	Nick Jones	no				yes	Hemet should be in the Calverts district, Hemet has no ties with Palm Springs
2sbernardino_20110615	6152011	Jay P. Ebersohl	no		Highland	San Bernadino	yes	City of Highland should be split among San Bernadino and Redlands districts, based on hwy CA-30 as the boundary; west Highland should be in a district with San Bernadino and east Highland should be in the IMNSB district with Redlands and Yucaipa
2sbernardino_20110615	6152011	Sal Carlos, Jr.	no		Chino Hills	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split Chino Hills, La Verne, or San Dimas among districts, the entire city should be in the same district
2sbernardino_20110615	6152011	Steven Palacios	no				yes	Upland should be in a district with Ontario, and not with Claremont
2sbernardino_20110615	6142011	David E. Raley	no				yes	Do not include Rancho Cucamonga in the same district as Redlands; follow the proposal created by Inland Action, keeping Rancho Cucamonga with the west end cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110615_1		Del Mar, National City, Rancho Bernardo		no	yes	Special interests of wealthy communities should not determine district lines	
1sdiego_20110615_2		Hemet, Palm Springs		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110615		Highland, San Bernadino, Redlands, Yucaipa	CA-30	no	yes	East Highland, east of CA-30 has little in common with west Highland; east Highland is in the Redlands school district while west Highland is in the San Bernadino school district	
2sbernardino_20110615		Chino Hills, La Verne, San Dimas		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110615		Upland, Ontario, Claremont		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110615		Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands		no	yes	East end cities share transportation routes I10 and I-215, and proposed rail service from San Bernadino to Redlands, proposed bus service from north San Bernadino to Loma Linda; also share shopping centers, school districts, and water districts	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110615_1			no				
1sdiego_20110615_2			no			Thought the commission was going to use mountain ranges to determine district lines	
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
2sbernardino_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110615	6142011		no				yes	Do not put Rancho Cucamonga in a district with Redlands; city of San Bernadino, Highland, and Redlands should be in the same district
2sbernardino_20110615	6142011	Phil and Terry Wolloch	no			San Bernadino	yes	San Bernadino Mountains communities should be in the same district, communities from Crestline to Big Bear share common interests and should not be split up and bundled with urban communities
2sbernardino_20110615	6142011	Jim and Dora Huff	no			San Bernadino	yes	Mountain communities from Green Valley Lake to Cedarpines Park should be in the same district; do not separate Crestline from these mountain communities, as well as Lake Arrowhead
2sbernardino_20110615	6142011	Robert Ward	no				yes	Keep Yucaipa, Calimesa, Beaumont and Banning with Redlands, Loma Linda, changes especially needed on the Congressional map; (lists groupings of cities based on maps.
2sbernardino_20110615	6152011	Gene Hinds	no		Redlands	San Bernadino	yes	Put Rancho Cucamonga in the Pomona Valley district, not with the 63rd district with the Inland Empire cities. Put Calimesa in the 63rdInland Empire district instead

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110615		Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernadino, Redlands, Highland		no	yes	East end cities share transportation routes I10 and I-215, and proposed rail service from San Bernadino to Redlands, proposed bus service from north San Bernadino to Loma Linda; also share shopping centers, school districts, and water districts	
2sbernardino_20110615	San Bernadino			no	yes	Mountain communities in San Bernadino Mountains have similar demographics and common interests	
2sbernardino_20110615				no	yes	Mountain communities have similar interests	
2sbernardino_20110615		Yucaipa, Calimesa, Beaumont, Banning, Redlands, Loma Linda		no	yes	Eastern Inland Empire residents go west toward Inland Empire for shopping and recreation, not east into high desert communities	
2sbernardino_20110615				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
2sbernardino_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110615	6152011	Joseph W. Schroer	no		Chino Hills	San Bernadino	yes	Keep all of Chino and Chino Hills in the Ontario district; do not put northern Chino Hills in the E. San Gabriel ValleyDiamond Bar district; suggests putting Pomona into the E. San Gabriel ValleyCovina district
3orange_20110615	6162011	Everett W. Knell	no			Orange	yes	Keep Rossmoor in Ed Royces CD; Rossmoor is in Orange county, adjacent to Los Alamitos and Seal Beach; do not put Rossmoor in a district with Long Beach
3orange_20110615	6162011	Wendy Grose	no				yes	Keep Los Alamitos and Rossmoor in the district encompassing Orange county; do not put them with Long Beach in the district encompassing Los Angeles county
3orange_20110615	6152011	Jim and Theresa Murphy	no			Orange	yes	Keep Rossmoor and Los Alamitos with Orange county, do not put them with Long Beach
3orange_20110615	6162011	Emily S. Knell	no			Orange	yes	Keep Rossmoor in Ed Royces CD; Rossmoor is in Orange county, adjacent to Los Alamitos and Seal Beach; do not put Rossmoor in a district with Long Beach
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Harry N. Hirschensohn	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Sherman Oaks in one district; do not split Sherman Oaks along Ventura Blvd. Sherman Oaks includes the flats, and runs from Magnolia Blvd on the north to Mulholland Drive to the south; do not put Sherman Oaks with areas on other side of hills

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110615		Chino, Chino Hills, Ontario, Diamond Bar, Covina		no	yes	Chino and Chino Hills have similar culture and demographics, and share the same newspaper	Chino and Chino Hills both try to maintain an agriculturalrural atmosphere
3orange_20110615	Orange	Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110615	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110615	Orange	Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110615	Orange	Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110615			Ventura Blvd, Magnolia Blvd, Mulholland Drive	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110615			no				
3orange_20110615			no				
3orange_20110615			no				
3orange_20110615			no				
3orange_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615	6162011	Daniel and Bridget Shycoff	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Draw the district line along Mulholland Drive, not along Ventura Blvd; the area south of Ventura Blvd identifies with the Studio City area, not to the Los Angeles area on the other side of the hills
4langeles_20110615	6162011	Philip M. Saeta	no				yes	Keep South Pasadena in the same district as Pasadena and San Marino, not with Vernon
4langeles_20110615	6162011	Gabriel Godinez	no				yes	Keep all of Long Beach with Los Angeles County; Bellflower, Lakewood, Cerritos, La Mirada, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs should be in a SD together with Long Beach and Downey; Put Cerritos in a district with Los Angeles county, not with Orange county
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Barbara Freed	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Sherman Oaks together as a community

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615		Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110615		South Pasadena, Pasadena, Vernon, San Marino		no	yes	South Pasadena has interests in common with Pasadena and San Marino, not with Vernon	
4langeles_20110615	Los Angeles, Orange	Long Beach, Bellflower, Lakewood, Cerritos, La Mirada, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, Downey		no	yes	Bellflower and Lakewood share a common school district; Cerritos is under contract with the Los Angeles county fire department and sheriff, while Orange county cities have their own firepolice; transit proposed to links Bellflower, Lakewood, Cerritos	Bellflower, Lakewood, Cerritos, La Mirada, Norwalk, and Santa Fe Springs have long standing economic interests in common
4langeles_20110615				yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615	Sherman Oaks real estate prices would be harmed if split up among districts		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Lorraine Geittmann	no				yes	Put San Pedro, Lomita and Lawndale with Wilmington, Long Beach and Harbor City, outside the 53rd district; draw SE line along Westerb Ave; Put all Santa Monica Bay cities (Torrance, Santa Monica, Redondo Beach, Marina del Rey, Malibu) in on SDCDAD.
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Judith Riley	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Put all of Santa Clarita, of Los Angeles county, in one ADSDCD. Add Agua Dulce to the SCV AD.
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Jeanne Lacombe	no				yes	Supports the proposed changes for the Rancho Palos Verdes area
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Teri Knafla	no			Los Angeles	yes	Add Agua Dolce to the SCV AD
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Don Linden	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Ellen Bagelman	no				yes	the 405 Freeway is a natural boundary; put Lake Balboa with Encino, Northridge, and Reseda
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Julian Boykin	no				yes	Keep the southern part of the Santa Clarita Valley as it currently is, do not merge it with San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110615	6162011	Gladys Azenzer	no				yes	Keep all of Sherman Oaks in the same district; do not draw boundary along Verntura Blvd; the community goes from Burbank Blvd to Mulholland Drive
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Harry Knafla	no				yes	Add Agua Dulce to the SVC AD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615		San Pedro, Lomita, Lawndale, Wilmington, Long Beach, Harbor City, Torrance, Santa Monica, Redondo Beach, Marina del Rey, Malibu	Westerb Ave	no	yes	Santa Monica Bay cities have LAX airport in common, and share ocean issues; Lawndale and Lomita are inland cities with different interests; Lomita, San Pedro and Harbor City are in Los Angeles school dist, while beach cities have own districtslibraries	Redondo Beach and Marina del Rey both have small craft harbors
4langeles_20110615	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	yes	Santa Clarita is a tight-knit community; residents work, volunteer and shop within the city	
4langeles_20110615		Rancho Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615			Burbank Blvd, Mulholland Drive	no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no			The proposed districts seem gerrymandered, they should be based on preserving contiguous neighborhoods	
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615	6162011	Victor Flores	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Malibu and Beverly Hills in the same district as Echo Park and Westlake
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Jason Popeski	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association, Member	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Sherman Oaks along Ventura Blvd
4langeles_20110615_2	6102011	Joe Aguilar	yes	City of Commerce, Mayor	Commerce	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Commerce in one CDADSD
4langeles_20110615_2	6162011	Elizabeth A. Pollock	yes	Del Rey Homeowners Association Neighbors Association, President	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Put Del Rey neighborhood of LA in one district; bounded by Marina del Rey (west), Playa Vista (south), Culver City (east), and alleys behind Culver City businesses (north), as per 6102011 proposed maps see attached maps; also put it in one AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes	Echo Park and Westlake have common demographics, political interests, and history, which is different from that of Beverly Hills and Malibu	
4langeles_20110615			Ventura Blvd	yes	yes	Sherman Oaks is a close-knit community which includes areas on both sides of Ventura Blvd	
4langeles_20110615_2		Commerce		no	yes	Citizens of Commerce share interest in health and environmental matters including railroad and truck traffic, diesel pollution, the city has made signficiant progress while being unified in one district	
4langeles_20110615_2		Culver City		no	yes	Del Rey is a COI, share schools and recreational facilities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615_2			no				
4langeles_20110615_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615_2	6112011	Mary E. Wiesbrock	yes	Save Open SpaceSanta Monica Mountains, chair			yes	Keep Santa Monica Mtns Natl Rec Area (SMMNRA) in one SDCD; use 1991 boundaries; include Las Virgenes, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu, Santa Monica see letter for full list; do not include CastaicSanta Clarita
5sbarbara_20110615	6152011	Ron Fink	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc in one district with Vandenberg Village, Mesa Oaks and Mission Hills
5sbarbara_20110615	6152011	Ashley	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc in one SDAD
5sbarbara_20110615	6142011	Terrence Dressler	no				yes	Happy with maps showing 35th AD and 19th SD which retain cohesiveness of coastal communities in Santa Barbara county; also likes 23rd and 24th CD lines; north and south Santa Barbara county are two separate COIs
5sbarbara_20110615	6142011	Paul G. Rosso	no				yes	Happy with central coast SLOSB CD; AD map is confusing; put all of Lompoc in SLOSB AD; SD should combine SLOSB and SBWVEN, do not combine with area from Monterey county to Morgan Hill, Gilroy, Santa Cruz

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615_2		Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Malibu, Santa Monica		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110615		Lompoc		no	yes	Lompoc shares comen interest with these communities, and is a community, not a correctional facility	
5sbarbara_20110615		Lompoc		no	yes	Lompoc is a community that is geographically isolated from other communities, share common interests and concerns; Lompoc is not just a correctional facility, it is a city	
5sbarbara_20110615	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110615	Monterey	Lompoc, Morgan Hill, Gilroy, Santa Cruz		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615_2			no				
5sbarbara_20110615			no			Please correct the record to reflect that Lompoc has a population of 42,434 as of the 2010 census	
5sbarbara_20110615			no				
5sbarbara_20110615			no				Commission is doing a great job designing the redistricting maps
5sbarbara_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110615	6142011	Eileen S. Anthony	no				yes	Remove Isla Vista from District 3, which includes Santa Ynez Valley and North County; put Isla Vista with city of Santa Barbara
5sbarbara_20110615	6152011	Rosie Chandler	no				yes	Keep Lompoc in one district
5sbarbara_20110615	6152011	Debra Jewell	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc among two districts
5ventura_20110613	6132011	Victoria Johnson	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Ventura County communities of Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo together; do not put these communities with Palmdale, Santa Clarita; do not put Thousand Oaks with Los Angeles
5ventura_20110613	6132011	Cherie Doherty	no				yes	Keep Thousand Oaks in a single ADSD
5ventura_20110613	6132011	John and Louise Helliwell	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks in a single CDSDAD
5ventura_20110613	6132011	Joana D. Smith	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks in a single ADCDSD; do not put Thousand Oaks with San Fernando Valley, it is part of Ventura county not Los Angeles county
6kern_20110613	6102011	Renee Westa-Lusk	no				no	
7sclara_20110613	6142011	Bruce Karney	no		Mountain View	Santa Clara	yes	Likes the commissions ADSDCD lines for Mountain View

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110615		Santa Barbara		no	yes	Isla Vista is a transient, student community, more in line with the city of Santa Barbara	
5sbarbara_20110615		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110615		Lompoc		no	no		
5ventura_20110613	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Camarillo, Santa Clarita, Palmdale, Los Angeles		no	yes	Ventura communities outside the urban areas are more conservative than liberal urban center populations	
5ventura_20110613		Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110613		Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110613	Los Angeles, Ventura	Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Thousand Oaks shares simiar demographics and population density, and shares Ventura county services	Thousand Oaks shares economic characteristics with Ventura, not LA
6kern_20110613				no	no		
7sclara_20110613		Mountain View		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110615			no				
5sbarbara_20110615			no				
5sbarbara_20110615			no				
5ventura_20110613			no				
5ventura_20110613			no				
5ventura_20110613			no				
5ventura_20110613			no				
6kern_20110613			no				User could not access maps through website; Redistricting Commision responded that they were unable to duplicate the error and she should try again
7sclara_20110613			no				Commission is doing a great job

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110613	6142011	Jim Schrempp	no				no	
7sclara_20110613	6132011	Craig England	no				yes	Likes the new districts for Santa Clara county
7sclara_20110614	6152011	Carol Ashman	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Proposal puts small area around our home in a narrow area extending 28 miles to Newark; the SD goes 36 miles to Hayward; zip 95148 should be with San Jose City Council District 8
7sclara_20110614	6142011	Andres Quintero	yes	East San Jose Democrats, President	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Central and East San Jose whole letter attached, but not visible in PDF file, may be additional comments in attachment
7sclara_20110615	6152011	Carol Piros	no				yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark should be in a district with LA county, allowing the rest of Ventura county to have a stronger voice
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Paul Carreiro	no			Los Angeles	yes	Supports comments by Tiffany Balonek and Eugene Starr, dated 5242011. Keep El Camino Village in the same district with South Bay cities, which toghether comprise a cohesive community

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110613				no	no		
7sclara_20110613	Santa Clara			no	no		
7sclara_20110614		San Jose, Newark, Hayward		yes	no	This San Jose neighborhood has a high level of involvement in the San Jose community, common community groups and city and county governements	
7sclara_20110614		San Jose		no	no		
7sclara_20110615	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110613			no				Commission has done a great job following its mandate, making compact districts that follow natural and political boundaries
7sclara_20110613			no				Congratulations to the commission for drawing clean districts instead of gerrymandering like the state legislature has produced
7sclara_20110614			no				
7sclara_20110614			no				
7sclara_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615	6142011	George Alexander	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Lucille Lund, duplicate	no				yes	
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Lucille Lund	no				yes	Keep district 46 as it is; Orange county representatives care about coastal issues, while inland reps have different issues
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Judith Neal	no		San Dimas	Los Angeles	no	district lines should run along county lines
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Carol Pickle	no				yes	Objects to proposed districts in San Gabriel Valley because they would cause loss of two Republican congressmen; Do not split Pasadena along the freeway; splitting cities among districts should be avoided
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Gregory Dobie	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	CD 27 looks gerrymandered, 27 should include all of Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys; Sherman Oaks should not be in a district with Calabasas or Santa Clarita as it has nothing in common with those cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615	Orange			no	yes	Coastal communities share interests in pollution, docks, and wildlife in the ocean	
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615		Los Angeles, Calabasas, Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615			no				The maps are not useful because some districts are not completely enclosed by lines or lack numerical designation; cannot tell what is in the 23rd and 25th ADs, streets are not identified
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				District lines should be drawn based on diversity of population, not diversity of ethnic race; the maps are too hard to read, cannot determine if cities are being split
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Joyce Brody	no				no	
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Kathryn Dunn	no				no	
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Joan P. Curd	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include Agua Dolce in the same district as Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Lois Woodruff	no				yes	Add Agua Dolce to the SVC AD
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Richard Stark	no				yes	Palos Verdes Peninsula should be in a district with the South Bay (district 36), not Orange County (district 46)
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Patricia A. Kelly	no				yes	Add Agua Dolce to the SVC AD; add Newhall to the 25th CD
4langeles_20110615	6142011	Patty Paul	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				yes	yes	Studio city is an organized community with an active residents association and neighborhood council	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615			no				Cannot comment because the maps do not show street names, unable to tell where the district lines are being drawn, would like to see maps that at least include names of major streets
4langeles_20110615			no				The maps that have been generated are of such poor quality that they are not usable by any newspaper in the state; please improve the maps immediately
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615	6152011	L. Hamilton	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Include Altadena in the Pasadena AD
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Christine Rowe	no			Los Angeles	yes	Make LAs San Fernando Valley (SFV) its own dist for ; put area west of I-405 in west SFV CD, wAgoura Hills Westlake Village; West Hills, put Bell Canyon, Chatsworth in west SFV AD; put ocean COIs together; proposed SFV Dist is too spread out
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Bernard Bergman	no				yes	Do not split up Brad Shermans district in the San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Deborah Moorehead	no				yes	Add Agua Dulce to the SCV (Santa Clarita Valley) ADSDCD
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Eileen Zierhut	no				yes	Add Agua Dulce to the SCV (Santa Clarita Valley) ADSDCD
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Kim Mischook	no				yes	Keep Altadena and Pasadena together in one AD
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Ellen Bagelman, duplicate	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615		Pasadena		yes	yes	Altadena shares common interests Pasadena; it shares a school district; African-America community in West Altadena is interconnected with the African-American community in Nortwest Pasadena; splitting them would go against goal of keeping COIs together	
4langeles_20110615	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Thousand Oakds, Malibu, Oxnard		no	yes		
4langeles_20110615				no	yes	Jewish community in the San Fernando Valley should not be split up, this area includes at least 3 synagauges and two Jewish day schools	
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615		Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615	The proposed SFV district is too spread out, traffic on HWY 101 and inadequate freeway access would prohibit any representative from serving the entire area		no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Ellen Bagelman, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110615	6152011	Peter Riley	no				yes	Add Newhall back into the Santa Clarita Valley CD, do not put Newhall with the San Fernanado Valley
4langeles_20110615_2	5272011	Julian L. Hartwell	no		San Marino	Los Angeles	yes	Put San Marino in the 44th AD with Pasadena, South Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, La Canada Flintridge, and Arcadia
4langeles_20110615_2	652011	R.W. Thee	no		Arcadia	Los Angeles	yes	Put LA county Northern Sierra Madre Foothill COIs of Arcadia, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, Duarte, Bradbury, Glendora, Azusa, La Verne and Claremont in same district maps attached; do not include El Monte, Alhambra, or San Gabriel

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615				no	no		
4langeles_20110615_2		Arcadia, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, South Pasadena, Sierra Madre, San Marino		no	yes	These communities share a community college district, and the high schools in the area are members of the Rio Hondo League, a CA Interscholastic Federation (CIF) sanctioned league; California Blvd connects Pasadena and San Marino	
4langeles_20110615_2	Los Angeles	Arcadia, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, Duarte, Bradbury, Azusa, La Verne, Claremont, El Monte, Alhambra, San Gabriel		no	yes	These cities are threaded by the Metro Gold Line extension; common infrastructure, share inter-city law enforcement, utilities, natural resources, waste management and medical facilities; shared living standards and common goals	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615			no				
4langeles_20110615_2			no				
4langeles_20110615_2		There is already high diversity above 5 in these cities, complying with VRA; Asian-Americans comprise over 60 in Arcadia	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110615	6162011	Kerri Dunlay	no				no	
7sclara_20110615_2	612011	Ann Roberts	yes	League of Women Voters, member	Saratoga	Santa Clara	yes	Saratoga (15th SD) is represented by a state senator from San Luis Obispo, very gerrymandered; put Saratoga with Silicon Valley
7scruz_20110613	6132011	Marsha Hill	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Unspecified location in Santa Cruz county should be included with Santa Cruz county and Monterey, not with San Jose
7scruz_20110613	6132011	Herbert L. Fogel	no		Scotts Valley	Santa Cruz	yes	Scotts Valley should be in a district with Santa Cruz, not in the 14th CD
7scruz_20110614	6142011	Betty Devalcourt	no				yes	Likes that Santa Cruz and Monterey are put together, and that the farming communities are in a separate district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110615				no	no		
7sclara_20110615_2				no	yes		Saratoga is home to many high tech industry workers in Silicon Valley, while coastal communities are mostly agricultural
7scruz_20110613	Santa Cruz	Monterey, San Jose, Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110613				no	no		
7scruz_20110614	Santa Cruz, Monterey	Santa Cruz, Monterey		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110615			no				There are too many Democrats on the commission, there must be a balance of Republicans and Democrats to make fair, unbiased decisions
7sclara_20110615_2			no				
7scruz_20110613			no				User cannot interpret the actual boundaries on any of the maps, and cannot tell within which district her Santa Cruz county location lies
7scruz_20110613			no				User is not able to understand new map, cannot tell what district Scotts Valley is in
7scruz_20110614			no				Thanks to the Commission for truly being a citizens commission and doing a great job, the new map is an imporvement on past gerrymandering

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110614	6142011	Ronald Bourret	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Put Felton in a district with Santa Cruz, not with Silicon Valley; draw the line along the top of the mountains, or north of there but south of Los Gatos and Saratoga
7scruz_20110615	6142011	Betty Devalcourt, duplicate	no				no	
7scruz_20110615	6142011	Ronald Bourret, duplicate	no				no	
7scruz_20110615	6132011	Herbert L. Fogel, duplicate	no				no	
7scruz_20110615	6132011	Marsha Hill, duplicate	no				no	
7scruz_20110615_2	672011	Gail L. Pellerin	yes	California Association of Clerks and Election Officials, President			no	
8alameda_20110613	6132011	Li Bing	no				yes	Keep Fremont with Tri-Cities and southern Alameda county; do not split Fremont between CDs and legislative districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110614	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz, Los Gatos, Saratoga		no	yes	Santa Cruz Mountain communities have cultural, environmental, economic and civic connections to Santa Cruz, not to suburbs of Sunnyvale	
7scruz_20110615				no	no		
7scruz_20110615				no	no		
7scruz_20110615				no	no		
7scruz_20110615				no	no		
7scruz_20110615_2				no	no		
8alameda_20110613	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110614			no				
7scruz_20110615			no				
7scruz_20110615			no				
7scruz_20110615			no				
7scruz_20110615			no				
7scruz_20110615_2			no			Nest districts where practicable; Prop 11 (2008) showed voter intent to nest state SDsADs where practicable; Non-nested districts increase election costs, necessitate multiple district boundary lines, and increase the number of precincts (see diagram)	
8alameda_20110613			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110613	6132011	Carol J. Vernaci	yes	Union City City city council, former member	Union City	Alameda	yes	Keep Union City, Newark, and Fremont in the same district
8alameda_20110613	6132011	Narendra Vemula	no				yes	Do not divide the city of Fremont, keep Fremont in one CD
8alameda_20110613	6132011	Marilyn Singer	yes	League of Women Voters of Fremont, Newark and Union City, member			yes	Do not put San Jose and Fremont in the same district; Fremont should be grouped with Newark and Union City
8alameda_20110613	6142011	Sandi Pantages	no				yes	Do not split Fremont among districts
8alameda_20110614	6152011	Ward Belding	yes				no	
8alameda_20110614	6142011	Bette Peters	no				yes	Keep all of San Leandro in one district
8alameda_20110614	6152011	Nicky Neau	no		Livermore	Alameda	yes	Livermore is now gerrymandered in CD 10, surrounded by CD 11; Put Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon and Danville (Tri-Valley area) together; may include Castro Valley, Discovery Bay; do not put Livermore with Hayward
8ccosta_20110615	6152011	Bob Caughron	no				yes	
8ccosta_20110615	6162011	Paul Abelson	no				yes	Do not cut Oakley and Bethel off from Contra Costa county; instead, reassign an area in west Contra Costa county to an adjacent area in northern Alameda county, or put a southern Contra Costa area with an adjacent eastern Alameda county district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110613		Union City, Newark, Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110613				no	no		
8alameda_20110613		San Jose, Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		Fremont, Newark and Union City share meandering borders and joint ventures
8alameda_20110613		Fremont		no	yes	Fremont is a COI	
8alameda_20110614				no	no		
8alameda_20110614		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110614		Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, Danville, Castro Valley, Discovery Bay, Hayward		no	yes	Tri Valley cities are a COI, and mix freely for shopping and social interaction	
8ccosta_20110615				no	no		
8ccosta_20110615	Contra Costa, Alameda	Oakley, Bethel		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110613			no				
8alameda_20110613			no				
8alameda_20110613			no				
8alameda_20110613			no				
8alameda_20110614			no			Realigned districts are generally very favorable.	
8alameda_20110614			no				
8alameda_20110614			no				
8ccosta_20110615			no			Leave the districts the way they are	
8ccosta_20110615			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110615	6152011	Susan Wittenberg	no				yes	COMMENT IS CUT OFF, ONLY PARTIALLY VISIBLE IN PDF; Keep Richmond in George Millers district; do not use proposed changes, which cut up Contra Costa county along racial and economic lines
8ccosta_20110615	6152011	Carol M Hehmeyer	no				no	
8napa_20110615	692011	David Beckstoffer, Jim Berhey	yes	Napa Valley Grapegrowers; David President; Jim Chair, Industry Issues Committee		Napa	yes	Include Santa Rosa, Lake, Napa, Colusa, Glenn, northern Yolo, Sutter and Yuba in one CD. Napa, Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino, Yolo and Solano is a grape growing COI; keep existing lines of district 1
8napa_20110615	642011	Laverne Oyarzo	yes	California Conservative Action Group			yes	Use CA Conservative Action Group Bay Area maps; do not draw districts across the bay, as Latino Policy Forum map does; use BerkeleyOakland hills as barrier; put Union City with FremontNewark, not Danville; do not put Palo Alto wSanta Cruz

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110615	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110615				no	no		
8napa_20110615	Lake, Napa, Colusa, Glenn, Yolo, Sutter, Yuba, Sonoma, Mendocino, Solano	Santa Rosa		no	yes		Common wine, tourism and agricultural industries
8napa_20110615		Berkeley, Oakland, Union City, Fremont, Newark, Danville, Palo Alto, Santa Cruz		no	yes		BerkeleyOakland hills divide urban, ethnic, diverse communities from suburban bedroom communities to the east; san jose Latino community is an ethnic COI

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110615			no				
8ccosta_20110615			no				Where are the transcrips of the hearings? They are needed to organizeanalyze COI testimony. Did 500k cost to Gibson Dunn destroy the budget? Switch to Neilson firm, they are better.
8napa_20110615			no				
8napa_20110615	Group Marin with areas along 101 to the north, which would include people who work in Marin	Supports compliance with VRA; Latino Policy Forum map violates VRA	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110615	642011	averne Oyarzo	yes	California Conservative Action Group	Calistoga	Napa	yes	Keep Latino commuinty in San Jose in one district; Marin dist should expand north along HWY 101, not east to Benecia; keep north bay and SF districts separate; do not join Fremont with Tri-ValleyPleasanton; opposes MALDEF and CIJEE maps
8smateo_20110615	6152011	Andy Cohen	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not divide Menlo Park into two CDs
8smateo_20110615	6162011	Mark Leach	no				no	
8sonoma_20110613_2	6132011	Ray Holley	no		Healdsburg	Sonoma	yes	Change Sonoma lines on 610 map; the long coastal district divides rather than unties the community; put Northern Sonoma and Napa counties together
8sonoma_20110614_2	6142011	Sharon S. Robison	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not split Santa Rosa between two districts; Put Santa Rosa with the coastal region; keep Sonoma county in one district
8sonoma_20110614_2	6142011	Sandy Chapman	no				yes	Proposed redistricting changes north bay to eliminate a typically Democratic constituency
8sonoma_20110614_2	6142011	Sharon Robison	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not split up Sonoma county or Santa Rosa; keep them both in one district
8sonoma_20110614_2	6142011	Matthew Danielczyk	no				yes	Put Santa Rosa with Sonoma and Marin counties, not with Sacramento valley counties or Yuba City; likes old boundaries more than proposed ones

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110615	Marin	San Jose, Benecia, Fremont, Pleasanton		no	no		
8smateo_20110615		Menlo Park		no	no		
8smateo_20110615				no	no		
8sonoma_20110613_2	Sonoma, Napa			no	yes		Wine industry unites Sonoma and Napa, rural communities and family-based agriculture in common
8sonoma_20110614_2	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110614_2				no	no		
8sonoma_20110614_2	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110614_2	Sonoma, Marin, Sacramento	Santa Rosa, Yuba City		no	yes	Santa Rosa, coastal communities, and Marin are a COI, have political, geographical and cultural similarities	North bay (Marin, Santa Rosa) share economic interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110615			no				
8smateo_20110615			no				
8smateo_20110615			no			Keep small towns and school districts in one piece, or at least make the pieces large enough to matter to elected officials	
8sonoma_20110613_2			no				
8sonoma_20110614_2			no				
8sonoma_20110614_2			no				
8sonoma_20110614_2			no				
8sonoma_20110614_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110615	6142011	Sharon S. Robison, duplicate	no				no	
8sonoma_20110615	6142011	Sharon Robison, duplicate	no				no	
8sonoma_20110615	6142011	Matthew Danielczyk, duplicate	no				no	
8sonoma_20110615	6142011	Sandy Chapman, duplicate	no				no	
9dnorte_20110615_2	6142011	Patti Kraft	no				yes	Do not group Del Norte county with counties to the south; should be grouped instead wcounties to the east
9dnorte_20110615_2	6152011	Toni Radle	no				yes	Put Del Norte with eastern counties, not with counties to the south
9dnorte_20110615_2	6152011	Grant Werschkull	no				yes	Put Del Norte with other coastal communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110615				no	no		
8sonoma_20110615				no	no		
8sonoma_20110615				no	no		
8sonoma_20110615				no	no		
9dnorte_20110615_2	Del Norte			no	yes		Del Norte is an agricultural area, similar to areas to the east, different from urban industrial areas to the south
9dnorte_20110615_2	Del Norte			no	yes	Del Norte is a small, rural area, does not have similar interests as sophisticated counties to the south	
9dnorte_20110615_2				no	yes	Del Nortes economy, culture, recreational opportunities, regulatory agencies, native habitats and landscapes, threats and issues, heritage, and transportation are all in common with coastal communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110615			no				
8sonoma_20110615			no				
8sonoma_20110615			no				
8sonoma_20110615			no				
9dnorte_20110615_2			no				
9dnorte_20110615_2			no				
9dnorte_20110615_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110615_2	6152011	Steve Crockett	no				yes	Put Del Norte with Humboldt, Mendocino, Trinity, and Siskiyou; not with Sonoma and Marin; consider East-West redistricting
9dnorte_20110615_2	6142011	Jaime Yarbrough	no				yes	COMMENT CUT OFF IN PDF, PARTIALLY NOT VISIBLE. Unable to understand intent of comment.
9edorado_20110615	662011	Raymond J. Nutting	yes	County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors, Chair		El Dorado	yes	Keep Lake Tahoe in same SDAD as El Dorado and Placer counties, as it has been for 160 years; Roseville, Placerville, Auburn, South Lake Tahoe and Tahoe City belong together (see attached Board of Supervisors Resolution)
9humboldt_20110615	6162011	Sue Pierce	no				yes	Put Humboldt county in a district with Del Norte, Siskiyou, Shasta, Trinity and Modoc, not with Bay Area counties like Sonoma and Mendocino
9siskiyou_20110613	6132011	Richard Marshall	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110615_2	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Trinity, Siskiyou, Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
9dnorte_20110615_2				no	no		
9edorado_20110615	El Dorado, Placer	Roseville, Placerville, Auburn, South Lake Tahoe, Tahoe City		no	yes	El Dorado, Placer, Lake Tahoe and surrounding communities share common historical heritage and environmental concerns	
9humboldt_20110615	Del Norte, Siskiyou, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc, Humboldt, Sonoma, Mendocino			no	yes	Humboldt has more in common with these rural, agricultural areas, and should not be with weatlhy Bay Area counties	
9siskiyou_20110613				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110615_2			no				
9dnorte_20110615_2			no				
9edorado_20110615		Splitting Lake Tahoe from El Dorado would harm the geographic integrity of the community, contrary to the VRA	no				
9humboldt_20110615			no				
9siskiyou_20110613			no				Committee has taken a south California slant; why have there not been public meetings in Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc, or Trinity areas? These are areas you would most drastically impact and have been denied representation

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110613	6142011	Jon E. Lopey	no		Mount Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Etna, Fort Jones, and the east side of Scott Valley to the Coastal District; this will harm Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110614	6152011	Marcia Armstrong	no			Siskiyou	yes	New Siskiyou ADSDCD lines split Supervisorial District in two; do not split part of Siskiyou to be with coastal communities; it is far from EurekaWeaverville, but closer to Redding
9siskiyou_20110614	6152011	Donald Obrien	no				yes	Siskiyou logging, mining and ranchingfarming have been undermined by activists from HumboltDel Norte counties; do not put Etna, Fort Jones, Callahan with north coast district
9siskiyou_20110614	6142011	Amy Friend	no				yes	Do not split up Siskiyou county, putting the western part in the coastal region; Siskiyou has better transportation to Redding; Siskiyou cannot afford the additional costs of redistricting
9siskiyou_20110614	6142011	Colleen Setzer	yes	Siskiyou County, County Clerk	Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou into different SDADCDs

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110613	Siskiyou	Etna, Fort Jones		no	yes	Travel times, political issues and perspectives of coastal leaders do not represent Siskiyou county communities	
9siskiyou_20110614				no	yes	Roads easily connect Siskiyou to Redding, but connections to coastal areas are over windy mountian roads that are sometimes closed due to snow	Siskiyou is a poor rural area, with farming, logging and mining industries; coastal areas have fishing industries; these industries have conflicting interests
9siskiyou_20110614	Siskiyou, Humboldt, Del Norte	Etna, Fort Jones		no	yes		Siskiyou is a COI of logging, mining, and ranchingfarming which is distinct from coastal Humboldt and Del Norte counties
9siskiyou_20110614	Siskiyou	Redding		no	yes	Siskiyou has better transportation connection to Redding; is united in lifestyle, economy and issues	
9siskiyou_20110614	Siskiyou			no	yes	Splitting Siskiyou would split supervisorial districts, board of education areas, community collegehigh schoolgrammar school districts, and the fire protection district. Siskiyou shares living standards, transportation and media.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110613			no				
9siskiyou_20110614			no				
9siskiyou_20110614			no				
9siskiyou_20110614			no				
9siskiyou_20110614			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110614	6152011	Anna L. Marsh	no				yes	Totally supports the split of Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110615	6152011	Jon E. Lopey	yes	Siskiyou County, Sheriff-Coroner		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county into separate SDADCDs; this would wrongly split Fort Jones and Etna; do not put Siskiyou with coastal Mendocino and Humbold
9siskiyou_20110615	6152011	Ed Valenzuela	yes	Siskiyou Board of Supervisors, Second District Supervison (Southern)		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110615_2	6132011	James A. Waddell	yes	Karuk Arara Tribe, member	Roseville	Placer	yes	Leave Scott Valley, Fort Jones, Etna, Callahan, etc in the same district as Yreka, with the rest of Siskiyou county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110614	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110615	Siskiyou, Humboldt, Mendocino	Fort Jones, Etna		no	yes	Splitting Siskiyou would split supervisorial, school and fire districts; the area has common interests in land use, water rights, marijuana cultivation, and recreation; inadequate roads to coastal area would make it difficult for this Sheriff to see reps	Siskiyou has distinct priorities in agriculture, water rights, dam removal, endangered species, foresting, mining and land use
9siskiyou_20110615	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110615_2	Siskiyou	Etna, Fort Jones, Yreka		no	yes	Karuk Arara members of Siskiyou county should be in same district; drive from Scott Valley to Yreka is 20 minutes, while it takes 3-4 hours to get to coastal areas, and roads to coastal areas may be closed in winter due to snowrock slidesfloods	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110614			no				
9siskiyou_20110615			no				
9siskiyou_20110615			no				The public meeting in Redding was not well-noticed, and would have been a 2 hour drive for Siskiyou residents
9siskiyou_20110615_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110615	692011	Marc B. Robinson	yes	Robinson Bradford LLP	Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Keep San Joaquin county whole; (see maps - see non-district comment)
20110614	6142011	Brian Wilfley	no				no	
20110614	6142011	Brian Lawson	no				no	
20110614	6142011	Steven Horstman	no				no	
8sonoma_20110615_2	6122011	K. Riggs	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not put Santa Rosa with central areas
8sonoma_20110615_2	652011	Mike Healey	yes	Petaluma City Council, member	Petaluma	Sonoma	yes	Put Petaluma wSonoma cty cities Rohnert ParkSanta Rosa along HWY 101 corridor; put Lake County (pop. 64,665) in North Coast district, and move Petaluma (pop. 57,941) and immediate environs from North Coast dist to Santa RosaNapa dist

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110615	San Joaquin			no	no		
20110614				no	no		
20110614				no	no		
20110614				no	no		
8sonoma_20110615_2		Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110615_2	Sonoma, Lake	Petaluma, Santa Rosa, Rhonert Park	HWY 101	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110615			no				Letter refers to map, but there is no map in the PDF; letter says the map was also submitted to Sacramento office of the CRC
20110614			no				You are doing an excellent job. Do not listen to complaints from incumbent legislators whose primary interst is to keep their seats.
20110614			no			Technical comment regarding deferred population in new senate districts (see attached chart)	
20110614			no				Are maps available with more detail, such as street boundaries that coincide with district lines? This would make it easier to see where the districts are.
8sonoma_20110615_2			no				
8sonoma_20110615_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110615_2		Onita Pellegrini	yes	Petaluma Area Chamber of Commerce	Petaluma	Sonoma	yes	Put Petaluma (pop. 58,000) wother cities in HWY 101 corridor, not with Coastal District; Lake County (Pop. 65,000) would be better fit for Coastal District
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Naomi Carmona-Morshead	no			Los Angeles	yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, nest it with East Ventura County (Camarillo, Thousand oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley). Keep inland suburban valleys connected
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Paul Little	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena whole and keep with Glendale and burbank. Pasadena has little inn common with Diamond Bar, Chino Hills, etc
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	teri knafla	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of SCV in the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita district
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Lynndell Kennedy	no				yes	Hollydale should be included with Long Beach, Downey, Paramount
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	teri knafla	no				yes	SCV be nested with East Ventura county
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Patricia E. and Michael Dempsey	no				yes	Do not divide up Santa Clarity Valley, Newhall Belongs Keep with Acton, Aqua Dulce. Malibu is far away and different
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	harry knafla	no				yes	SCV be nested with East Ventura County
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Jeannie Atkins	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Santa Clarita, add Newhall into Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Aggi Oschin	no				yes	do not split up Santa Clarita, add Newhall into Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Patricia A. Kelly	no				yes	do not split up Santa Clarita, add Newhall into Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110615_2				no	yes	Petaluma does not fit in with agrarian communities in coastal district	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles, East Ventura County	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes	history, like communities	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Diamond Bar, Chino Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	SCV,		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Hollydale, Long Beach, Downey, Paramount	West side of south gate, freeway	no	yes	better representation, small community	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles, East Ventury	SCV		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Acton, Aqua Dulce, Santa Clarita valley		no	yes	same requirements	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	SCV, EVC		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	yes	one vibrant community	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110615_2			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				California has gone from wo-derful to a place where people cant make decent living
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Robert Hazard	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	do not split up Santa Clarita, add Newhall into Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Irene Boyd	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Bob Bennett	no				yes	Why is Old orchard I in Valencia excluded along w newhall, from rest of SCV.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Christine Greenn	no				yes	Do not split Newhall from district, leave with SCV
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Mary Sinclair	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Put Pasadena in one district. With Burbank and Glendale
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Margaret McAustin, Vice Mayor	yes	Pasadena	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Move Southern portion of Pasadena from East San Gabriel Valley-Diamond Bar into San Gabriel Mountains Foothill. Move most of upland into Ontario district. Move SE Chino Hills from Ontario to East San Gabriel Valley-Diamond Bar district
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Michael Kelly	no				yes	Should not redistrict Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Linda Lambourne	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Rosalind Gold, Senior Director of Policy	yes	NALEO Educational Fund	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Concerns about closing times of two venues for hearings in LA County
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Michael Logan (duplicate)	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Pasadena in two, put pasadena with Arcadia, South Pasadena, Monrovia, Glendale, and Burbank
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Alina Bokde	no		Lincoln Heights	Los Angeles	yes	Support for new boundaries for downtown and Northeast LA communities
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	William Howard Fairchile	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley- Santa Clarita Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5				no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Valencia, Newhall SCV		no	yes	integrity	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Newhall, SCV		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Diamond Bar, Ontario, Upland, Chino Hills	210 freeway as a dividing line is bad	no	yes	one community	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Pasadena, South Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Needs more detailed maps
4langeles_20110620_5	lived here for 35 years		no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5		preserve the voting rights act	no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Attached letter
4langeles_20110620_5			no				This makes more sense
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110620_6	6202011	Marcelle Keehne	no		North Hollywood,	Los Angeles	yes	Sunland-Tujunga, Shadow Hills, La Tuna canyon has more in common with foothills of Crescenta Valley.
4langeles_20110620_6	6212011	Darrell Bice	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach whole.
4langeles_20110620_6	6202011	Andrew Kinkaid	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	County line between LA and Orange is definitive.
4langeles_20110620_6	6202011	Gerald Marcil	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Santa monica and venice should be replaced by Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Harbor City.
4langeles_20110620_6	6202011	Marsha McLean, Mayor	yes	Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Concern that neighborhoods in Santa Clarita are being split. Entire Santa Clarita should be put in Antelope ValleySanta Clarita district
4langeles_20110620_6	6202011	Mary Ellen Strote	no		Calabbasas	Los Angeles	yes	Santa monica mountains should not be divided. Pacific Coast Highway, 101 Freeway, cross canyon roads need to stay together in business, etc
4langeles_20110621_shermanoaks	6212011	Bob Anderson	yes	Chair, Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association	sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Split Sherman Oaks across two districts. Move southern boundary of Calabasas from Ventura to Mullholland
5barbara_20110620	6202011	Phillip	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5barbara_20110620	6212011	Anne Jimenez	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Opposed to Lompoc being split
5barbara_20110620	6202011	Robert M. Newman	no				yes	Keep Lompoc whole in one district, lompoc more alligned with Santa Maria as COI

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110620_6	Los angeles	Sunland-Tujunga, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon	foothills	no	yes	issues relating to mountains, protection of hillsides, equestrian, biking, hiking, backpacking, planning concerns, corridor	
4langeles_20110620_6	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	yes	one city, one school district, one gas, one water department	
4langeles_20110620_6	Los Angeles, Orange			no	no		
4langeles_20110620_6	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Venice, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Harbor City		no	yes	South bay homogeneity in businesses, schools, parks	
4langeles_20110620_6	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		yes	yes	geographic, social, climatic, watershed, political boundaries	
4langeles_20110620_6	Los Angeles	Santa Monica Mountains	101 Fwy, cross-canyon roads, pacific coast highway,	no	yes	share businesses, tourism, environmental orgs, homeowners groups	
4langeles_20110621_shermanoaks	Los Angeles	Sherman Oaks, Calabasas	Ventura Blvd, Mullholland Drive	no	no		
5barbara_20110620	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5barbara_20110620	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5barbara_20110620	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110620_6			no				
4langeles_20110620_6	boundaries well-defined by freeways and waterways		no				Many testifying to split are politicians putting ambition before city
4langeles_20110620_6			no				California grew first by counties.
4langeles_20110620_6			no				
4langeles_20110620_6			no				
4langeles_20110620_6			no				Thank you for reading
4langeles_20110621_sherma noaks			no				Maps included
5barbara_20110620			no				Travesty, idiocy
5barbara_20110620			no				Disrespectful
5barbara_20110620	more aligned		no				Federal prison population included in population count, unreasonable as felons cant vote and are not residents by choice

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110619_2	6192011	Cathy Gregory	no				yes	Keep Lompoc intact. Buellton, Solvang and Santa Ynez are closer to Santa Barbara than Lompoc.
5ventura_20110618_2	6182011	Jerry and Marion Lewi	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Opposed to splitting of Thousand Oaks. Interests are served by Ventura County, not LA County or Santa Clarita. Share interest with Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Camarillo.
5ventura_20110620_2	6202011	Les Spencer	no				yes	Do not split Thousand Oaks.
5ventura_20110620_3	6142011	Cheryl Ackermann	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Opposed to making Moorpark part of Los Angeles county, instead of Ventura.
5ventura_20110620_4	6202011	Suzanne Maisner	no				yes	opposes incorporating parts of Northern Los angeles into ventura, oxnard. Concerns of this area are different from those in Simi Valley and Northern LA
5ventura_20110620_4	6202011	Patricia Beals	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Opposes split of thousand oaks and redistricting. Better district is natural following the 101 Thousand Oaks, Lake Sherwood, Oak Park, Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, West San Fernando Valley
6inyo_20110617	6172011	Brian Law	no				yes	Wants outreach to people of Inyo and Mono Counties. Should not be lumped with a county with nothing in common.
6merced_20110620	6202011	Les Oreck	no				yes	Disapproves of motion to Redistrict SD 12.
6merced_20110620	6212011	Tom Faria	no				yes	splitting 12 Seat district across the coastal ranges will weaken representation for San Joaquin Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110619_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc, Buellton, Solvang, Santa Ynez		no	no		
5ventura_20110618_2	Ventura County, Los Angeles County	Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Camarillo		no	no		
5ventura_20110620_2		Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110620_3	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110620_4	Los Angeles, Ventura	Ventura, Oxnard, Santa Monica, Malibu, Los Angeles, Simi Valley		no	yes	Coastal cities share nuclear power palnt concerns, geography, culture	
5ventura_20110620_4	LA, Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Lake Sherwood, Oak Park, Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, West San Fernando Valley	the 101	no	no		
6inyo_20110617	Inyo, Mono		mountains	no	no		
6merced_20110620	Merced			no	no		
6merced_20110620	Merced			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110619_2			no			keep Lompoc intact	another way for politicos to cut lompocs influence
5ventura_20110618_2			no			No interests in common with any part of LA County	
5ventura_20110620_2			no				
5ventura_20110620_3			no			Los Angeles is too big to give representation, and there is a higher tax rate and insurance costs	Please fire whoever dreamed up this crazy idea.
5ventura_20110620_4			no			Simi and LA dont have same concerns	
5ventura_20110620_4			no				I do my part
6inyo_20110617			no				I work for a radio station
6merced_20110620			no			CLCV believes not in best intereset of health of area	
6merced_20110620	under-represented and under-funded		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110620	6202011	Noel Michael Rucka	no				yes	Proposed lines extend from North Santa Cruz county to a part of Santa Barbara county. This is a four hour drive for residents.
7sclara_20110617_2	6102011	Andres Quintero, President	yes	East San Jose Democrats	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Opposes removing parts of East San Jose from the rest of SJ and placing in districts to the north. Placing with Mt. Hamilton Range and San Antonio valley based on route corridor of Hwy 130 is wrong. Include Mckee Rd as N boundary, all of E SJ, Hwy 87 to W
7sclara_20110617_2	6172011	Steven Levin	no				yes	Putting meeting for public input on Saturday precludes religious Jews from attending.
7sclara_20110620	6202011	Pat Pierce	no				yes	Sunnyvale and Santa Clara are not consistently shown on the maps.
7sclara_20110620	6202011	Joan Krolak	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	West Valley should end at the Los Angeles County line, and includes Conejo Valley
7sclara_20110620_2	6202011	Carol Wall	no		West Valley	Santa Clara	yes	West Valley should not cross over into East Valley. San Fernando Valley is divided by 405, West Valley from the 405 to Wetern LA line and includes Conejo Valley. Theas Valley is from 405 to Burbank, Glendale.
7scruz_20110619	6192011	Heather McDougal	no		Davenport	Santa Cruz	yes	Protests boundary on Northern part of Swanton Rd near Davenport, off Cabrillo Highway.
7scruz_20110620	6202011	Leigh Hill (duplicate)	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Should not include part of Santa Cruz County in Santa Clara County. Line should be at summit of Santa Cruz mountains. Nothing in common with Portola Valley or Cupertino

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110620	Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara			no	no		
7sclara_20110617_2	Santa Clara, Alameda	San Jose	Mckee Rd, highway 87,	yes	yes	Latino population, latino vote is diluted, school district, public safety, public transportation	
7sclara_20110617_2	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	no		
7sclara_20110620	Santa Clara	Santa Clara, Sunnyvale		no	no		
7sclara_20110620	Los Angeles	West Valley, Conejo Valley		no	no		
7sclara_20110620_2	Santa Clara, L.A. County	West Valley, East Valley, San Fernando Valley, Conejo Valley, Burbank, Glendale	405, L.A. County line	no	no		
7scruz_20110619	Santa Cruz, San Mateo	Davenport	Swanton Rd, Davenport, Cabrillo Hwy	no	yes	school district, postal district, county, government	
7scruz_20110620	Santa Cruz, Santa Clara	Portola Valley, Cupertino	Santa Cruz Mountains	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110620			no			It is a long drive for constituent services, time will be limited	
7sclara_20110617_2	history, population, demographic	Much needs to be taken into consideration based on VRA	no				
7sclara_20110617_2			no				Commission should be senstive to diversity in CA
7sclara_20110620			no				
7sclara_20110620			no				I expect the commission to be fair with this matter
7sclara_20110620_2			no			West Valley has the population and deserves separate district	
7scruz_20110619	All part of Davenport community		no			follow county line	
7scruz_20110620	Leave Scotts Valley, Felton, Ben Lomond, Boulder Creek		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110620	6212011	Christina Hatcher	no		San Lorenzo Valley	Santa Cruz	yes	reconsider including Santa cruz mountain and North Coast communities in Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110620	6202011	Leigh Hill	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Santa Cruz should remain intact. Do not exclude watsonville. Santa cruz is connected to Monterey and San Benito counties more than Santa clara
7scruz_20110620	6212011	Benjamin Short	no		North Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Davenport, Scotts Valley, and San Lorenzo Valley communities should be with Santa Cruz, not Silicon Valley.
8alameda_20110619	6192011		no			Alameda	yes	Portion of Oakland City Council District 6 and 7 should be put back in assembly distict 16. Currently they are Castro Valley, Dublin, Hayward, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, and Pleasanton.
8ccosta_20110620	6202011	Bryan Montgomery	no				yes	Does not make sense to carve Oakley from Contra Costa county. Should find a piece of Solano or Sonoma instead.
8ccosta_20110620_2	6202011	Marilyn Langlois	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	In favor of having Richmond switched to same district as Albany, Berkeley, and Oakland.
8ccosta_20110620_2	6202011	Liz Elias	no			Contra Costa	yes	Oppose combining Oakley, Knightsen, etc with Stockton, Lodi and environs
8ccosta_20110620_3	6212011	Charles F. Carpenter	no		Concord	Contra Costa	yes	Object to deferring, sd7.
8ccosta_20110620_3	6202011	Valerie Castaldi	no		Oakley	Contra Costa	yes	Oakley belongs in contra Costa County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110620	Santa Cruz	San Lorenzo Valley, Santa Cruz Mountain, North Coast		no	yes	proximity, community	
7scruz_20110620	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara	Watsonville		no	no		
7scruz_20110620	Santa Cruz	Davenport, Scotts Valley, San Lorenzo Valley		no	yes	we live, work, eat, shop, recreate in Santa Cruz, similar culture,	
8alameda_20110619	Alameda	Castro Valley, Dublin, Hayward, San Leandro, Pleasonton		no	yes	socio-economic, racial demographics	
8ccosta_20110620	Contra Costa, Solano, Sonoma	Oakley	River, big bridge	no	no		
8ccosta_20110620_2	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond, Albany, Berkeley, Oakland		no	yes	shared demographics, geographic continuity	
8ccosta_20110620_2	Contra Costa	Oakley, Knightsen, Stockton, Lodi		no	no		
8ccosta_20110620_3	Contra Costa			no	no		
8ccosta_20110620_3	Contra Costa	Oakley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110620	so communities are not fractured		no				thank you for your consideration
7scruz_20110620			no			no common communinty with that exclusion and inclusion	
7scruz_20110620			no			dissimilar from Bay Area, no representative access Over the Hill	
8alameda_20110619			no				crude form of gerrymandering took place during the 2000 redistricting
8ccosta_20110620			no				
8ccosta_20110620_2			no				
8ccosta_20110620_2			no			Oakley, etc are ruralsuburban with no industry, Stockton and Lodi are industrial areas with different demographics. Will amount to lack of representation	
8ccosta_20110620_3			no			arbitrary numbering decision should not take away representation	
8ccosta_20110620_3	Have only been city for 10 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110618	6182011	Roger and Linda Wilson	no		Santa Rosa	Marin	yes	Keep coastal region as entire group
8marin_20110619_2	6192011	Ken Sablik	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Does not like shape of district, no strong COI. Should not exclude Santa Rosa from district
8napa_20110617_2	6172011	Tom McNicholas	no				yes	No on removal of American Canyon from Napa County. Putting it in Sonoma and Marin would be detrimental to Napa county
8napa_20110620_2	6202011	Jean Hasser, Gerald Hasser	no		Napa	Napa	yes	Important for American Canyon to be in same District as Napa County.
8sfrancisco_20110620	6202011	Steven Spencer-Steigner	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	San Fransciscos senate seat should receive an odd number so East side and district 8 do not lose representation. Commission should not divide Diamond Heights, Twin Peaks, Upper Haight, Cole Valley, Western Edition
8sfrancisco_20110620_2	6212011	Mark Scheuer	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	San Fransciscos senate seat should receive an odd number so East side and district 8 do not lose representation. Commission should not divide Diamond Heights, Twin Peaks, Upper Haight, Cole Valley, Western Edition
8sfrancisco_20110620_2	6202011	David Troup	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	LGTB community should be kept together in 13th assembly district.
8smateo_20110617	6172011		no				yes	Palo Alto new district looks gerrymandered central menlo park put with san Mateo. Menlo park should stay attached to Palo Alto, and Atherton should go to San Mateo.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110618				no	no		
8marin_20110619_2	Marin, Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
8napa_20110617_2	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8napa_20110620_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	governments are small, work together, mutual concern	
8sfrancisco_20110620	San Francisco	San Francisco	East Side, West Side	yes	yes	LGBT communities should not be divided	
8sfrancisco_20110620_2	San Francisco	San Francisco	East Side West Side	yes	yes	LGBT communities should not be divided	
8sfrancisco_20110620_2	San Francisco	San Francisco	13th District	yes	yes	LGBT community should not be divided, social and political interests	
8smateo_20110617	San Mateo, Palo Alto	Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Atherton		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110618			no				My namesake came with the gold
8marin_20110619_2	Santa Rosa is principal city of the area		no				
8napa_20110617_2	integral valley geographically and economically, wine industry, housing, warehousing, transportation		no				
8napa_20110620_2			no				
8sfrancisco_20110620			no				
8sfrancisco_20110620_2			no				to deprive many from having a senator for two years is not good government
8sfrancisco_20110620_2			no				
8smateo_20110617	contiguous land area		no				appears to favor anna eshoo, so as not to compete with Jackie Speier

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8solano_20110617	6172011	Lindsey McWilliams, Assistant Registrar of Voters	yes	Solano County	Fairfield	Solano	yes	Border between Napa and ECC crosses Napa-Solano border south to a PG and S easement. Then Continues SSE to Fairfield. Should Go south on suisun valley road to Fairfield, follow city limits west to Green Valley rd to add 315 people
8solano_20110620	6202011	Amit Nischal	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	American Canyon should be in Napa county, not Solana County. Traffic issues face hwy 29.
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	Marjorie Stein	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa should not be cut off from Sonoma County and the north coast. Little in common with Glenn, Colusa, sutter, Yuba, Yola counties.
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	Nicholas Xenelis	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa rosa does not belong with the valley. Should be with north bay.
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	Carol Williams	no		Cotati	Sonoma	yes	Santa Roma is hub of sonoma county and its COI is in North Bay area of Marin and Sonoma. Should not be placed with district up to Yuba County.
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	George	no				yes	Unfair to link Santa Rosa with Sacramento Valley. Santa Rosa, Sonoma County values are not shared there.
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	Jennie Orvino	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa should not be cut off from Sonoma County and the north coast. Little in common with Glenn, Colusa, sutter, Yuba, Yola counties.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8solano_20110617	Napa, Solano	Napa, Fairfield	PGS transmission line easement, Green Valley Road, Suisun Valley Road, Rockville Road	no	no		
8solano_20110620	Napa, Solano	American Canyon	hwy 29	no	no		
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, yolo	Santa Rosa		no	yes	With North Bay russian river, coastal preservation, SF bay, wine, organic gardening, smart rail, thinking and outlook	
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma, Marin, Yuba	Santa Rosa		no	yes	With Marin and Sonoma	
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma,	Santa Rosa, Sacramento Valley		no	no		
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8solano_20110617	adds 315 people		no				attached map
8solano_20110620	traffic issues, other		no				
8sonoma_20110618_2			no			Valley is big agriculture, conservative, rural. Santa Rosa is small, sustainable, organic, liberal	same problems in communities of color in LA
8sonoma_20110618_2			no			Valley is big agriculture, conservative, rural. Santa Rosa is small, sustainable, organic, liberal	
8sonoma_20110618_2			no				
8sonoma_20110618_2			no			not shared values	
8sonoma_20110618_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	Cathleen Caffrey	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa should not be moved out of the North Coast Counties
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	Keiht Bouldin	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa rosa should not be included with inland Counties of Glenn, colusa, Sutter, Yuba and Yolo.
8sonoma_20110618_2	6182011	Shirley Simone	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa should not be cut off from Sonoma County and the north coast. Little in common with Glenn, Colusa, sutter, Yuba, Yola counties.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Ami Cooper	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole for congress redistricting. Newhall Area does not match with San Fernando Valley and City of LA
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	John Dortch	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Michael DeLeeuw	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Likes that Pasadena is in Assembly district with Burbank and Glendale. Do not listen to those who say to cut out Glendale and Burbank and include cities along 210 freeway instead. Does not like that you cut Pasadena in half.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	John Dortch	no			Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura county in a senate seat
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Gaynor Grubbs	no			Los Angeles	yes	Moved from San Fernando Valley, does not want to be considered part of it again
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Bonnie Hood	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Valley-Santa Clara Valley district
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Barbara Shoag	no			Los Angeles	yes	Thanks for keeping Long Beach a complete City

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma	Santra Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma, Glenn, colusa, Sutter, Yuba and Yolo.	Santa Rosa, North Bay		no	no		
8sonoma_20110618_2	Sonoma, Glenn, colusa, Sutter, Yuba and Yolo.	Santa Rosa		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall, San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale,	210 freeway	no	yes	similar populations, middlde and working class	
4langeles_20110620_5	East Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110618_2			no			gerrymandering, puts Sant Rosa voters in a more conservative area where their votes wont count	this isnt democracy, this is tyranny
8sonoma_20110618_2			no				
8sonoma_20110618_2			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Thank you
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Do not listen to politicians who are invested in keeping safe districts for incumbents
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				in 1989
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Cris Hughes	no		Lake View Terrace	Los Angeles	yes	Prefers Lake view Terrace to be in CD2
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Richard Brunner, President	yes	Peninsula Verde HOA	Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Supports boundary proposals for south bay, needs representative boundary with like communities
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Dara Pettinato	no		Santa Clarita Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Wants Santa clarita Valley to be kept as one entity.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Harry Knafla	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of SCV in antelope Valley- Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Alexandre Montiero, member (duplicate)	yes	School Board of Hawthorne	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Hawthorne from Inglewood, Lawndale, Gardena, Lenox. All part of Centinela Valley Area.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Naomi Carmona-Morshead	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Valley-Santa Clara Valley district
8sonoma_20110619_2	6192011	Sonia Taylor	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa should not be thrown away from the COIs in Sonoma County.
8sonoma_20110619_2	6192011	Barbara Baer	no		Forestville	Sonoma	yes	Appalling that Santa Rosa might be cut from the county.
8sonoma_20110619_2	6192011	Nancy King, R.N.	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa rosa should not be redistricted to Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Lake View Terrace		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los angeles	Racho Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los angeles	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes	love of ideals represented in the community	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Gardena, Centinela Valley, Inglewood		no	yes	values, demographics, medical services, youth, safety, law enforcement, school district, LAX-los angeles airport	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
8sonoma_20110619_2	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Santa Rosa is COI with Sonoma russian river watershied, wastewater reuse program,	water reuse program
8sonoma_20110619_2	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Santa Rosa is COI with Sonoma county newspapers, websites, interest groups, hi-tech creativity,	hi-tech, wine, organic agriculture products
8sonoma_20110619_2	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110620_5			no				deserves councilmember who is responsive to concerns, knowledgable, and has passion for concerns of people being served
4langeles_20110620_5			no				thank you for efforts
4langeles_20110620_5			no				thank you
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Thank You
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
8sonoma_20110619_2			no			No relationship with Lodi through San Joaquin Valley	
8sonoma_20110619_2	transportation, schools, entertainments, housing, job recovery		no			not aquainted with other parts of Northern california	
8sonoma_20110619_2			no			Sonoma county is quite populated and very urban	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110620_2	6202011	Attila Nagy	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Should not cut off Santa Rosa from 6th Congressional District, as Santa Rosa is County seat of Sonoma County, integral part of North Bay.
8sonoma_20110620_3	6202011	Nicole Roberts	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Exclusion of Santa Rosa from SonomaMarin district is appaling. Nothing in common with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or Yolo counties.
8sonoma_20110620_3	6202011	Angela Savelli (duplicate)	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Exclusion of Santa Rosa from SonomaMarin district is appaling. Nothing in common with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or Yolo counties.
8sonoma_20110620_3	6202011	Kathy Roberts	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Exclusion of Santa Rosa from SonomaMarin district is appaling. Nothing in common with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or Yolo counties.
8sonoma_20110620_3	6202011	Eleanor Rimkeit	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Exclusion of Santa Rosa from SonomaMarin district is appaling. Nothing in common with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or Yolo counties.
8sonoma_20110620_3	6202011	Wade Roberts	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Exclusion of Santa Rosa from SonomaMarin district is appaling. Nothing in common with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or Yolo counties.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110620_2	Sonoma, Marin	Santa Rosa	101 corridor	no	yes	county seat, urban hub	
8sonoma_20110620_3	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110620_3	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110620_3	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110620_3	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110620_3	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110620_2			no			marin is not integral, nor smaller towns north of santa rosa	
8sonoma_20110620_3			no			Valley is big agriculture, conservative, rural, Santa Rosa is; small sustainable, organic, liberal. Will disenfranchise voters.	
8sonoma_20110620_3			no			Valley is big agriculture, conservative, rural, Santa Rosa is; small sustainable, organic, liberal. Will disenfranchise voters.	
8sonoma_20110620_3			no			Valley is big agriculture, conservative, rural, Santa Rosa is; small sustainable, organic, liberal. Will disenfranchise voters.	
8sonoma_20110620_3			no			Valley is big agriculture, conservative, rural, Santa Rosa is; small sustainable, organic, liberal. Will disenfranchise voters.	
8sonoma_20110620_3			no			Valley is big agriculture, conservative, rural, Santa Rosa is; small sustainable, organic, liberal. Will disenfranchise voters.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110620_2	6202011	Felice Pace	no		Klamath	Del Norte	yes	Keep coastal counties together on the North Coast.
9dnorte_20110620_3	6202011	Scott R. Johnson	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Del Norte belongs in coastal district that will extend from Oregon County line down to santa rosa.
9humboldt_20110620	6202011	Gary Todoroff	no			Humboldt	yes	Urban areas of Eureka and district should not be aligned with rural North Coast CA.
9mendocino_20110620	6202011	Joel Chaban	no		Gualala, CA	Mendocino	yes	Support lines drawn for North Coastal District. Western Siskiyou are coastal community. Coastal communities have a lot in common
9modoc_20110618	6182011	Judith Mason	no				yes	Region 9 is close to 45 percent of state, so half of state had no representation. Meeting should be in Redding, 2.75 hours from Modoc
9nevada_20110619	6192011	Olivia Diaz	no		Cascade Shores	Nevada	yes	Cascade Shores should not be split down the middle.
9nevada_20110620	6202011	Curtis L. Walker	no			Nevada	yes	Sliver of Nevada county should be changed to use the Nevada county line
9sacramento_20110620_2	6152011	Kevin McCarty, councilmember District 6 and steve Cohn, Councilmember, District 3	yes	City of Sacramento	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Eastern portion of Sacramento should not be seperated from city in maps.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110620_2	Del Norte	North Coast	101 corridor	no	yes	rivers for salmon and steelhead, favor ocean and shoreline protection, harbors, redwoods, 101 corridor, shopping	
9dnorte_20110620_3	Del Norte	Del Norte, Santa Rosa, Oregon		no	yes	fishing community, most productive harbor on North Coast. Align Delnorte county with other coastal counties.	
9humboldt_20110620	Humboldt	North Coast		no	no		
9mendocino_20110620	Mendocino Western Siskiyou			no	yes	rivers, shoreline protection, harbors, redwood parks, 101 corridor	
9modoc_20110618	Modoc	Redding, Modoc		no	no		
9nevada_20110619	Nevada	Nevada City, Cascade Shores		no	yes	no longer has a polling place	
9nevada_20110620	Nevada			no	no		
9sacramento_20110620_2	Sacramento	Sacramento		yes	yes	historical ties, school boundaries	business activity, economic development, higher education opportunities,

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110620_2			no				
9dnorte_20110620_3			no				
9humboldt_20110620			no			urban v. rural	does not like big city interests dominating
9mendocino_20110620	shopping, culture,		no				
9modoc_20110618			no				
9nevada_20110619			no				
9nevada_20110620			no				otherwise great job
9sacramento_20110620_2	hospital synergy, connectivity		no				thank you in advance

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110620_2	6152011	Jerry Vorpahl, CEO	yes	Power Inn Alliance	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Eastern portion of sacramento should not be seperated.
9siskiyou_20110617_2	6172011	Sharon Ollmann	no			Siskiyou	yes	Objects to split of Siskiyou County.
9siskiyou_20110620	6202011	Rebecca Phillipe	no			Siskiyou	yes	People of Scott Valley support Yreka and Siskiyou county. Yreka and Scott Vally are inland, close to I-5. Eureka is coastal
9siskiyou_20110620	6202011	Domenic and Joan Favero	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Siskiyou should not be split. Interests lie with Modoc, Lassen Plumas, and Sierra counties
9siskiyou_20110620	6202011	Rebecca Phillipe	no			Siskiyou	yes	Scott valley of siskiyou does not belong in coastal district
9sjoaquin_20110617	6172011	Joseph C. Hohenrieder	no		Acampo	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district that includes Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. Lodi should be kept in a single district.
9sjoaquin_20110617	6172011	Lani Eklund	yes	Chair of Lockeford Municipal Advisory Council	Lockeford	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi and Lockeford should not be in the same district as Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties.
9sjoaquin_20110620	6212011	Joseph Valente	no				yes	Lodi needs to be mapped with San Joaquin and Sacramento county, not others.
9sjoaquin_20110620	6202011	Virginia A. Higgs	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district with Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. It should be with San Joaquin county
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	6202011	Carol Elliot	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district with Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. It should be with San Joaquin county
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	6182011	Elizabeth Youngman-Westphal	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district with Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. It should be with San Joaquin county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110620_2	Sacramento	sacramento		yes	yes	historic, neighborhood associations, BIDs, school boundaries, CSUS, med center	
9siskiyou_20110617_2	Siskiyou			no	yes	schools, fire districts, interests, and support	
9siskiyou_20110620	Siskiyou	Yreka, Scott Valley, Eureka	I-5	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110620	Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Plumas, Sierra	Yreka		no	yes	rural	
9siskiyou_20110620	Siskiyou	Scot Valley		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110617	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110617	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Lockeford		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110620	San Joaquin, Sacramento	Lodi		no	yes	share agriculture, school districts, fairs, newspapers, fund raising for youth programs, law and fire,	
9sjoaquin_20110620	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110620_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110617_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110620			no				
9siskiyou_20110620			no				
9siskiyou_20110620			no			nothing in common with coast	
9sjoaquin_20110617			no			Lodi needs own poltical voice	
9sjoaquin_20110617			no			geographical delineatons	
9sjoaquin_20110620			no				
9sjoaquin_20110620			no			Maybe Tracy for split	thank you for your time
9sjoaquin_20110620_2			no			Maybe Tracy for split	
9sjoaquin_20110620_2			no			Maybe Tracy for split	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	6202011	Kurt Kautz, Managing Member	yes	Bear Creek Winery	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district with Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. It should be with San Joaquin county
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	6202011	Donna Rowe	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district with Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. It should be with San Joaquin county
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	6202011	William L. Rowe, Jr	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district with Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. It should be with San Joaquin county
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	6202011	Craig Rous	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in district with Yola, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties. It should be with San Joaquin county
9tehema_20110620	6202011	Stephen Kimbrough	yes	Corning City, Manager	Corning City	Tehema	yes	appreciates leaving representation unchanged.sees community of interest with counties represented along with Corning
9trinity_20110617	6172011	Valerie Eisman	no		Trinity Center	Trinity	yes	Santa Rosa should not be cut out of Marin and Sonoma, as it is contiguous and a COI
9trinity_20110620	6202011	Al Saxton	no			Trinity	yes	Oppose moving Trinity County to the coast. Most of the county deals with Shasta County businesses
20110618_2	6182011	Carole Robinson	no		Belmont	San Mateo	no	
20110618_2	6182011	Marcia Mcdougal	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Needs Last chance road and swanton to be in same district
20110618_2	6182011	Geri Kenyon, M.S., L.E.P	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep desert and ocean communities separate, such as Malibu, Topanga, Santa monica, pacific palisades.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110620_2	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9tehema_20110620	Tehema	Corning		no	no		
9trinity_20110617	Trinity, Marin, Sonoma	Santa Rosa,		no	yes	Neighboring urban county	
9trinity_20110620	Shasta, Trinity			no	yes	with Shasta and central Valley shopping, medical care, legal representation	buisness
20110618_2				no	no		
20110618_2	Santa Cruz	Swanton	last chance road	no	no		
20110618_2		Malibu, topanga, santa monica, pacific palisades		no	yes	oceans with oceans, deserts with deserts	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110620_2			no			Maybe Tracy for split	
9sjoaquin_20110620_2			no			Maybe Tracy for split	
9sjoaquin_20110620_2			no			Maybe Tracy for split	
9sjoaquin_20110620_2			no			Maybe Tracy for split	
9tehema_20110620			no				put communities on you map
9trinity_20110617			no			Santa rosa and trinity are very different politically. Trinity is far too republican to include Santa Rosa.	
9trinity_20110620			no				Coast is too far
20110618_2			no				Wikipedia entry for gerrymandering. Their wonderful friend has a plan
20110618_2	school and fire dept will lose out		no				Do not be a sell out
20110618_2	education, special needs children		no				public education

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110618_2	6182011	Glenn Gelineau	no		San Carlos	San Mateo	no	
20110619	6192011	Judy Miller	no				no	
20110620	6192011	Jennifer	no		San Diego	San Diego	no	
20110620	6202011	Maureen Coughlin	no		Santa Paula	Ventura	no	
20110620_2	6202011	Eugene Lee	yes	APALC			no	
20110620_2	6202011	Rosalind Gold (duplicate)	yes	NALEO	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	no	
20110620_2	6202011	Rosalind Gold (duplicate)	yes	NALEO	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	no	
20110620_2	6202011	Casey Scott, RCE	no				yes	More work needs to be done to avoid splitting counties like Glenn and Siskiyou. Marin and Sonoma should be joined. Remainder of sonoma with Del Norte, Humbolt, Trinity, Menodino, Lake, Napa. Interstate 5505 counties, and combine Northeastern
20110620_2	6202011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110618_2				no	no		
20110619				no	no		
20110620				no	no		
20110620				no	no		
20110620_2				no	no		
20110620_2				no	no		
20110620_2				no	no		
20110620_2	Glenn, Siskiyou, Marin, Del Norte, Humbolt, Trinity, Menodino, Lake, Napa, Sonoma		505,	no	yes	many	
20110620_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110618_2			no				Redistricting is failing miserably, recommends using county lines and zip codes
20110619			no				Some people are still playing blame game and crying in beer.
20110620			no				Regions are more contiguous. Thank you
20110620			no				How can we receive fair divisions?
20110620_2			no				Associates itself with attached letter about closing times.
20110620_2			no				Attached a letter
20110620_2			no				Puts forth ideas and concerns about the inflexible closing time of the public input heating.
20110620_2			no				Includes detailed maps
20110620_2			no				Determine how census has counted temporary residents like student, military, prisons

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CCAG_20110614	6142011	Robert Bacon RN	no				no	
CSCFR_20110608	682011	Stacie Anne Gereb	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	no	
CSCFR_20110610	6102011	Sharon Custer	no		Westlake Village	Ventura	no	
CSCFR_20110610	6102011	Diana Philbrook	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	no	
CSCFR_20110611	6112011	Phyllis Melampy	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	no	
CSCFR_20110611	6112011	Jean Lambert	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	no	
CSCFR_20110617	6172011	Lisa Lehman	no		Valencia	Los Angeles	no	
CSCFR_20110618	6182011	Mrs. Bonnie Hood	no		Canyon Country	Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CCAG_20110614				no	no		
CSCFR_20110608				no	no		
CSCFR_20110610				no	no		
CSCFR_20110610				no	no		
CSCFR_20110611				no	no		
CSCFR_20110611				no	no		
CSCFR_20110617				no	no		
CSCFR_20110618				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CCAG_20110614			no				Supports all Bay Area Maps submitted by Coalifornia Conservative Action Group
CSCFR_20110608			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110610			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110610			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110611			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110611			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110617			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110618			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110618	6182011	Roberta Marie Johnson	no		Canyon Country	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Erik Counseller	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Include Eastern San Gabriel mountains in the district of those south of them.Its important for people of Rancho Cucamonga to get a say in their mountains
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Henry Nivichanov	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts.Instead, add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita valley district.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	William Oberholzer	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne and Lawndale should be in our district because they are a part of our community. Exclude Venice and Santa Monica.
4langeles_20110621_2	6142011	Luis Marquez	yes	City Council(mayor)	Downey	Los angeles	yes	entirety of Downey should remain in one congressional district.current plan violates integrity of Downey, splitting up two city council districts.Plan ignores Rio HondoSan Gabriel Rivers and I-710,I-605 Freeways which are natural WE boundaries of city.
4langeles_20110621_2	6172011	Jack Scott	yes	City Council(past assembly member)	Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Pasadena and Altadena in assembly districts.Altadena shares common interests with Pasadena.Keep them together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110618				no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Pasadena,Rancho Cucamonga		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	San Pedro, Torrance,Venice, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_2	Los Angeles	Downey	Interstate 5, 605, 710, 105 Freeways.Rio Hondo and San Gabriel Rivers.	no	yes	police, fire, water, unified school district.city enclosed by	
4langeles_20110621_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Altadena		no	yes	shared school district.Commercially and culturally connected.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110618			no				Supports maps proposed by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_2		current plan violates commissions own stated principles.	no				
4langeles_20110621_2			no			They have been in the same district for a long time. Keep it that way.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_2	6152011	Don Kendrick	yes	City Council(mayor)	La Verne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split La Verne into two congressional districts as is proposed.having one representative works better for La Verne.Proposed boundary would divide community.Interstate 210 should not create barrier between northsouth.
4langeles_20110621_2	6142011	Steve Tye	yes	City Council(mayor)	City of Diamond Bar	Los Angeles	yes	Do not group Pasadena and Diamond Bar.Very different socially,economically.Grouping them will affect funding for projects in Diamond Bar.
4langeles_20110621_2	6162011	Janet B. Averill	yes	Board of Trustees of the Lowell Joint School District		Los Angeles	yes	Include La Habra Heights in the proposed Los Angeles Country Congressional district including Whittier, La Miranda.Shared COI interests.
4langeles_20110621_2	6212011	John G. Powers	yes	City Council	La Habra Heights	Los Angeles	yes	La Habra Heights interests not in line with Majority of Cities in proposed congressional district.La Habra should be with Los Angeles county cities whom we share challenges.
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	Adam Scott	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	Tina Ivanov	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_2	Los Angeles	La Verne	Interstate 210.	no	yes	pride in being one small community.all elected officials serve whole community.	
4langeles_20110621_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena,Diamond Bar,Alhambra,Monterey Park,Chino Hills,Brea,Yorba Linda,Walnut,Fullerton, Rowland Heights.		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_2	Los Angeles	La Habra Heights, Whittier,La Miranda, Downey.		no	yes	Lowell joint school district shared.	
4langeles_20110621_2	Los Angeles	La Miranda, La Habra Heights, Downy,Whittier		no	yes	Been involved with city council of other L.A. cities.similar needs.	
4langeles_20110621_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_topanga	los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_2			no				
4langeles_20110621_2			no			Assembly and senate districts look fine.	
4langeles_20110621_2			no			should share congressman	
4langeles_20110621_2			no				state assembly and senate district first drafts look good.
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	Cynthia Scott	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	Catherine McClenahan	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	William Douglass	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	Peter Anton	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	Kelly Constantine	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_topanga	6212011	Abby Gilad	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side-Santa Monica district and join with Santa Clarita, with whom Topanga has no common interest.Proposal of senate district noted Santa Monica MountainsBay-west side.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	B.J. Atkins	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole. Do not split into two separate congressional districts.Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Hadley Rierson	no				yes	Keep Hollywoods together.Keep communities touching Griffith Park in one assembly district.Including Atwater Village,Silver LakeCommunities share many things
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Thaddeus Wadleigh	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not group Topanga with Santa Clarita. No similar interests.Redistrict Topanga with the Westside.Shared interests there.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Richard B. Winslow	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not group Topanga with Santa Clarita. No commonalities with it. Group Topanga into West side-Santa Monica Mountains district instead. Topanga shares Westwood village,Santa Monica interests.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Bill Hopkins	yes	North Neighborhood Council			yes	Dont split Granada Hills or the North Neighborhood Council.Instead, use the 5 FWY until it joins the 405 as a new boundary
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Sue Mansis	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep District as is.lines should include sunlandtujungaShadow HillsLakeview TerraceGlendaleLa Crescenta.Shared interests with these places.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga,Calabasas,Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Atwater Village,Silver Lake,Los Feliz,Hollywood Hills,Hollywood Proper,Burbank		no	yes	all share History, culture,shopping	employment patterns, key industries,state issues
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Woodland Hills, Calabasas		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Topanga,Westwood Village,Santa Monica,Santa Clarita,		no	yes	Shopping, work,political similarites	
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Granada Hills	5 Fwy, 405 Fwy	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Sunland,Tujunga,Shadow Hills,Lakeview Terrace,Glendale,La Crescenta		no	yes	neighborhood uses, socio-economic population needs	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_topanga			no				Good job on assembly districts.
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622	6222011	James Flourney	no				yes	Montebello Hills and Communities north of it need to be with Rowemead.South San Gabriel should be with 90640 Zip Code.For senate district-Expand east rather than south.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Sheila ONeill OConnor	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	return key cities removed on preliminary maps to our district.and take the ones added out.Venicesanta monica not part of southbay community.Lawndale and Hawthorne are.include hawthorne and lawndale in CD.Remove VeniceSanta Monica.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Maddie Stodart	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Add community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley- Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Lani Luedde	no				yes	Exclude venice and santa monica areas from the 36th district. They do not represent our demographics
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Lucia Affatato	no		North Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate North Hollywood from rest of Los Angeles.Communities that border Griffith Park and hollywood must stay in one assembly and senate district.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Laura McMillan	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Please add Community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Steven Turner	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita as one city. Keep Newhall part of us.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Robert K. Comer	no				yes	Do not split up Santa Clarita. We need district to remain intact.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Montebello Hills,Rowemead	hills in San Gabriel valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Lawndale,hawthorne,lennox,wilmington,San pedro.Venice, harbor city, Harbor Gateway	405 Freeway.	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Venice, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	los angeles	North Hollywood		no	yes	social,cultural community,parks, recreational activities	state issues,movie industry.
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622	common interests		no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Teresa Penner	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Topanga in the Santa Clarita district. Re Draw the line
4langeles_20110622	6222011	S L Wojciechowski	no				yes	Please advise where Cerritos is Positioned
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Julie Levine	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned about proposed redistricting of Topanga.Topanga has little in common with areas in San Fernando Valley, much less with Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Dorothy Cole	no				yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole.Do not split into two separate congressional districts. Instead add community of Newhall into the antelope valley- santa clarita valley congressional district
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Kenneth Mazur(duplicate)	yes	Topanga association for a scenic community	Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Combine assembly districts of West side-Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks-Santa monica into one assembly district.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Carol Upton	no				yes	instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County.Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley connected to Santa clarita in senate seat will keep inland valley together.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Karilyn Crolius	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita valley whole. Do not split city into two congressional districts. Instead, add community of Newhall into Antelope valley-Santa Clarita valley congressional district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Topanga		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles, Orange	Cerritos		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los angeles	Topanga,Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los angeles	Santa clarita, newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles,East ventura county	Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita.		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622	Shared interests and challenges.		no			West side-santa monica and Thousand oaks- santa monica districts are great.	
4langeles_20110622	Keep The inland valleys together and better represented.		no				
4langeles_20110622			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Karilyn Crolius	no				yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County.Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley connected to Santa clarita in senate seat will keep inland valley together.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Josie Kelly	no				yes	Do not associate Topanga with Santa Clarita instead of the westside.This change endangers and damages our hope for adeqate support.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Liz Bush	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts.Keep it whole.Instead, add the community of Newhall into the antelope valley-santa clarita valley congressional district
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Beverly McCalla	no				yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole by drawing lines to include all of Newhall. Especially south of Lyons Ave.Newhall has been a part of Santa Clarita for over 30 years.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Linda Tarnoff	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts.Newhall is different from San Fernando Valley-Tujunga.Seperated by mountain range.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Stacy Sledge	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Clarita Valley has no commonalities with Topanga,Malibu,Woodland Hills,Calabasas,Thousand Oaks.Revisit proposal,make lines similar to 1991 and 2001 District maps.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Eileen Daniels	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole. Do not split it into two districts.Add community of Newhall into the AVSanta Clarita Valley congressional district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles, East ventura	Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita.		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita.		no	yes	emergency preparedness and response, land use, environment	
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall	Lyons Ave.	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles, San Fernando Valley	San Fernando, Tujunga, Santa Clarita, Newhall	mountains.	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Topango,Malibu,Woodland Hills,Calabasas,Thousand Oaks.		no	yes	Watershed,similar interests in wildlife and environment(santa monica mountains)	
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622	Keep The inland valleys together and better represented.		no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Carol Upton	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts.Add community of Newhall into Antelope valley-Santa Clarita valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	William Paige	no		West Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	West Los Angeles should be included with its neighbors, santa monica,beverly hills,westwood,brentwood.
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Michael Lewis	no				yes	Do not split Granada Hills in two.Do not use Balboa as the dividing line. Instead, continue south on the 5 until it meets for 405
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Alison Robinson	no				yes	Not wise to split Granada Hills in two.Violates integrity of town.Instead of using Balboa as boundary line, simply continue south on the 5 until it meets the 405
4langeles_20110622	6222011	Joanne Grosh	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Together
4langeles_20110622_topanga	6222011	Catherine Robin Rudnikoff	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Combine districts of West side-santa monica mountains and Thousand oaks-santa monica mountains together as a senate district.Do not join this area with Santa Clarita. No common interests.Rename new district Santa Monica Mountains-bay west side
4langeles_20110622_topanga	6222011	RC Brody	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Combine districts of West side-santa monica mountains and Thousand oaks-santa monica mountains together as a senate district.Do not join this area with Santa Clarita. No common interests.Rename new district Santa Monica Mountains-bay west side

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los angeles	Santa monica,beverly hills,westwood,brentwood, west los angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Granada Hills	Balboa, the 5, the 405	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Granada Hills	Balboa, the 5, the 405	no	no		
4langeles_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita,Calabasas,		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_topanga	los angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita,Calabasas,		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				looks like all the high income areas are in one district, all the low income areas in the other.
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110622_topanga			no				
4langeles_20110622_topanga			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_topanga	6222011	Frank Harper	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Combine districts of West side-santa monica mountains and Thousand oaks-santa monica mountains together as a senate district.Do not join this area with Santa Clarita. No common interests.Rename new district Santa Monica Mountains-bay west side
4langeles_20110622_topanga	6222011	Ronald Sharrin	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Combine districts of West side-santa monica mountains and Thousand oaks-santa monica mountains together as a senate district.Do not join this area with Santa Clarita. No common interests.Rename new district Santa Monica Mountains-bay west side
5sbarbara_20110615_2	6152011	Jean and Richard Jacoby	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Current map of new senate and assembly districts splits Lompoc in two.This will not provide fair and effective representation for the city.
5sbarbara_20110616_2	6172011	Carol Benham	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	State assembly and senate proposed districts for Lompoc are troubling.Splits city in half.reconfigure maps to keep Lompoc intact.Do not split it from Neighbors.If split, lompoc will be in district of dissimilar cities.non beneficial.
5sbarbara_20110621	6212011	Anthony Ayala	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split up Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110621	6212011	Edith Chaney	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Bisection of Lompoc into two districts is unacceptable and inconsistent with guidelines to keep communties intact.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_topanga	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita,Calabasas,		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_topanga	los angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita,Calabasas,		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110615_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110616_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc, Vandenberg Village,Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks, Santa Paula, Ojai, Fillmore		no	yes	shopping, dining,	
5sbarbara_20110621	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110621	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_topanga			no				
4langeles_20110622_topanga			no				
5sbarbara_20110615_2			no				
5sbarbara_20110616_2	must stay with surrounding COIs		no				
5sbarbara_20110621			no			Commission is supposed to keep cities intact, get rid of gerrymandering for partisan purposes.	
5sbarbara_20110621			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110621	6212011	Paul G. Rosso	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in two.in the past, joining lompoc with other districts has been devastating. Dont zig zag boundary through middle of town. Making neighbors on same street represented by different officials.
5sbarbara_20110622	6222011	Lisa White	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into two different districts for state and federal representation.Commissions own guidelines say a community should not be split and disenfranchised.
5sbarbara_20110622	6222011	Justin LeCavalier	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Splitting up Lompoc is a bad thing. We deserve one voice for all of Lompoc.splitting will make voice impossible to be heard because of two small populations
5sbarbara_20110622	6222011	Mary Ferris	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5ventura_20110621	6212011	Danielle Smith	no				yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County.Keeping Camarillo,thousand oaks,moorpark,simi valley connected to Santa Clarita in senate seat will keep inland valleys togetherrepresented.
5ventura_20110621	6212011	Ronald Kirk	no				yes	Please observe historical sanctity of East Ventura County.Simi Valley,thousand oaks, Moorpark, Camarillo form a coherent community of values.Representation is denied when districts are divided.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110621	Santa Barbara	Lompoc,Simi Valley, Santa Barbara, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita.		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5ventura_20110621	East Ventura County	Camarillo, thousand oaks,moorpark,simi valley, santa clarita		no	yes		
5ventura_20110621	Ventura	Camarillo,moorpark,thousand oaks, simi valley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110621			no				
5sbarbara_20110622			no				
5sbarbara_20110622			no				
5sbarbara_20110622			no				we are glad you are making an attempt to take past political gerrymandering out of redistricting.
5ventura_20110621	Keep inland populations together.		no				
5ventura_20110621			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110622	6222011	Vivian Zinn	no				yes	Change first draft maps.Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu,Nest it with East Ventura County.keep camarillo,thousand oaks,moorpark,simi valley connected to Santa Clarita in senate seat to keep inland valleys together and represented.
5ventura_20110622	6222011	Vivian Zinn	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole. Do not split it into two congressional districts.Add community of newhall into antelope valley-santa clarita CD
5ventura_20110622	6222011	Roy Talley	no				yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark have nothing in common with Santa Clarita.These communities need to stay with Ventura County.
6kern_20110621_2	6162011	Howard	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	no	
6kern_20110622	6222011	Deborah Corlett	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest in Kern County.We need our current representatives
6merced_20110621	6282011	Robin Westrope	no				yes	Coastal area is not in tune with needs of Central Valley. They do not understand agriculture requirements.Valley voice must be heard in unison with valley constituents, not coastal who are liberal.Valley inhabitants are conservative.
6merced_20110621	6212011	Janine Falasco	no			Merced	yes	Not in favor of including coastal area within merced voting district.different mindset than those in agricultural area of san joaquin valley.
6mono_20110622	6222011	Judy King	no			mono	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110622	ventura	Camarillo,moorpark,thousand oaks, simi valley		no	yes		
5ventura_20110622	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
5ventura_20110622	Los Angeles, Ventura	Simi Valley, MoorPark, Santa Clarita		no	no		
6kern_20110621_2				no	yes	work	
6kern_20110622	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6merced_20110621	Merced			no	yes	Central valley needs others with agricultural requirements.	
6merced_20110621	Merced			no	no		
6mono_20110622				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110622	Keep inland suburban valleys connected to represent them and show populations		no				
5ventura_20110622			no				
5ventura_20110622			no				
6kern_20110621_2			no			Current plans are perfect.	
6kern_20110622			no				
6merced_20110621			yes	Merced	Coastal valley not understanding needs of central valley.		
6merced_20110621			yes	Merced	Coastal area votes should not be included with agricultural area of san joaquin valley.		
6mono_20110622			no				call for input is just a cover since you never listened to us the last time you redistricted.you didnt last time.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6stanislaus_20110621	6212011	Richard Robinson	no			Stanislaus	yes	Do not combine Central valley area with coastal communities.Grouping these will lead to no representaion for either.
7sclara_20110621	6212011	Eddie Garcia	yes	Latino Leadership Alliance			yes	Opposition to San jose assembly and senate district plans.Do not remove segments of east san jose and place in north alameda county.this would remove our political voice at state level.Instead adopt a central and east san jose assembly district.mckee road
7sclara_20110621	6212011	Eddie Garcia	yes	Latino Leadership alliance			yes	as northern boundary. Western boundary use highway 87. for other boundaries avoid creating a major drop in current ethnic population.23rd and 28th assembly districts should be combined to create Santa Claramonterey county state senate district.
8alameda_20110621	6212011	Andrea Schacter(duplicate)	no				yes	Do not split city of fremont into 2 congressional districts and split between split between 2 counties, alameda and santa clara.Fremont should be kept with newark and union city.
8alameda_20110622	6222011	Vik Ghai	no				yes	Do not split Fremont community.keep fremont with the tri cities and southern alameda county.do not split fremont between congressional and legislative districts.
8alameda_20110622	6222011	Paul	no				yes	City of Pleasanton has been split into three parts. Please allow the city to be whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6stanislaus_20110621				no	yes	keep valley and coastal separate. Each have different needs	
7sclara_20110621	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	no		
7sclara_20110621	Santa Clara, monterey county, san benito	San Jose	highway 87, mckee road	no	no		
8alameda_20110621	Alameda, Santa Clara,	Fremont,Newark, Union city.		no	yes	governmental business. Faster action on behalf of fremont citizens.	
8alameda_20110622	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110622	Alameda	Pleasanton		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6stanislaus_20110621			no				
7sclara_20110621			no				
7sclara_20110621			no				
8alameda_20110621			no				
8alameda_20110622			no				
8alameda_20110622			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110621	6212011	Victoria	no				yes	assign odd number to Contra Costa so that new senator election can take place in 2012.If we are given even number, election will be in 2014, leaving us with two years of no legitimate representation in senate.Do not disenfranchise us.
8marin_20110622	6222011	Patricia and Lewis Zuelow	no				yes	Make marin county one district or continue combining it with Sonoma.These two counties have a few things in common at least.This is not true of marin and Northern CA.Representatives would be stretched out.situations are different.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Kamran Nikravan	no				no	
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Carol Hunt	no		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be included in area.Not dropped.Santa Monica should be removed from our area. It does not fit.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Michael Fuss	no		Kagel Canyon	Los Angeles	yes	Dont include with Arleta and Pacomia. Include Kagel Canyon in a foothill community district.Kagel has similar interests as Burbank,La Cresenta,Sunland Tujunga.these other foothill communities share pro environmental concerns.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Vikki Holmes	no				yes	Dont split city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts.Instead, add community of Newhall into Antelope Valleysanta Clarita Valley congressional district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110621	Alameda, Contra Costa			no	yes	state funding for education, transportation, health and human services, parks, water resources	
8marin_20110622	Marin,			no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1				no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Monica,Palos Verdes,Hawthorne, Lawndale,Inglewood,Lennox,Manhattan Beach,Redondo Beach,Torrance,Wiseburn.		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Sunland Tujunga, La Cresenta, Burbank.		no	yes	Shared environmental concerns	
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall,Antelope Valley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110621			no				
8marin_20110622			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no			I strongly oppose the redistricting.	
4langeles_20110621_1			no			the Schools special education breakdown has been in place for 20 years. And lists the cities in the district.	
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Wayde Hunter	no				yes	Using Balboa Blvd in Granada Hills as boundary line for Santa Clarita Los Angeles Senate districts is an error as it divides community of Granada Hills in two,and divides city of L.A.s 12th Council District,and Granada Hills North Neighborhood district.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Wayde Hunter	no				yes	Solution would be to continue east boundary of Santa Clarita District.(western boundary of San Fernando L.A. district Along the 5 Freeway to 405 Freeway, then turning west along 118 Freeway.this would have no impact on demographics.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Jack Simonson	no				yes	keep neighborhoods stretching from West hollywood to Silverlake together in state legislature districts.They belong together.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Roger Klemm	no				yes	Support proposed map which keeps Sunland and Tujunga in same district as Kagel Canyon,Lake View Terrace,Shadow Hills,La Tuna Canyon,La Crescenta,Montrose,Glendale,Burbank.They are a COI.SunlandTujunga not in Sun Valley or Pacoima
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Chris	no				yes	Santa Claritas Political Representatives should be local, from Santa Clarita, and not part of San Fernando Valley voting populace.
7sclara_20110618	6182011	Sarah Wilson	yes	Freelance editor and writer, Homeschool Review	Ben Lomond	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, Boulder Creek, and Bonny Doon in Santa Cruz

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_1				no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles. San Fernando	Santa Clarita, San Fernando,Granada Hills	Eastern Boundary of Santa Clarita District, 5 Freeway,405 Freeway, 118 Freeway.	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	West Hollywood, Silverlake		no	yes	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender influenced communty	
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles			no	yes	Views of mountainshills,open space,rural lifestyles,share desire to enjoy and preserve area.	
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
7sclara_20110618	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Meto	Sunnyvale, Ben Lomond, Mountain View, Saratoga, Keep Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, Boulder Creek, Bonny Doon	Highway 9	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1	only way to hold this together is by keeping these areas in same district.		no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
7sclara_20110618			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110621_2	6212011	Caroline Roth	no		Milpitas	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Milpitas in Santa Clara, not Alameda
7sclara_20110621_2	6212011	Melanie Espino	yes	Director, Community Education Council on Aging Silicon Valley	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep San Jose together
7scruz_20110621	6212011	Rebecca J. Garcia	yes	Trustee, Cabrillo Community College	Watsonville	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Salinas and Watsonville in the same district
8alameda_20110621_2	6212011	Bob Howe	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Combine Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore with San Ramon, Danville, Walnut Creek
8alameda_20110621_3	6212011	Andrea Schacter	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont with Newark and Union City
8alameda_20110622_2	6222011	Ann Schultz	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro together
8alameda_20110623	6232011	Elissa Kartman	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro together
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Joanne Peterson	no		Martinez	Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Sasha L. Robinson	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Berkeley, Oakland, Richmond together
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Cheryll Grover	no			Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Neil Janes	yes	Lead clerk specialist, Contra Costa County Conservation and Development		Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110622	6222011	Greg Feer	yes	CEO, Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council	Martinez	Contra Costa	no	
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Patricia and Lewis Zuelow	no			Marin	yes	Make Marin one district or combine with Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110621_2	Santa Clara, Alameda			no	yes		
7sclara_20110621_2	Santa Clara, Alameda, Monterey, San Benito	San Jose		no	yes	Shared political voice	
7scruz_20110621	Santa Cruz	Watsonville, San Jose		no	yes		
8alameda_20110621_2	Alameda	Plesanton, Dublin, Livermore, Union City, Hayward, San Leandro		no	yes		
8alameda_20110621_3	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes	Common interests	
8alameda_20110622_2	Alameda	San Leandro, Oakland, Berkeley		no	yes		
8alameda_20110623	Alameda	San Leandro, Oakland		no	yes	Unique small-city issues	
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez, Oakland, Richmond, Berkeley		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110622	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		
8marin_20110622_2	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110621_2			no				
7sclara_20110621_2			no				
7scruz_20110621			no				Let other Latino populations have the same representation we do
8alameda_20110621_2			no				
8alameda_20110621_3			no				
8alameda_20110622_2			no				
8alameda_20110623			no				
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator
8ccosta_20110622			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator
8marin_20110622_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Chris Brown (duplicate)	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Do not combine San Francisco with Marin
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Chris W.	no			Marin	yes	District 1 Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, Lake, western Siskiyou; District 6 Mill Valley, Sausalito, Marin city, Tiburon, San Rafael, Strawberry, Belvedere, Corete Madera, Larkspur, San Anselmo, Fairfax, Ross, Terra Linda Marinwood, Novato
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Sondra S. Wuthnow	no			Marin	yes	Do not include Marin and Sonoma with north coast counties
8napa_20110622_2	6222011	Nan Vaaler	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110622_2	6222011	John Stephens	no			Napa	no	
8sfrancisco_20110621	6212011	Terry Turrentine	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	no	
8sonoma_20110621_2	6212011	Diane Hichwa	yes	Conservation chair, Madrone Audubon Society	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Sonoma County should contain the west county, the north county and the coast
8sonoma_20110621_2	6212011	Efren Carrillo	yes	Chair and Fifth District Supervisor, Sonoma County Board of Supervisors		Sonoma	no	Combine Sonoma with Marin, Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Humbolt, Del Norte
8sonoma_20110622	6222011	Gary Wysocky	yes	Councilman, Santa Rosa City	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with the north coast, not the central valley
8sonoma_20110622	6222011	Barbara Cates	no		Healdsburg	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with the North Bay, not with the valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110622_2	Marin	San Rafael		no	no		
8marin_20110622_2	Marin, Siskiyou, Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, Lake, Sonoma	Cloverdale, Healdsburg, Windsor, Geyserville, Sebastopol, Santa Rosa, Guerneville, Occidental, Graton, Annapolis, Monte Rio, Jenner, Bodega, Bay, Two Rock, Cazadero, Sausalito, Marin city, Tiburon, San Rafeal, Strawberry, Belvedere, Corte Madera, Larkspur	cities continued San Anselmo, Fairfax, Ross, Terra Linda Marinwood, Novato	no	no		
8marin_20110622_2	Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, Siskiyou	San Rafeal, Novato, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Different transportation issues,	Different industries
8napa_20110622_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	Shared library system	
8napa_20110622_2	Napa			no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110621	San Francisco	San Francisco		no	no		
8sonoma_20110621_2	Sonoma	Santa Rosa, Petaluma		no	yes	Shared water system	
8sonoma_20110621_2	Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Marin, Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Humbolt, Del Norte			no	yes		Shared wine production and tourism
8sonoma_20110622	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Shared transportation, water corridors	Shared economy
8sonoma_20110622	Sonoma	Healdsburg		no	yes	Shared environmental interests	Agriculture, wine production

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110622_2			no				
8marin_20110622_2			no				
8marin_20110622_2			no				
8napa_20110622_2			no				
8napa_20110622_2			no				Good job
8sfrancisco_20110621			no				San Francisco needs an odd senate seat
8sonoma_20110621_2			no				
8sonoma_20110621_2			no				
8sonoma_20110622			no				
8sonoma_20110622			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110622	6222011	Kimberly Kunkel	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with Sonoma
1sdiego_20110607	5162011	Milton Gale	no			San Diego	yes	Recommend that the 51st district be made extremely Democrat (over 70) and the 52nd district be made extremely Republican (over 70)
1sdiego_20110607	612011	Mateo Camarillo	yes	San Diego Latino Redistricting Committee, Chairman		San Diego	yes	Include Section 2 district in San Diego County, include Imperial County in another district
2riverside_20110607	5262011	Marion Ashley, Barbara Hanna, Brian De Forge, Ella Zanowic	yes	Riverside County 5th District, Supervisor; City of Banning, Mayor; City of Beaumont, Mayor; City of Calimesa, Mayor	Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa	Riverside	yes	Keep together Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa cities and county areas of Cabazon and Morngo band of Mission Indians in current ADSD
2riverside_20110607		Walker Clute	no			Roverside	yes	Allow district lines to follow not only city lines, but mountains crests, the middle of deserts, and lakes.
2sbernardino_20110607		Joe Ayala	no		Rialto	San Bernadino	yes	See attached maps Boundaries north15215, south 60, east 30, west 15. Similar to San Bernadino, Fontana, Colton. Keep separate from Upland, Claremont, Redlands

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110622	Sonoma, Loki	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110607				no	no		
1sdiego_20110607	San Diego, Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110607		Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa		no	yes	Geographically connected, close in proximity, regional sharing of services, share Animal Control Services	
2riverside_20110607				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110607		Fontana, San Bernadino, Colton, Upland, Claremont, Redlands		no	yes	Democratic values, cultural diversity, strong support for school diversity leadership, respect all residents including homeless	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110622			no				
1sdiego_20110607			no				
1sdiego_20110607		Latinos in SD County form a sufficiently large, geographically compact, cohesive voting block to form Section 2 AD. Keep separate from Imperial County because not geographically compact.	no				
2riverside_20110607			no				
2riverside_20110607			no				
2sbernardino_20110607			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110607	5182011	Pendleton	yes	Palm Desert High School, business coordinator	Palm Desert	San Bernadino	yes	Do not put Coachella Valley with another separate distinctive region
2sbernardino_20110607	5262011	Marion Ashley, Barbara Hanna, Brian De Forge, Ella Zanowic	yes	Riverside County 5th District, Supervisor; City of Banning, Mayor; City of Beaumont, Mayor; City of Calimesa, Mayor	Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa	Riverside	yes	Keep together Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa cities and county areas of Cabazon and Morngo band of Mission Indians in current ADSD
3orange_20110607_2	5162011	Tamara Mason	yes	City of La Habra, City Clerk	La Habra	Orange	yes	Put La Habra with other Orange County cities, NOT with any Los Angeles Cities
3orange_20110607_2	5182011	Sukhee Kang	yes	City of Irvine, Mayor	Irvine	Orange	yes	No changes to Irvines supervisorial district boundaries, Irvine remains whole within a supervisorial district in Orange County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110607				no	yes	recreation, restaurants, hotels, business support of schools, surrounded by mountains	tourism
2sbernardino_20110607		Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa		no	yes	Geographically connected, close in proximity, regional sharing of services, share Animal Control Services	
3orange_20110607_2	Orange, Los Angeles			no	yes	North Orange County Community College District, Fullerton Joint Unified High School District, North Orange County City partnership, CSU Fullerton, OC Transportation Authority and Municipal Water District of OC	North OC Economic Development partnership, relies on technical and funding resources for infrastructure and water issues from Orange County-based agencies
3orange_20110607_2	Orange	Irvine		no	yes	common histories and inner-city relationships, diverse ethnic population. Need to be together to master-plan community effectively.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110607			no				
2sbernardino_20110607			no				
3orange_20110607_2			no				
3orange_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110607_2	5172011	Scott Nelson	yes	City of Placentia, Mayor	Placentia	Orange	yes	Maintain SD 29 along 57 corridor, from 91 to the south to 210 in north Arcadia, Bradbury, Brea, Chino, Chino Hills, Claremont, Diamond Bar, Glendora, La Habra, La Habra Heights, La Verne, Monrovia, Placentia, San Dimas, Sierra Madre, Walnut, Yorba Linda
3orange_20110607_2	5182011	James Gomez	yes	City of La Habra, Mayor	La Habra	Orange	yes	Put La Habra with other Orange County cities, NOT with any Los Angeles Cities
4langeles_20110607_2	5182011	Janet Farlee	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep W San Fernando Valley intact. W of 405 Freeway (or Sepulveda Blvd), between Mulholland Hwy on south and Santa Susana on north, L.A. county line on far west, Verdugo and San Gabriel Mtns on east. Towns North Hills to Chatsworth, Encino to Calabasa
4langeles_20110607_2	5182011	Janet Farlee	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Put Calabasas with Woodland Hills, Hidden Hills, Tarzana. Do not put with Malibu or coastal region

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110607_2	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernadino	Arcadia, Bradbury, Brea, Chino, Chino Hills, Claremont, Diamond Bar, Glendora, La Habra, La Habra Heights, La Verne, Monrovia, Placentia, San Dimas, Sierra Madre, Walnut, Yorba Linda	57, 91, 210	no	yes	Use SR 57, CSU Fullerton, collaboration of public services, transportation coalition between multiple cities, shared wildlife corridor	Similar working class incomes, housing needs
3orange_20110607_2	Orange, Los Angeles			no	yes	North Orange County Community College District, Fullerton Joint Unified High School District, North Orange County City partnership, CSU Fullerton, OC Transportation Authority and Municipal Water District of OC	North OC Economic Development partnership, relies on technical and funding resources for infrastructure and water issues from Orange County-based agencies
4langeles_20110607_2	Los Angeles	Verdugo, North Hills, Chatsworth, Encino, Calabasas	San Gabriel Mountains, Santa Susana, Mulholland Hwy, 405 Freeway, Sepulveda Boulevard	no	yes	Weather, utilities, traffic congestion, shopping, population	
4langeles_20110607_2		Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Malibu		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110607_2			no				
3orange_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				Thank you for serving state on this important, ground-breaking commission
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2	5162011	JJ Cacavas, Dave Hauser, John Higby, Ruthann, Levison, Dana Martin, Debbie Martin, Russell Myers, Sandi Parris	yes	Sand Canyon Community Association, Board of Directors	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Claritva Valley intact.
4langeles_20110607_2	672011	Cyndee Riding	no		Arleta	San Clarita	yes	Boundaries N-Pacoima Wash-between Woodman and I-5; S-Roscoe between Woodma, Tujunga Wash between Roscoe and Laural Canyon; E-I-5 to Branford up to Laurel Canyon and Tujunga Wash; W-Woodman between Roscoe and Pacoima Wash
4langeles_20110607_2		Jose Castello	no				yes	Boundaries N-Monterey Park; S-Commerce; E-Montebello; West Boyle Heights.
4langeles_20110607_2		Pablo Hernandez Jr.	no		Alhambra	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries North-Huntington Drive; S10 Freeway, E-San Gabriel Blvd; W-710 Freeway
4langeles_20110607_2		Celia Gonzalez	no		Boyle Heights	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-Monterey Park; S-Commerce; E-Montebello; West Boyle Heights.
4langeles_20110607_2		Rosa Gutierrez	no		Boyle Heights	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-Monterey Park; S-Commerce; E-Montebello; West Boyle Heights.
4langeles_20110607_2		Esperanza Sandoval	no		Boyle Heights	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-Monterey Park; S-Commerce; E-Montebello; West Boyle Heights.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2				no	yes	Rural, country lifestyle. Preserving open space, establishing trails and parks. Excellent education system. Santa Clarita Community College District.	Enterprise Zone, SCV Economic Development Corporation
4langeles_20110607_2		Branford	Pacoima Wash, Woodman, I-5, Roscoe, Tujunga Wash, Laurel Cyn, Branford	no	yes	2 high schools, 5 elementary schools, 4 preschoolchildcare schools, National Night Out to celebrate residents of community; strong hispanic influence	Low-income, residential-family businesses
4langeles_20110607_2		Montebello, Commerce		no	yes	problems with gangs	
4langeles_20110607_2			Huntington Drive, 10 Freeway, San Gabriel Blvd, 710 Freeway	no	yes	Chinese New Year Festival	Middle-class community
4langeles_20110607_2		Montebello, Commerce		no	yes	problems with gangs, speak Spanish, Adult Schools	Same jobs
4langeles_20110607_2		Montebello, Commerce		no	yes	problems with gangs, speak Spanish, Adult Schools	Same jobs
4langeles_20110607_2		Montebello, Commerce		no	yes	problems with gangs, speak Spanish, Adult Schools	Same jobs

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Anguiano Irene	no		Boyle Heights	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-Monterey Park; S-Commerce; E-Montebello; West Boyle Heights.
4langeles_20110607_2	5132011	Steve Madison	yes	City of Pasadena, Councilmember	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena should continue to be part of CD that includes Burbank, Glendale
4langeles_20110607_2	5192011	Sandra E. Thomas	yes	Quality of Life Center, Inc., CEODean of Scholars	Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	Include Altadena with Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale
4langeles_20110607_2	5152011	Jonas Peterson	yes	Santa Clarita Valley Economic Development Corporation, President and CEO	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley together
4langeles_20110607_2	5232011	Jim Cohen	yes	City of Hidden Hills, Mayor	Hidden Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu, Westlake Village together
4langeles_20110607_2	5302011	Jane Rogers	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley intact Saugus, Canyon Country, Newhall, Valencia

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2		Montebello, Commerce		no	yes	problems with gangs, speak Spanish, Adult Schools	Same jobs
4langeles_20110607_2		Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale		no	yes		Working relationships for operations and public services that have developed over years
4langeles_20110607_2		Altadena, Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale		no	yes	Boards and volunteers of non-profits and Chamber of Commerce draw from all four cities. Same environmental concerns. Educational issues.	
4langeles_20110607_2				no	yes		Advance economy of Santa Clarita Valley through recruitment, retention and expansion of business and suppport of development activities, programs and services in a unified community
4langeles_20110607_2		Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu, Westlake Village		no	yes	Las Virgenes Unified School District, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, MalibuLost Hills Sherriff Station, The Acorn newspaper	
4langeles_20110607_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				Thank CRC for opportunity to comment on difficult process and important task to ensure equal and fair representation for all citizens of California
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2	5272011	Julian Harwell	no		San Marino	Los Angeles	yes	San Marin should be in 44th AD with Pasadena, South Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, La Canada Flintridge, Arcadia
4langeles_20110607_2		Golando Zipeda	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Zulma Villalobos	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2		Pasadena, South Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, La Canada Flintridge, Arcadia, San Marino		no	yes	Pasadena Area Community College District, Pasadena City College, San Marino High School, La Canada High School, Monrovia High School, South Pasadena High School, Temple City High School, Blair High School, Rio Hondo League	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Guadalupe Volasco	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Oscar Reyes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Ana Avalos Reyes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Anonymous	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Veroniz B. Mendozo	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Silvia Gonzalez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Reyna Francisco	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Lina Arecko	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Paula Androde	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Alvaro	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Gilberto Berganza	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Yolanda Cruz	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Pedro Fours	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Oswaldo Garcia	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Adelo Lozano	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Mario Ortiz	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Genara Paxtor	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Oscar Reyes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Silvia Rivera	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Lucas Priuas	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Cesar Badas	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Gloria Roman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Evelica Gomez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Guadalupe Volasco	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Zulma Villalobos	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Golando Zepeda	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Claudia Carrillo	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Ismael Gonzalez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Andrea Martinez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Irma Martinez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Catalina Rivas	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Victor Rivera	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Paula Tellez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Ivan Tellez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Lydia Zavala	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Lina Greekek	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Lucia Bonilla	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Tania Cacheo	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Maria Cardena	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Reyna Francisco	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Roberto Garcia	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Maria Garcia	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Silvia Gonzalez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Raul Hernandez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Alicia Jimenez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Irma Lopez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		M. Luisa Ortega	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Veroniz B. Mendozo	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2		Anonymous	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Ana Avalos Reyes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Mariela Rodriguez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries N-North Hollywood, Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy), Griffith Park, LA Zoo; S-Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, right before 105; E-Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, W-Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park
4langeles_20110607_2		Phil Reyes	no		Duarte	Los Angeles	yes	See attached tables

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2			Los Feliz Blvd, Century Blvd, Hollywood Park Casino, 105 Fwy, Los Angeles St, 110 Fwy, Fairfax Blvd, Kenneth Hahn Park, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, LA Zoo, North Hollywood	no	yes	Central American Federation parade. 96 are MexicanCentral American in El Salvador Community. Central American Historial District developing	
4langeles_20110607_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				Thanks for opportunity to submit plans. Appreciates work the commission has accomplished to this point and want to recognize dedication to complex and time consumiong process

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_2	5202011	Patrick West	yes	City of Long Beach, City Manager	Long Beach	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110607_2	5212011	Lois Miller	no		San Marino	Los Angeles	yes	Include San Marino in AD 44.
4langeles_20110607_2	5162011	Jeffrey K. Ball	yes	Whittier Area Chamber of Commerce, Legislative Committee Chair	Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Keep intact Puente Hills Corridor (Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, La Mirada, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar)
4langeles_20110607_2	5172011	Marvin and Mary Owen	no		La Crescenta	Los Angeles	yes	Draw Glendale, La Canada, La Crescenta together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110607_2		San Marino		no	yes	Contiguous borders with South Pasadena, mutual support of fire trucks and police, helicopters. Pasadena Area Community College District, 210 Freeway, Huntington Gardens	
4langeles_20110607_2		Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, La Mirada, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar		no	yes	Share representation at County Supervisor level, one source of information through Whittier Daily News and San Gabriel Valley Tribune	
4langeles_20110607_2		La Canada, Glendale, La Crescenta		no	yes	Doctormedical facilities, restaurants, shopping, movies. Glendale Unified School District.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_2			no				Would like to invite Commission to Long Beach for a Post-Map public input hearing. Also offers a free meeting room in Long Beach and technical support from City of Long Beach.
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				
4langeles_20110607_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110607_2	5192011	Robert Huber	yes	City of Simi Valley, Mayor	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep communities within Ventura County kept together
1sdiego_20110607	5132011	Gagandeep Kaur (and 15 signatures)	yes	Sikh Foundation, Vice President; Poway Interfaith Team, Co-founder	Poway	San Diego	yes	Put Poway with Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos, Sabre Springs, Rancho Bernardo
1imperial_20110614	6142011	Lauryl Driscoll	no			Imperial	yes	Keep Salton Sea all in one district in the Imperial County
1sdiego_20110613	6132011	R.D. Hernandez	no			San Diego	yes	Agree with creating districts serperating coastal, middle, and inland areas
1sdiego_20110613	6132011	Sandra McHale-Renk	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Put Chula Vista in a district with coastal communities, not with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110607_2	Ventura			no	yes	Governmental programs through single social service provider; Ventura County Sherriffs department; Ventura County Fire District, Ventura County Free Library System; Ventura Council of Governments; Ventura County Transportation Commission	
1sdiego_20110607		Poway		no	yes	150-200 Sikh families in these areas. Sikh is a distinct South Asian community.	
1imperial_20110614	Imperial			no	yes	San Diego and Riverside are disinterested the seas problems and splitting it between two districts causes problems. Sea is part of Imperials irrigation system	
1sdiego_20110613				no	no		
1sdiego_20110613	San Diego, Imperial			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110607_2			no				
1sdiego_20110607			no				
1imperial_20110614			no				
1sdiego_20110613	People on the coast have completely different needs than inland peoples		no				
1sdiego_20110613	Chula Vista has no connections with Imperial County		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110614	6142011	Rudy Sovinee	no			San Diego	no	
2riverside_20110614	6142011	Dick Diamond	no		Temecula	Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110614	6142011	Peter S. Millington	no		Murieta	Riverside	no	
2sbernardino_20110613	6132011	David Jorgenson	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not put Redlands and Yucaipa in the same district as Mono County or cities of Bishop, Baker, Adelanto, but with other nearby cities that share the same histories, resources, and goals
2sbernardino_20110613	6132011	Bob Stewart	no		Loma Linda	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland, and moutain communities unified, not with cities of Fontana, Rialto, Bloomington. Respect Redland Unified School District boundaries. Split towns to west and LA County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110614				no	no		
2riverside_20110614				no	no		
2riverside_20110614				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110613	Mono, San Bernardino	Redland, Yucaipa, Bishop, Baker, Adelandot		no	yes	different geography, size, interests, diversity	
2sbernardino_20110613	San Bernardino	Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland, Fontana, Rialto, Bloomington		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110614			no			Referring to httpc365736.r36.cf2.rackcdn.commaps_20110610_q2_cd_socal_nesan.pdf Concerned that Del Mar, National City, Rancho Bernardo looks to be protecting moneyed interests.	
2riverside_20110614			no				Great job on some logical redistricting for the state
2riverside_20110614			no				Please issue a list of 9-digit ZIP codes that will be in the revised districts to know who my representative is
2sbernardino_20110613			no				
2sbernardino_20110613			no			Districts can cross county lines, as shown in Claremont-Montclair area	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110613	6132011	Michael Murphy	no		Highland	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Redlands into 2 districts and instead, split Highland -- areas east of the 210 to District 5 and areas West of I-210 to District 4. Put Highland with San Bernardino, Colton, and Rialto
2sbernardino_20110613	6132011	Steven Palacios	no		Upland	San Bernardino	yes	Put Upland with Inland Empire, not Los Angeles
2sbernardino_20110614	6142011	Steven Palacios	no		Upland	San Bernardino	yes	Upland has more in common with Ontario than with Claremont
2sbernardino_20110614	6142011	Robert Ward	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put Cities of Yucaipa, Calimesa, Banning, Beaumont with Redlands, Loma Linda, and cities west (vs. cities east) in an Inland Empire district, NOT with Morongo Valley or High Desert area. Especially change for the Congressional Map
2sbernardino_20110614	6142011	Phil and Terry Wolloch	yes		Blue Jay	San Bernardino	yes	Keep moutain communities together, from Crestline to Big Bear, and not with urban areas
2sbernardino_20110614	6142011	Jim and Dora Huff	no		Crestline	San Bernardino	yes	Keep moutain communities together, from Green Valley Lake to Cedarpines Park, including Crestline
2sbernardino_20110614	6142011	anonymous	no			San Bernardino	yes	Rancho Cucamonga and Redlands have no common interest. Put Highlands, Redlands, San Bernardino together. Reconsider the Inland Action District attached

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110613		Redland, Yucaipa, Menton, Loma Linda, Highland, San Bernardino, Colton, and Rialto		no	yes	East Highland, Yucaipa, Menton, Loma Linda connected in terms of school Redlands Unified and community colleges, while West Highland is similar to west of I-210	
2sbernardino_20110613	Los Angeles, San Bernardino			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110614		Upland, Ontario, Claremont		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110614		Redlands, Loma Linda,Yucaipa, Calimesa, Banning, Beaumont		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110614		Crestline, Big Bear		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110614				no	yes	Many concerns in Crestline are the same for Lake Arrowhead and surrounding areas	
2sbernardino_20110614		Rancho Cucamonga, Highlands, Redlands, San Bernardino	Keep Rancho with the west end districts and create a district of east end cities	no	yes	Common transportation routes (I10 and 1-215), school districts, shopping facilities, water sources, joint political agencies	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110613			no			agrees with Rep. Lewis that Redlands was treated as an afterthought to fill population quotas	
2sbernardino_20110613			no				
2sbernardino_20110614			no				
2sbernardino_20110614			no				
2sbernardino_20110614			no				
2sbernardino_20110614			no				
2sbernardino_20110614			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110614	6142011	David E. Raley	no			San Bernardino	yes	Rancho Cucamonga and Redlands have no common interest.Reconsider the Inland Action District.
3orange_20110614	6142011	Carlos N. Olvera	yes	President Dana Point Historical Society, Former foreman Orange County Grand Jury	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not put East Dana Point against West Dana Point
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Judith Neal	no		San Dimas	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110614	6152011	CHRISTINE ROWE	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110614	6152011	Bernard Bregman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Brad Shermans district in the San Fernando Valley and look at the distribution of religious institutions to see if minorities are being served.
4langeles_20110614	6152011	Eileen Zierhut	no			Los Angeles	yes	Add Aqua Dulce to the Santa Clarita Valley Assembly district
4langeles_20110614	6152011	Kim Mischook	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Altadena and Pasadena together in one Assembly district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110614		Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands		no	yes	Common transportation routes (I10 and 1-215), school districts, shopping facilities, water sources, joint political agencies	
3orange_20110614				no	no		
4langeles_20110614				no	no		
4langeles_20110614				no	no		
4langeles_20110614				no	yes	Valley has large Jewish constuency, feels that Jewish community is being discriminated against.	
4langeles_20110614		Aqua Dulce		no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Altadena and Pasadena		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110614			no				
3orange_20110614	new alignment will doubled our efforts to deal with Sacramento on regional issues with other communities that do not share the same county values		no				
4langeles_20110614			no				Dont cross county lines and use diversity of population, not ethnic race as guidelines, maps are hard to read, do a better job
4langeles_20110614			no				Original Comments dated May 15, 2011 have not been posted on the site, disappointed for first darft
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110614	6152011	Deborah Moorehead	no			Los Angeles	yes	Add Aqua Dulce to the Santa Clarita Valley Assembly district
4langeles_20110614	6152011	Richard Stark	no			Los Angeles	yes	Return Palos Verdes Peninsula (PVP) back to the 36th district with the South Bay
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Patty Paul	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City intact
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Patricia A. Kelly	no			Los Angeles	yes	Add Aqua Dulce to the Santa Clarita Valley Assembly district and Newhall to the 25th Congressional District
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Gregory A. Dobie	no		Sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Sherman Oaks neighborhood with Van Nuys and the rest of their community, which is not the proposed Congressional District 27. Make a clearly defined central district in the San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110614	6152011	L. Hamilton	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Add Altadena to the Pasadena Assembly District
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Paul Carreiro	no		El Camino Village	Los Angeles	yes	Reconsider congressional boundaries suggested by Tiffany and Eugene (May 24 2011) - includes the western half of Gardena and El Camino Village with the South Bay district lines

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110614		Aqua Dulce		no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Palos Verdes Peninsula		no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Studio City		yes	no		
4langeles_20110614		Aqua Dulce, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Sherman Oak, Van Nuys		no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Altadena, Pasadena		no	yes	Share school district, with 6 PUSD schools in district, sizable African-American population in West Altadena interwoven with one in Northwest Pasadena	
4langeles_20110614		Gardena, El Camino Village		no	yes	South Bay is a community with common lifestyles, industry, family and El Camino Village identifies with South Bay	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614	PVPs interests are more closely allied to the South Bay than to Orange County		no				
4langeles_20110614	Studio City is an organized and active community, but it is hard to get attention as a non-established neighborhood		no				
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614			no			Draw district lines that reflect neighborhoods or geography	
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Lucille Lund	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep district 46 lines and keep coastal areas from inland areas
4langeles_20110614	6142011	George Alexander	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Carol Pickle	no			Los Angeles	yes	Dont split Pasadena based on a freeway
4langeles_20110614	6142011	L. Lund	no			Los Angeles	yes	Coastal communities have lost representation with these proposed districts
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Kathryn Dunn	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Lois Woodruff	no			Los Angeles	yes	Add Aqua Dulce to the Santa Clarita Valley Assembly District
4langeles_20110614	6142011	Joan P. Curd	no			Los Angeles	yes	Add Aqua Dulce to the Santa Clarita Valley District
5sbarbara_20110614	6142011	Paul G. Rosso	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Assembly District Lompoc should be entirely in SLOSB. Senate district CENTRAL COAST is bad, combine SLOSB and SBWVEN
5sbarbara_20110614	6142011	Terence Dressler	no			Santa Barbara	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110614				no	yes	Coastal issues (pollution, docks, wildlife) are different from inland issues	
4langeles_20110614				no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110614				no	no		
4langeles_20110614				no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Aqua Dulce		no	no		
4langeles_20110614		Aqua Dulce		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110614		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110614				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614			no				Map are useless, lack numerical designations and street identifications. Hard to know what is proposed for Studio City
4langeles_20110614			no			The new districts in the San Gabriel Valley would make them lose 2 Republican congressman	
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614			no				Maps are very poor quality and not usable
4langeles_20110614			no				
4langeles_20110614			no				
5sbarbara_20110614	Current proposed senate district has nothing in common		no			Congressional District for Central Coast called SLOSB is very good	
5sbarbara_20110614			no				Excellent job for Santa Barbara County districts, for 35th Assembly District and 19th Senate District and 23rd and 24th Congressional District

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110614	6152011	Rosie Chandler	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split up Lompoc City
5sbarbara_20110614	6142011	Eileen S. Anthoney	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Put Isla Vista with Santa Barbara City instead of in the Santa Ynez Valley and North County
5sbarbara_20110614	6152011	Debra Jewell	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split up Lompoc City
6stanislaus_20110606	622011	Sharon R. Silva	yes	President, CEO; Turlock Chamber of Commerce	Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Keep Turlock in the same district
8ccosta_20110613	6132011	Susan Wittenberg	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in George Millers district
8marin_20110613	6132011	Jeanne Lese	no			Marin	yes	Do not combine Marin with Mendocino and Humbolt; keep it with San Francisco and Santa Rosa
8napa_20110614	6132011	Eve Kahn	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon in same district as Napa County
8smateo_20110613	6132011	Patti L. Fry	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	no	
8sonoma_20110613	6132011	Stew Lauterbach	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Lake, Mendocino together as one district
8sonoma_20110614	6142011	Norma Smith Davis	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not combine Santa Rosa with Glenn, Colusa, Yolo, Sutter, Yuba, San Joaquin
9dnorte_20110614	6142011	Jaim Yarbrough	no			Del Norte	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110614		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110614		Isla Vista, Santa Barbara		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110614				no	no		
6stanislaus_20110606	Stanislaus	Turlock, Riverbank, Oakdale		no	yes		Highway 99 is lifeline of city, economic development
8ccosta_20110613	Contra Costa	Richmond, Berkeley, Oakland		no	yes		Geroge Miller has experience with supporting poor populations
8marin_20110613	Marin, Mendocino, Humbolt, San Francisco, Santa Rosa			no	no		
8napa_20110614	Napa			no	yes	recreation trails	agriculture, shared highway infrastructure
8smateo_20110613		Palo Alto, Stanford, Atherton, Portola Valley, San Carlos, Daly City, South San Francisco, Half Moon Bay		no	no		
8sonoma_20110613	Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Lake, Mendocino	Santa Rosa		no	yes	natural borders, other counties next to coast	
8sonoma_20110614	Glenn, Colusa, Yolo, Sutter, Yuba, San Joaquin, Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	no		
9dnorte_20110614	Del Norte			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110614			no				
5sbarbara_20110614	physically closer and different politically because of college-student area		no				
5sbarbara_20110614			no				
6stanislaus_20110606			no				
8ccosta_20110613			no				
8marin_20110613			no				
8napa_20110614			no				
8smateo_20110613			no			The district doesnt make sense, since mid-peninsula communities are combined with non-mid-peninsula communities	
8sonoma_20110613			no				
8sonoma_20110614			no				
9dnorte_20110614			no			I support the 1st draft of the Assembly map	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110615	6152011	Phillip J. Gobel	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Do not keep Del Notre County with Bay Area Counties or rural or agricultural counties
9humboldt_20110613	6132011	Don Tuttle	no			Humboldt	no	
9sacramento_20110614	6142011	John Gordon	no		Galt	Sacramento	yes	Combine Galt with Elk Grove, Dixon, Vallejo, Woodland, Sebastopol; do not combine with Napa or Solano
9yolo_20110614	6142011	Jim Provenza, Don Saylor	yes	vice-chair, Yolo County Board of Supervisors; Yolo County Supervisor	Woodland	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo together
9yolo_20110614_2	6142011	Annamaria Amenta	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Include I-80 corridor from Vallejo up to Sacramento and surrounding area and Davis into a district
6fresno_20110614	6142011	Daren Stemwedel	no		Clovis	Fresno	yes	Unite Clovis and Fresno. Fresno State straddles Clovis and Fresno. Clovis Unified School District campuses are in Fresno and vice versa.
6kern_20110612	6112011	Linda Jackson	no				yes	Bakersfield looks gerrymandered.
6merced_20110613	6132011	Loreace Hornyak	no				no	Northern portion of Fresno county with Madera is perfect fit. Communities west of Diablo range (Santa Clara, San Benito, Monterey) are not COIs or realistic to geographic boundaries.
6mono_20110604	642011	Zane Davis	no			Mono	yes	Mono should not be with Inyo and Southern CA. Mono should be with Sierra counties above Hwy 49. Mono is isolate, depends on tourists and needs environmental protection.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110615	Del Norte	Crescent City		no	no		
9humboldt_20110613	Humboldt			no	no		
9sacramento_20110614	Sacramento, Napa, Solano	Galt, Elk Grove, Dixon, Vallejo, Woodland, Sebastopol		no	yes		
9yolo_20110614	Yolo			no	yes	Shared educational facilites, interests, land use interests	Agriculture
9yolo_20110614_2	Yolo	Davis, Sacramento		no	yes		
6fresno_20110614	Fresno	Clovis, Fresno		no	yes	Fresno State straddles Clovis and Fresno. Clovis Unified School District campuses are in Fresno and vice versa.	
6kern_20110612		Bakersfield		no	no		
6merced_20110613	Madera, Monterey, Fresno, Santa Clara	Santa Clara, San Benito, Monterey		no	no		
6mono_20110604	Mono, Inyo, Sierra			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110615			no				
9humboldt_20110613			no				There are no redistricting meeting north of Oakland and Sacramento.
9sacramento_20110614			no				
9yolo_20110614			no				Retain same number of Senate districts as before
9yolo_20110614_2			no				
6fresno_20110614			no				
6kern_20110612			no				
6merced_20110613			no				
6mono_20110604			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6mono_20110611	6112011	Mary Andrews	no				no	
1imperial_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Guadalupe Arce	no		Brawley	Imperial	yes	Maintain collective choices of Imperial County with Coachella Valley. Do not change that current district.
1imperial_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Rebecca Terrazas-Baxte	no		Heber	Imperial	yes	Make state and federal districts similar to 80th AD. Do not put Imperial with SD.
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Anonymous	no		Carlsbad	San Diego	yes	keep coastal cities together Carlsbad, Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, Del Mar, Encinitas, Rancho Sant Fe, Solano Beach, Vista
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Lorena Gonzalez	yes	San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council, AFL-CIO		San Diego	yes	Border-Area Community of Interest Imperial County (including El Centro, Calexico), San Diego Countys National City, Chula Vista, San Ysidro, Barrio Logan, Coachella Valleys Coachella, Indio, Mecca. Separate Palm Springs, Palm Desert, Twentynine Palms

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6mono_20110611				no	no		
1imperial_20110523_5pmafter	Imperial	Brawley		no	no		
1imperial_20110523_5pmafter	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	yes	Imperial is geographically, environmentally related to eastern Riverside.	Imperial similar to eastern Riverside economically, demographically. Both Imperial and Coachella have interested developers and investors due to potential of renewable energy development
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter		Carlsbad, Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, Del Mar, Encinitas, Rancho Sant Fe, Solano Beach, Vista	I-5, Hwy 101	no	yes	common coastal identity, specific coastal markets, shared school districts, water districts, hospital district	
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	Imperial County, San Diego County	El Centro, Calexico, National City, Chula Vista, San Ysidro, Barrio Logan, Coachella, Indio		no	yes	larger households, speak Spanish at home, many more children and Latinos	Per capita income is 60 less than state average.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6mono_20110611			no			Take into consideration the elected official who will be servicing the districts you draw. Make sure there roads that make it easy to travel through the district.	
1imperial_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1imperial_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Allen Chan	yes	Asian Pacific American Coalition for Fair Representation, Co-Convener	San Diego	San Diego	no	Supports testimony of following speakers San Marcos 5132011 34, 36; San Diego 5142011 18, 20, 28, 44, 46
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jonathan Valdes	no		San Diego	San Diego	no	Supports testimony of following speakers San Marcos 5132011 34, 36; San Diego 5142011 18, 20, 28, 44, 46
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Janel Bruan	no		San Diego	San Diego	no	Supports testimony of following speakers San Marcos 5132011 34, 36; San Diego 5142011 18, 20, 28, 44, 46
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Megan Topanta	no		La Mesa	San Diego	no	Supports testimony of following speakers San Marcos 5132011 34, 36; San Diego 5142011 18, 20, 28, 44, 46
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Laura Cyphert	no	Lakeside Planning Group	Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Alpine, Descanso, Gutay, Pine Valley, Jamul, Poway, Ramona and other rural communities on western side of Cuyamaca mtn Range (and Cleveland National Forest) together
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Ardith Burrows	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Unify Escondido into one assembly district. Put it with San Marcos, Valley Center, Vista, Fallbrook
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jean Stanzick	no			San Diego	yes	Separate San Diego from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Christy Figueroa-Pettis	yes	San Diego Organizing Project, PICO National Network, Co-Chair		San Diego	yes	Keep together southeast San Diego, Encanto, Chula Vista, La Mesa, Spring Valley, East San Diego, Lemon Grove, SDSU College areas, etc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	Imperial, San Diego	El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Alpine, Descanso, Gutay, Pine Valley, Jamul, Poway, Ramona	Cuyamaca Mountain Range, Cleveland National Forest	no	yes	These are bedroom communities in the San Diego area, but Imperial County is more concerned with desert and farming communities	
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	San Diego	Vista		no	yes	Dry arid agricultural area	
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	San Diego, Imperial			no	yes	News, weather, entertainment, educational facilities, churches in San Diego	
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	San Diego	Chula Vista, La Mesa, Lemon Grove		no	yes	Share family interests. Face gang crime, limited senior serviceseducational resourcestransportationparks and recreation centers	Problems affordable housing, foreclosures

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Harold E. Gottschalk Jr.	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep East County, San Diego (Alpine, El Cajon, Lakeside, Santee, Ramona, Poway) together
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Edward Wilson	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Do not redistrict Lakeside with Imperial County
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Myrna Reyes	no			San Diego	no	Supports testimony of following speakers San Marcos 5132011 34, 36; San Diego 5142011 18, 20, 28, 44, 46
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Stewart Gage	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Unify Escondido into one AD, then put it with inland communities Valley Center, Hidden Meadows, Fallbrook, San Marcos, etc.
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Barbara Gottschalk	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep East San Diego County separate from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Marissa Acierto	no			San Diego	yes	Supports of Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law (SCAPAL) and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) in advocating to keep Asian Pacific Islander neighborhoods and communities together in San Diego County
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Carol Vacin	no			San Diego	yes	Keep East San Diego County communities together El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Ramona, Alpine, Poway and separate from Imperial.
1sdiego_20110524	5242011	Nick Dieterich	no			San Diego	yes	Keep Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, Valley Center, San Pasqual, Harmony Grove, Elfin Forest, Whispering Palms, Cielo, Crosby Estates, The Farms, Rancho Santa Fe together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter		Alpine, El Cajon, Lakeside, Santee, Ramona, Poway		no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	Imperial	Lakeside		no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter		Escondido		no	yes	Escondido is inland, not coastal.	All share an agricultural economy
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	Imperial, San Diego			no	yes	Imperial County and East San Diego County do not share a water districttransportation routes, etc.	
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter	San Diego, Imperial	El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Ramona, Alpine, Poway		no	yes	East San Diego County share transportationwater concerns	East San Diego County share economies
1sdiego_20110524		Vista, San Marcos, Escondido		no	yes	Rural	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110523_5pmafter			no				
1sdiego_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110524	5242011	Nick Dieterich	no			San Diego	yes	Coastal communities (W of I-5) together Oceanside, Carlsbad, Leucadia, Encinitas, Cardiff by the Sea, Solana Beach, Del Mar
1sdiego_20110524	5242011	Josie L. Calderon	yes	Mexican Business and Professional Association (MABPA)		San Diego	yes	Keep Chula Vista unified
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Norma Margot	no			Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella with Imperial
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ellen Swensen	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Salton Sea as is-partly in Riverside and partly in Imperial.
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Elizabeth Barkis	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Corona, Norco, Eastvale together
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dennis Lopez	no				yes	AD1 El Cerrito, Corona, Coronita, Home Gardens, Norco, NW Riverside City, Pedley, Rubidoux, Glen Avon, Sunnyslope, parts of unincorporated NW Riverside.
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dennis Lopez	no				yes	AD2 El Sobrante, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Perris, March Air Force Base, Central, Southern and Eastern portions of the City of Riverside, and the entire City of Moreno Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110524		Oceanside, Carlsbad, Leucadia, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Del Mar		no	yes	Coastal	
1sdiego_20110524		Chula Vista		no	yes	Over 50 Latino, large number of young families	Boom in housing and retail development, growth in resources
2riverside_20110523_5pm	Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110523_5pm	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes	Clean up Salton Sea so it is fit for tourism and recreational purposes.	Geothermal energy in South Salton Sea will provide jobs.
2riverside_20110523_5pm	Corona, Norco, Eastvale			no	yes	Mayors all work together, children go to school in same school district	
2riverside_20110523_5pm	El Cerrito, Corona, Coronita, Home Gardens, Norco, NW Riverside City, Pedley, Rubidoux, Glen Avon, Sunnyslope			no	yes	under-represented ethnic minority, educational crisis, family health care	low income
2riverside_20110523_5pm	El Sobrante, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Perris, Moreno Valley			no	yes	under-represented ethnic minority, educational crisis, family health care	low income

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110524			no				
1sdiego_20110524			no				
2riverside_20110523_5pm			no				
2riverside_20110523_5pm			no				
2riverside_20110523_5pm			no				
2riverside_20110523_5pm		CRC should adhere strictly to this, with specific reference to Section 2. Protection of ChicanosLatinos voting rights in this region	no				
2riverside_20110523_5pm		CRC should adhere strictly to this, with specific reference to Section 2. Protection of ChicanosLatinos voting rights in this region	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dennis Lopez	no				yes	SeemapSD Coronita, Corona, El Cerrito, Home Gardens, El Sobrante, Norco, Mira Loma, Glen Avon, Rubidoux, Highgrove, Riverside, Moreno Valley, March Air Force Base, Woodcrest, Lake Mathews, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Perris, Romoland, contig unincorp areas
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dennis Lopez	no				yes	See map from 552011 CD Glen Avon, Pedley, Rubidoux, Highgrove, Riverside, Woodcrest, Lake Mathews, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Perris, Romoland, Nuevo, March Air Force Base, Moreno Valley, contig unincorporated areas
2riverside_20110523_5pm	5232011	Alexis Weisbrod	no		Murietta	Riverside	yes	Murietta and Temecula are connected, as are Corona and Norco. Both are connected to Orange County.
2riverside_20110527	5272011	Dennis Stratton	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not include Imperial County with Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110527	5272011	Jeff and Linda Davis	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Desert cities should remain in Riverside County and not be included in the Imperial County maps

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110523_5pm	Coronita, Corona, El Cerrito, Home Gardens, El Sobrante, Norco, Mira Loma, Glen Avon, Rubidoux, Highgrove, Riverside, Moreno Valley, March Air Force Base, Woodcrest, Lake Mathews, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Perris, Romoland			no	yes	under-represented ethnic minority, educational crisis, family health care	low income
2riverside_20110523_5pm	Glen Avon, Pedley, Rubidoux, Highgrove, Riverside, Woodcrest, Lake Mathews, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Perris, Romoland, Moreno Valley			no	yes	under-represented ethnic minority, educational crisis, family health care	low income
2riverside_20110523_5pm	Orange	Temecula, Murietta, Norco, Corona		no	yes	Residents frequently commute between cities, mixing business and pleasure.	
2riverside_20110527	Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110527	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110523_5pm		CRC should adhere strictly to this, with specific reference to Section 2. Protection of ChicanosLatinos voting rights in this region	no				
2riverside_20110523_5pm		CRC should adhere strictly to this, with specific reference to Section 2. Protection of ChicanosLatinos voting rights in this region	no				
2riverside_20110523_5pm			no				
2riverside_20110527			no				This is supposed to be a fair and honest proceeding with citizen-based redistricting, not special interest with powerful lawyers to influence the outcome.
2riverside_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110527	5272011	Cindy Roth	yes	Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce, PresidentCEO		Riverside	yes	See attached maps New districts affecting City of Riverside should stay within Riverside County boundaries
2riverside_20110527	5272011	Jean Nelson	no			Riverside	yes	Do not combine Imperial County with Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110527	5272011	Ellen Swensen	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial
8ccosta_20110528	5282011	Richard Daniel	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110528	5282011	Allen Payton	no				no	
8ccosta_20110528	5282011	Carol Hehmeyer	no			Contra Costa	yes	Do not favor highly gerrymandered maps presented by MALDEF

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110527	Riverside	Riverside		no	yes	Transportation, school districts, community college, shared identity	federalstate matching fund requirements
2riverside_20110527	Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110527	Imperial			no	no		
8ccosta_20110528		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110528				no	no		
8ccosta_20110528				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110527			no				
2riverside_20110527			no				
2riverside_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110528			no				
8ccosta_20110528		Make sure CVAP percentages are not diminished in four section 5 counties in California	yes	Montere y, Kings, Merced, Yuba			
8ccosta_20110528			no				Hard for individual citizens to have as many resources as special interest groups do. The deadline for citizen comments is too soon; for example, the May 23 deadline for comments affecting June 10 maps

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110528	5282011	Dolores Shore	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110528	5282011	Dolores Shore	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110528	5282011	Gerald Hashimoto	no				yes	Do not let districts cross Bridges (Bay Bridge, Golden Gate, Richmond, Dumbo). Do not let districts cross mountain ranges or hills (Oakland-Berkeley Hills)
8marin_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Cindy Culcasi	no				yes	Marin and Sonoma should be in a district, without San Francisco
8marin_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jim Ketchum	no				yes	Do not change anything involving Marin.
8marin_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Edward Patton	no				yes	Combine Marin and Sonoma. San Rafael, Golden Gate Bridges beginning of Marins southern district. Do not include Contra Costa, San Francisco
8marin_20110527	5272011	Ilene Meyers	no		Larkspur	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110528				no	no		
8ccosta_20110528				no	no		
8ccosta_20110528			Bay Bridge, Golden Gate, Richmond, Dumbo, Oakland-Berkeley Hills	no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes		Rural and agricultural components
8marin_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pmafter	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco, Contra Costa		Golden Gate, San Rafael	no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110528			no				
8ccosta_20110528			no				
8ccosta_20110528			no				
8marin_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8marin_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8marin_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Ilene Meyers	no		Larkspur	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Lilka W. Areton	no		San Anselmo	Marin	yes	Do not put Marin with San Francisco or East Bay communities. SD Marin, Sonoma, Napa. CD Marin, Sonoma. AD Southern Sonoma, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael. Or AD Marin, Southern Sonoma, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, contiguous part of Napa
8marin_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Gini David	no		Novato	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Dominic DiBlasio	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Dominic DiBlasio	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Dominic DiBlasio	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	San Anselmo, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael, Petaluma, Rohnert Park		no	no		
8marin_20110523_5pmafter	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Lauren Isaacson	no		Tiburon	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Terry Avtonomoff	no		Tiburon	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Terry Avtonomoff	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Terry Avtonomoff	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Michelle Belfor Kralovec	no				yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Michelle Belfor Kralovec	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Michelle Belfor Kralovec	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	William John Keast	no		Novato	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	William John Keast	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	William John Keast	no		Novato	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Giti Underhill	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Keep Marin separate from Vallejo and Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Barbara Dickey	no		Novato	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Barbara Dickey	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Barbara Dickey	no		Novato	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Sally Zelikovsky	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
2riverside_20110528	5282011	Carol O Donnell	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial
2riverside_20110528	5282011	Anonymous	no				no	
2riverside_20110531	5312011	Glenn Miller	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Toni Wickstrom	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange County and cities together, especially San Clemente, Huntington Beach
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Charles and Ronea Hart	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange County and cities together, especially San Clemente, Huntington Beach
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Carol Woodwort	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Keep Orange County and cities together, especially San Clemente, Huntington Beach

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
2riverside_20110528	Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110528				no	no		
2riverside_20110531	Imperial			no	no		
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	Orange	San Clemente, Huntington Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	Orange	San Clemente, Huntington Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	Orange	San Clemente, Huntington Beach		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
2riverside_20110528			no				
2riverside_20110528			no				City Council June 1
2riverside_20110531			no				
3orange_20110523_5pmafter			no				
3orange_20110523_5pmafter			no				
3orange_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Sandra Wojciechowski	no			Orange	yes	N Orange County areas of Los Alamitos, Seal Beach and OC portion of Cerritos should sit within Orange County. Huntington Beach should be with other OC beach communities. San Clemente should be grouped with beach communities to north such as Dana Point
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	M. Jane Muelle	no		Laguna Woods	Orange	yes	Put San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Aliso Viejo, Coto de Caza, Dana Point, Ladera Ranch, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita with Orange, not with San DiegoImperial
3orange_20110524	5242011	Judy Davis	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange County and cities together, especially San Clemente, Huntington Beach
3orange_20110524	5242011	Oldrich and Ivana Unger	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange County and cities together, especially San Clemente, Huntington Beach
3orange_20110530	5302011	Victoria Ramirez	no		Anaheim	Orange	yes	Anaheim and Santa in one CD. SD all of Santa Ana, flatlands area of Anaheim, southwest section of Orange, west section of Tusting, parts of Stanton and Buena Park. Nest 2 ADs into one SD, one should be in Santa Ana with S Anaheim, SW Orange, W Tustin

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	Orange	San Clemente, Cerritos, Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110523_5pmafter	Orange, San Diego, Imperial	San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Aliso Viejo, Coto de Caza, Dana Point, Ladera Ranch, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita		no	yes	Shares tourism, media, culture	Shares commerce
3orange_20110524	Orange	San Clemente, Huntington Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110524	Orange	San Clemente, Huntington Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110530	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim, Tustin, Stanton, Buena Park		no	yes	See attached statistics. More immigrant, Latinao	Working ClassBlue Collar demographic

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110523_5pmafter			no				
3orange_20110523_5pmafter			no				
3orange_20110524			no				
3orange_20110524			no				
3orange_20110530			no				Excited about historic role that CRC will play in establishing district boundaries that clearly group COIs together

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110531	5312011	Victor Rodriguez	yes	California State University long Beach, professor and political sociologist		Orange	yes	Do not be afraid to cross cities when maintaining communities of interest, such as the connecting Harbor Boulevard from Santa Ana, through Garden Grove, into Anaheim
3orange_20110531	5312011	Laurie Gooch	no			Orange	yes	San Clemente kept with Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, Laguna Beach. Kept in Orange County
3orange_20110531	5312011	Mary Carter	no			Orange	no	
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	CD 40 Seal Beach, Los AlamitosRossmoor, Stanton, Garden Grove, Westminster, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa (W of 55)
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	CD 42 Cypress, La Palma, Fullerton, La Habra, Brea, Yorba Linda, Placentia, Yorba Linda, Anaheim (E of 559190), North Canyons (Weir), Orange (E of 55) , Villa Park, Tustin, LemonPanorama Hts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110531	Orange	Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Anaheim		no	yes	Latinos, Asians need to be kept together	
3orange_20110531	Orange	San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, Laguna Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110531				no	no		
3orange_20110531		Seal Beach, Los AlamitosRossmoor, Stanton, Garden Grove, Westminster, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa	55	no	yes	Relatively large Asian community, not dominated by Latino community	
3orange_20110531		Cypress, La Palma, Fullerton, La Habra, Brea, Yorba Linda, Placentia, Yorba Linda, Anaheim, Villa Park, Tustin, LemonPanorama Hts	55	no	yes	Racially diverse, connecting Asian areas to west and east	Some diversity in income

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110531			no				Is 50 CVAP standard is appropriate measure for determining if districts meet first test Gingles test and if use leads to legally actionable packing? Reexamine historical recordCOI testimony in determining whether Latinos form cohesive group
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				How to find the new map that just came out on the website?
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	CD 46 (shared district) (South OC) Dana Point, Laguna Niguel, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, empty East; (NW San Diego County) PendletonSan Onofre, Oceanside, Fallbrook, Carlsbad, Vista; but not including Encinitas, Escondido, San Marcos
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	CD 47 Santa Ana (W of 55), Anaheim (W of 559190), Orange (W of 55)
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	CD 48 Newport Beach, Santa Ana (E of 55), Costa Mesa (E of 55), Irvine, Laguna Beach, Mission Viejo, Lake Forest, Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills, Aliso Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, most of Canyon Country
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	AD (A) Northern La Habra, BreaOlinda, Fullerton, Placentia, Anaheim (E of Dale, W of Harbor, N of Lincoln to SR-57)
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	AD (B) Central Anaheim (S of Lincoln between Harbor Blvd. and SR-57,), Orange (W of 55), Santa Ana (W of 55).
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	AD (C) Western Los AlamitosRossmoor, Seal Beach, Garden Grove, Westminster, Huntington Beach (W of SR-39)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110531	San Diego, Orange	Dana Point, Laguna Niguel, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, PendletonSan Onofre, Oceanside, Fallbrook, Carlsbad, Vista, Encinitas, Escondido, San Marcos		no	yes	Fits well to N SD county, Lots of retirees, Caucasian population with Latino cultural influences	Mostly well-off, underwater housing prices
3orange_20110531	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim	55	no	yes	Largely Latino, separate from Vietnamese	Moderate to low income
3orange_20110531	Orange	Newport Beach, Santa Ana, Costa Mesa, Irvine, Laguna Beach, Mission Viejo, Lake Forest, Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills, Aliso Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, Canyon Country	Santa Ana River	no	no	Caucasian, Asian	relatively wealthy, underwater housing prices
3orange_20110531		La Habra, BreaOlinda, Fullerton, Placentia, Anaheim	SR-57	no	yes	North Orange County identity, substantial Latino population	economic diversity
3orange_20110531		Anaheim, Santa Ana	SR-57, 55	no	yes	Latino	lower-income
3orange_20110531		Los AlamitosRossmoor, Seal Beach, Garden Grove, Westminster, Huntington Beach	SR-39	no	yes	Focused on Vietnamese and western beach cities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Sally Zelikovsky	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Sally Zelikovsky	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Dan Hanlon	no		Novato	Marin	yes	SD Marin, Sonoma, Napa. CD Marin, Sonoma. AD Southern Sonoma, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael. Or AD Marin, Southern Sonoma (Petaluma, Rohnert Park), contig. Napa
8marin_20110527	5272011	Pam McCart	no		Novato	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Jeanne Hanlon	no		Novato	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Jeanne Hanlon	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael		no	yes	Cultural, commercial, transportation issues	
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Jeanne Hanlon	no		Novato	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
9dnorte_20110530	5302011	Gordon Bonser	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte with Humboldt, Mendocino
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Michele Fell	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Coastal Northern California should not have boundaries reflect an east-to-west orientation.
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Peg Gardner	no			Humboldt	yes	Include Humboldt in a north-south Northern California coastal district
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Patricia-Anne WinterSun	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Draw Northern California district lines north to south, including Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma
9humbolt_20110524	5242011	Doris M. Osburn	yes	Dist. 1 National Silver Haired Legislautre, Represenative	Fortuna	Humboldt	yes	Do not put Del Norte and Humboldt with Redding, Santa Rosa

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
9dnorte_20110530	Humboldt, Mendocino, Del Norte			no	yes	coastal, ruralremote, shared hardships brought on by decline of fisheries and timber industry	
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes	Coastal (Eureka) vs. Urbanizing (Redding)	
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter	Humboldt			no	yes	Dividing in this way creates more in common in the interest of transportation.	
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter	Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma			no	yes	Coastal entities should be kept separate from inland valleys. There is a mountain range that is the natural boundary	
9humbolt_20110524	Del Norte, Humboldt	Redding, Santa Rosa		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
9dnorte_20110530			no				
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter			no				Do not disenfranchise Eureka by holding the cloests meeting 100s of miles from it. Please hold a public meeting in Eureka.
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter			no				
9humbolt_20110523_5pmafter			no				
9humbolt_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humbolt_20110530	5302011	Jacqueline Torres	no				yes	In Northern California, do not redraw district lines horizontally
9lake_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	James and Arthur Wilkie	no			Lake	yes	Keep intact Lake County and District 9
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	BC Macdonald	no		Albion	Mendocino	yes	Keep coastal region embraced by Eel and Russian rivers together. Do not change district 1.
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter	5242011	Ann Thrupp	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep Mendocino with Sonoma, Napa
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter	4262011	David Jensen	yes	Mendocino Coast Audobon Society, President	Fort Bragg	Mendocino	yes	Do not make an east-west division of the northern part of the states
9mendocino_20110531	5232011	Becky Bowen	no		Caspar	Mendocino	yes	Combine Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Trinity, Lake, Napa, Sonoma
9mendocino_20110531	5232011	Dennis Patton and Andrea Silverstein	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte together. Keep Mendocino, Lake, Napa, Yolo in same CD. Do not redistrict in an east-west orientation

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humbolt_20110530				no	yes	Communities along Hwy 101 differ immensely from those living along I-5 and farther east in the state.	
9lake_20110523_5pmafter	Lake			no	yes	transportation corridors, parks, lakes	wine, tourism
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter			Eel River, Russian River	no	yes	Coastal, native American areas, caring for land and ocean. Ocean is productive.	
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter	Mendocino, Sonoma, Napa			no	yes		North Coast wine industry, commerce, tourism opportunities
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes	Coastal, not inland. Concerns in different kinds of environment. United by Hwy 101.	
9mendocino_20110531	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Trinity, Lake, Napa, Sonoma			no	yes	Ocean, wildlife, water, land, birds. 45 conversation ownershipmanagement.	
9mendocino_20110531	Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte, Napa, Lake, Yolo			no	yes	North Coast, Redwood Coast, Wine Country together. Share California National Monuments, watersheds. Exist on North-South Hwy 101 Corridor and Hwy 1 along coast	Agriculture, wine industries

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humbolt_20110530			no				Please hold meetings across all counties in Northern California before setting new lines.
9lake_20110523_5pmafter			no				
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter			no				
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter			no				
9mendicino_20110523_5pmafter			no				Commends CRC on efforts to redistrict
9mendocino_20110531			no				
9mendocino_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110531	5232011	Spencer Brewer	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte together. Keep Mendocino, Lake, Napa, Yolo in same CD. Do not redistrict in an east-west orientation
9mendocino_20110531	5232011	Gregg Smith	yes	Office of Emergency Services Coordinator, Mendocino County Fire Warden, Fire Chief of Hopland Fire Protection District,	Ukiah	Mendocino	yes	Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte, Lake, Napa, Yolo together. Keep current CDSD. Do not change northern California to an east-west orientation.
9mendocino_20110531	5232011	Lin Morgan Barrett	no			Mendocino	yes	Do not redistrict Northern California in an east-west orientation. Keep Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte together
9mendocino_20110531	5232011	Richard Green	no			Mendocino	yes	Do not redistrict Northern California in an east-west orientation. Keep Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte together
9mendocino_20110531	5232011	M.K. Grady	no			Mendocino	yes	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110531	Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte, Napa, Lake, Yolo			no	yes	North Coast, Redwood Coast, Wine Country together. Share California National Monuments, watersheds. Exist on North-South Hwy 101 Corridor and Hwy 1 along coast	Agriculture, wine industries
9mendocino_20110531	Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte, Lake, Napa, Yolo			no	yes	Coastal, common interest in combating major contiguous disaster. Hwy 101, Hwy 1, Hard to travel to I-5.	
9mendocino_20110531	Mendocino, Del Norte, Humboldt			no	yes	Hard to travel east-west. Share Hwy 101, 1, California Coastal National Monuments, watersheds, redwood trees, wineries	Agriculture, wine industries
9mendocino_20110531	Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte			no	yes	Hard to travel east-west. Share Hwy 101, 1, California Coastal National Monuments, watersheds, redwood trees, wineries	Agriculture, wine industries
9mendocino_20110531	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma			no	yes	College students tend to study at institutions to north and south.	Natural resource economy. Agriculture. Timber and fisheries, newer enterprises in tourism and recreation

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110531			no				
9mendocino_20110531			no				
9mendocino_20110531			no				
9mendocino_20110531			no				
9mendocino_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9placer_20110530	5312011	Margaret Petrovich	no			Placer	yes	District lines should be drawn based on county lines to keep citizenry true to areas where people live.
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after	5232011	Gustavo Arroyo	no	Board of Education for Sacramento City Unified School District, President	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Do not follow the citycounty lines which divide South Sacramento. Keep neighborhoods in Trustee Area 4 of South Sacramento together
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after	5232011	Chris Parker	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Keep Citrus Heights, the area west of it (Antelope to North Highlands, maybe over to Natomas) as part of Sacrament County focused districts
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after	5242011	Vanessa Cajina	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Keep finger in South Sacramento together
9sacramento_20110525	5252011	Gary Boatwright	no		Folsom	Sacramento	yes	Folsom, Granite Bay, El Doardo Hills, Placer County along Lake and American River
9shasta_20110529	5292011	Jacqueline Torres same as before	no				no	
9siskiyou_20110529	5292011	Dona Farnam	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou in Delta District
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pmafte r	5232011	Linda Jimene	no		Tracy	San Joaquin	yes	When dividing San Joaquin, consider that North County linked to Sacramento area, TracySouth County connected with Stockton. Put Tracy and Stockton in same AD.
9sjoaquin_20110526	5262011	Brian Ratto	no			San Joaquin	yes	Keep San Joaquin County whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9placer_20110530				no	no		
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after	Sacramento	Sacramento		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after	Sacramento	Citrus Heighs, Antelope, North Highlands		no	yes	Distinct and clear difference in feel of communitiesstreetsparks as moving from Sacramento County to Placer County	
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after	Sacramento			no	no		
9sacramento_20110525	Sacramento, Placer	Gold River, Folsom, Granite Bay, El Dorado Hills		no	yes		
9shasta_20110529				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110529	Siskiyou			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pmafter	San Joaquin	Stockton		no	yes	North County open land. South County linked with Stockton through I-5, Hwy 99	South County agriculture alomnds, vegetable
9sjoaquin_20110526	San Joaquin			no	yes	LGBT community	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9placer_20110530			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after			no				Thank you for work in making this successful
9sacramento_20110523_5pm after			no				
9sacramento_20110525			no				
9shasta_20110529			no				
9siskiyou_20110529			no				
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pmafter			no				
9sjoaquin_20110526			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Joe Krovoza	no	City of Davis, Mayor	Davis	Yolo	yes	ADSD with an East-West orientation. Put Davis with Solano, Napa, Lake. Do not change Odd Number 5 status of SD. Put Davis with West Sacramento, Vacaville, Suisun, Fairfield, Vallejo
9yolo_20110525	5252011	Pamela Nieberg	no				yes	Keep together from West Sacramento along I-80 northeast to Solano County (south of Vacaville, east to Rio Vista)
20110518	5182011	Anonymous	no				yes	See attached maps
20110522	5222011	Raul Flores	no				no	
20110528	5282011	Robin Schneider	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
20110528	5282011	Robin Schneider	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110523_5pmafter	Sonoma, Napa, Lake	Davis, Sacramento, Vacaville, Suisun, Fairfield, Vallejo		no	yes	East-west orientation will align Davis with COIs. Open spaceresource protection, watershed policy, Delta protection policies, transportation along I-80.	UC Davis an economic engine.
9yolo_20110525	Sacramento, Solano	Vacaville, Rio Vista		no	yes	Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District	
20110518				no	no		
20110522				no	no		
20110528				no	no		
20110528				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110523_5pmafter			no				
9yolo_20110525			no				
20110518			no				
20110522			no				If you can look into the seeds of time,And say which grain will grow and which will not,Speak then to me, who neither beg nor fearYour favour nor your hate.
20110528			no				
20110528			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Paul Elliott	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Paul Elliott	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Scott Schneider	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Scott Schneider	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Pat McGovern	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Pat McGovern	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Kathleen Doyle	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Kathleen Doyle	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Albert DiStasio	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Albert DiStasio	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Amy Chorney	no			Marin	yes	Do not put Marin with SF or East Bay
8marin_20110527	5272011	Cathleen Gillies	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Cathleen Gillies	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Kevin Denny	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	SD Marin, Sonoma, Napa. CD Marin, Sonoma. AD Southern Sonoma, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael. Or AD Marin, Southern Sonoma (Petaluma, Rohnert Park), contig. Napa

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	San Francisco, Marin			no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael		no	yes	Cultural, commercial, transportation issues	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Richard Willis	no				yes	Consider conservative suggestions on voting districts. Latino, Sieera Club, CIJEE plans are outrageous and biased in favor of Democrat majorities
8marin_20110527	5272011	Thomas L. Bires	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Thomas L. Bires	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Thomas L. Bires	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Pam McCart	no		Novato	Marin	yes	SD Marin, Sonoma, Napa. CD Marin, Sonoma. AD Southern Sonoma, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael. Or AD Marin, Southern Sonoma (Petaluma, Rohnert Park), contig. Napa
8marin_20110527	5272011	Joyce Kleege	no			Marin	yes	Separate Marin from San Francisco using Golden Gate Bridge

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael		no	yes	Cultural, commercial, transportation issues	
8marin_20110527	marin, San Francisco		Golden Gate Bridge	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				Thank you for willingness to serve

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Patricia M. Cook	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Patricia M. Cook	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Regina	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Regina	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Roland	no			Marin	yes	Do not join Sonoma and Vallejo

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Nuri Sutter	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Nuri Sutter	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Morgan Kelley	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan, reject Latino
8marin_20110527	5272011	Morgan Kelley	no			Marin	yes	Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan. Marin and Sonoma.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Patty Armanini	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Patty Armanini	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	John Armanini	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	John Armanini	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Kernan Jang	no			Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Kernan Jang	no			Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no		El Sobrante	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no		El Sobrante	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no		El Sobrante	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Thomas Bires	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Thomas Bires	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Thomas Bires	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Thelma Ann Gregory	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	connect Marin and Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Mark O Toole	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	AD (D) Central Coast Huntington Beach (E of SR-39), Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Santa Ana (E of 55), Newport Beach, Irvine (W of Jamboree or S of I-405), Laguna Beach, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills (N)
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	AD (E) Central Inland Yorba Linda, Anaheim (E of 57), Orange (E of 55), Lemon Heights and Panorama Heights, Villa Park, Tustin, Irvine (E of Jamboree and N of I-405), Foothill Ranch, Silverado, almost all canyons

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
3orange_20110531		Huntington, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Santa Ana, Newport Beach, Irvine, Laguna Beach, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills	SR-39, 55, I-405	no	yes	Joins two disparate communities. Culturally similar	Socioeconomically similar
3orange_20110531		Yorba Linda, Anaheim, Lemon Heights and Panorama Heights, Villa Park, Tustin, Irvine, Foothill Ranch, Silverado	57, 55, 405	no	yes	Largely Caucasian and Asian, distinct from Central Coast in not being coastal	Well-off

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	AD (F) South County Laguna Hills (S), Lake Forest, Rancho Santa Margarita, Coto de Caza, Mission Viejo, Laguna Niguel, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Trabuco Highlands, Dove Canyon.
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	AD (G) Northwestern(shared district). (OC) Buena Park, Cypress, La Palma, Stanton, Anaheim (W of Dale) Los Angeles) Cerritos, Artesia, La Mirada, Whittier, area south of Friendly Hills, La Habra Hts.
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	SD Northern AD (A)(B)
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	SD Coastal AD (C)(D)
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	SD Eastern AD (E)(F)
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	SD Northwestern AD (G) and LA County District Cerritos, Artesia, La Habra Hts, La Mirada, Whittier, area south of Friendly Hills, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110531		Laguna Hills, Lake Forest, Rancho Santa Margarita, Coto de Caza, Mission Viejo, Laguna Niguel, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Trabuco Highlands, Dove Canyon		no	yes		
3orange_20110531		Buena Park, Cypress, La Palma, Stanton, Anaheim, Cerritos, Artesia, La Mirada, Whittier, area south of Friendly Hills, La Habra Hts.		no	yes	Half and Half LAOC district that gives Asian community straddling county a common district	
3orange_20110531				no	no		
3orange_20110531				no	no		
3orange_20110531				no	no		
3orange_20110531	Orange	Cerritos, Artesia, La Habra Hts, La Mirada, Whittier, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	BOE (1) Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Humboldt, Trinity, Shasta, Tehama, Lassen, Plumas, Glenn, Butte, Yuba, Sierra, Lake, Colusa, Yuba, Nevada, Yolo, Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, Amador, Alpine, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mono
8marin_20110527	5272011	Mark O Toole	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Mark O Toole	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Gene Pennington	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110531	Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Humboldt, Trinity, Shasta, Tehama, Lassen, Plumas, Glenn, Butte, Yuba, Sierra, Lake, Colusa, Yuba, Nevada, Yolo,Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, Amador, Alpine, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mono			no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110531			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Gene Pennington	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Gene Pennington	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Dan Hanlon	no		Novato	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	Dan Hanlon	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Dan Hanlon	no		Novato	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	Carolyn Vance	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110527	5272011	Carolyn Vance	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	Carolyn Vance	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8marin_20110527	5272011	David Curtis	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110527	5272011	David Curtis	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8marin_20110527	5272011	David Curtis	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8marin_20110527				no	no		
8marin_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				
8marin_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110523_5pmafter_2	5232011	Diane Dillon	yes	Napa County Supervisor		Napa	yes	Align Napa with Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino counties
8napa_20110523_5pmafter_2	5232011	Paul Dolan	yes	Paul Dolan Vineyards		Napa	yes	Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino
8smateo_20110529	5272011	Susan Hart	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	AD Marin and Sonoma, including Santa Rosa; SD3 Marin, Sonoma, Napa; CD6 Marin, Sonoma
8smateo_20110529	5272011	Susan Hart	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8smateo_20110529	5272011	Susan Hart	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8smateo_20110530	5302011	Jackson Schultz	no			San Mateo	yes	Allow districts containing Burlingame-San Mateo area follow Prop 11.
8solano_20110523_2	5232011	Thomas Peters	no		Eureka		yes	Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte, Lake, Trinity

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110523_5pmafter_2	Napa, Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino			no	yes	Governmental alignments with Bay Area neighbors, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Transportation issues	Premium wine grape, tourism industries
8napa_20110523_5pmafter_2				no	yes		Interconnectedness of wine community
8smateo_20110529	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin, Sonoma, Napa rural, suburban, family oriented.	Marin and Sonoma SMART Train, agricultural economies
8smateo_20110529				no	no		
8smateo_20110529				no	no		
8smateo_20110530				no	no		
8solano_20110523_2	Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte, Lake, Trinity			no	yes	Coastal interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110523_5pmafter_2			no				
8napa_20110523_5pmafter_2			no				
8smateo_20110529			no				
8smateo_20110529			no				
8smateo_20110529			no				
8smateo_20110530			no				
8solano_20110523_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110526	5262011	Mark Fernwood	yes	Danville Materials, Inc., Vice President	Danville	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110526	5262011	Alexander	no			Contra Costa	yes	Tri-Valley (San Ramon, Danville, Dublin, Walnut Creek, Pleasanton) should be kept together and separate from Fremont, Berkeley, Richmond
8ccosta_20110526	5262011	Rick Stivers	yes	Altamont Manufactuing, Inc., President	Livermore	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110526	5262011	Robert Evans	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110526	5262011	Matt Lopez	no		Concord	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Gayle Kindall	no				yes	Support recommendations of Contra Costa Redistricting Task Force

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110526		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110526		San Ramon, Danville, Dublin, Walnut Creek and Pleasanton, Fremont, Berkeley, Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110526		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110526		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110526		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110526			no				
8ccosta_20110526			no				
8ccosta_20110526			no				
8ccosta_20110526			no				
8ccosta_20110526			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Becky Bridgen	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Becky Bridgen	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Melanie Moss	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Melanie Moss	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Patsy Rodriguez Ronat	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Patsy Rodriguez Ronat	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Shirley Meloy	no				yes	Include Sunol, Pleasanton, Livermore with 680 corridor
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Arthur Talley II	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5282011	Arthur Talley II	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527		Sunol, Pleasanton, Livermore		no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no		El Sobrante		yes	Do not lump Marin with San Francisco or East Bay communities. Put Marin with Sonoma and Napa in a SD. CD Marin, Sonoma. AD Marin, southern Sonoma, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael. Or, AD Marin, S Sonoma, PetalumaRohnert Park, some Napa
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Alexander Meloy	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael, Petaluma		no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Alexander Meloy	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Mr. Wm F Thompson and Mrs. S C Thompson	no				no	
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Carol Gibson	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Carol Gibson	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Hilary Gavenda	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				Hope to get an honest redistricting that will make voting worthwhile. Get someone who knows the area.
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Hilary Gavenda	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Lewis Egan	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Lewis Egan	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Donald Powell	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Donald Powell	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Salathiel Materson	no		El Sobrante	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Salathiel Materson	no		El Sobrante	Contra Costa	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Mr. and Mrs. Ronald P Corley	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Mr. and Mrs. Ronald P Corley	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	BOE (1 cont) Stanislaus, Merced, Mariposa, Madera, Fresno, Inyo, Kings, Tulare, Kern, some of Solano, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino Counties
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	BOE (2) Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo, San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino, Solanos cities Vallejo, Benecia, Vacaville
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	BOE (3) All of Los Angeles County south of I-210 and north almost to SR128, plus all ofSanta Clarita, Stevenson Ranch westward, City of Los Angeles, Glendale, La Crescenta, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, Sierra Madre, Arcadia, Monrovia, Bradbury
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	BOE (3 cont) Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne and Claremont. Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne and Claremont

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
3orange_20110531	Stanislaus, Merced, Mariposa, Madera, Fresno, Inyo, Kings, Tulare, Kern, Solano, Los Angeles, San Bernardino			no	no		
3orange_20110531	Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo, San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino	Vallejo, Benecia, Vacaville		no	no		
3orange_20110531	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Stevenson Ranch westward, City of Los Angeles, Glendale, La Crescenta, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, Sierra Madre, Arcadia, Monrovia, Bradbury	I-210, SR128	no	no		
3orange_20110531		Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne and Claremont.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				
3orange_20110531			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110531	5312011	Greg Diamond	no	Law Office of Gregory A. Diamond, attorney		Orange	yes	BOE (4) San Diego, Imperial, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino County cities of Chino Hills, Chino, Montclair, Upland, Rancho Cucamonga, Ontario, Fontana, unincorporated areas west of Rialto
4la_20110523_5pm	5232011	Arnold Levy	no		West Hills, San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	bounded by the Santa Susana Mountains to the north and west, the Mulholland Drive to the south, and the San Gabriel Mountains to the east. Includes Burbank, Calabasas, Glendale, Hidden Hills, San Fernando
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Maria Hughes	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	See attached maps of 1991 districts for Santa Monica Mountains area Bind communities situated near Santa Monica Mountains West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, and Malibu
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	David Hyman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split San Fernando Valley communities such as North Hills and Van Nuys. Do not split at 405, as it connects communities
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Mike Tucker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley together Canoga Park, Northridge, Lake Balboa, Encino, Woodlandhills, Chatsworth, Tarzana, Winnetka
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Maria M. Cali	no		Lennox	Los Angeles	yes	Unify Lennox

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110531	San Diego, Imperial, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino	Chino Hills, Chino, Montclair, Upland, Rancho Cucamonga, Ontario, Fontana		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pm	Los Angeles	Burbank, Calabasas, Glendale, Hidden Hills, San Fernando	Santa Susana Mountains, Mulholland Drive, San Gabriel Mountains	no	yes	Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles Police Department, Habitat for Humanity separate San Fernando Valley from rest of LA through district boundaries	
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes	Preserve Santa Montica Mountains. Single Sherriff station, three Fire Stations, one Water district. Strong schools.	
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Canoga Park, Northridge, Lake Balboa, Encino, Woodlandhills, Chatsworth, Tarzana, Winnetka		no	yes	Cohesive and unique area	
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Los Angeles	Lennox		no	yes	90 are Latinos. Family oriented. Air quality improvements, crime control, quality education, health care	Green technology, higher business base

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110531			no				
4la_20110523_5pm			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Raul Rey	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	CD Catalina, Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills, Rancho Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, San Pedro, Wilmington, Lomita, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, Lawndale, the western half of Gardena, Hawthorne, El Segundo, Lennox
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Raul Rey	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	CD (cont) Westchester, Del Aire, Playa Del Rey, Marina Del Rey
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Sheri Garay	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Sheri Garay	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Catalina, Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills, Rancho Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, San Pedro, Wilmington, Lomita, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, Lawndale, the western half of Gardena, Hawthorne, El Segundo, Lennox		no	yes	Richly demographic.	Synergistic businesses and industries.
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Westchester, Del Aire, Playa Del Rey, Marina Del Rey		no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Linda Garvey	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Linda Garvey	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Joseph Garvey	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Joseph Garvey	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Margie Liberty	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Margie Liberty	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Larry Goldenberg	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Larry Goldenberg	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	David Hoover	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	David Hoover	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Carol Saxen	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Carol Saxen	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Alan Wadsworth	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Alan Wadsworth	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Jenelle Balofnon	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Jenelle Balofnon	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Denise Fowler	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Denise Fowler	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Anne S Pettigrew	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Anne S Pettigrew	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Glenda Kitchel	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8ccosta_20110527	5272011	Becky Kolberg	no		San Ramon	Contra Costa	yes	Include Lamorinda with Walnut Creek,San Ramon Valley the Tri- Valley
8solano_20110528	5282011	Heather Graves	no			Solano	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8solano_20110528	5282011	Heather Graves	no			Solano	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527				no	no		
8ccosta_20110527		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, San Ramon Valley		no	no		
8solano_20110528				no	no		
8solano_20110528				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8ccosta_20110527			no				
8solano_20110528			no				
8solano_20110528			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110526	5262011	Rich Larsen	no			Sonoma	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8sonoma_20110526	5262011	Rich Larsen	no			Sonoma	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8sonoma_20110531	5312011	Kirstin Merrihe	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Consider Columbia Law Schools redistricting plan combine Sonoma, Mendocino, part of Napa
8sonoma_20110527	5272011	Lynda Puccinelli	no			Sonoma	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8sonoma_20110527	5272011	Lynda Puccinelli	no			Sonoma	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Donald McArthur	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte in the Second State Senate District

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110526				no	no		
8sonoma_20110526				no	no		
8sonoma_20110531	Sonoma, Mendocino, Napa			no	yes	Rural	
8sonoma_20110527				no	no		
8sonoma_20110527				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110526			no				
8sonoma_20110526			no				
8sonoma_20110531			no				
8sonoma_20110527			no				
8sonoma_20110527			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Ralph Johansen	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte with other coastal communities
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Patty McCleary	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	CD1 Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino. AD1 Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma. SD Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Jerry Cochran	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma together
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Cindy Fox	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Include Del Norte with Lake, Napa
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Martha McClure	no			Del Norte	yes	Keep Del Norte in CD 1, AD 1, return it to SD 2.
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Dean Wilson	no	Del Norte County, Sheriff		Del Norte	yes	Del Norte, Humboldt, Siskiyou, Modoc, Trinity, Shasta, Lassen
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Barry Wendell	no			Del Norte	yes	Del Norte, Humboldt together
9dnorte_20110523	5232011	Joseph Aliotti	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino Counties together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte			no	yes	Preservation and enhancement of coastal assets.	
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma,			no	yes	Hwy 101, coastal zone, tsunami preparedness	saving fishing economy, tourist industry,
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma			no	no		
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte, Lake, Napa			no	yes	state and federal parks	tourism, fishing, agriculture, wine industry, dairy industry
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte			no	yes	coastal community, Tribal Governments, Marine Life Protection, Coastal National Monuments, State and Federal Agency regional oversight, transportation	
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte, Humboldt, Siskiyou, Modoc, Trinity, Shasta, Lassen			no	yes	Coastal communities	logging, fishing, tourism
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte, Humboldt			no	yes	coastline, the Yurok Tribe, Redwood, National and State Parks, Eureka has closest synagogueBuddhist group	
9dnorte_20110523	Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino			no	yes	Transportation, tribal affiliations	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110523			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				
9dnorte_20110523			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Raul Rey	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	CD boundaries to west and south Pacific coastline. North Jefferson Blvd. N boundary of West chester that proceeds to east boundary for that area, 405. East buondary proceeds SE along 405 to N and E boundaries of Lennox then to
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Raul Rey	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	CD boundaries cont N boundary of Hawthorne (Imperial Hwy). From Hawthorne, E boundary proceeds south along Western Avenue, encompasses western half of Gardena and E boundary of Torrance until it extends to N boundary of Wilmington along Lomita Blvd
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Raul Rey	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	E boundary then proceeds further south along east boundary of Wilmington to coast
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	David Baisley	no			Los Angeles	yes	Montrose, Glendale, La Canada Flintridge
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Eleanor Zalin	no			Los Angeles	yes	Council district 12 should not be with Chatsworth, but would like to be put back with Encino (does not state where from)
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Noel	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redraw the ADSDCD surrounding Whittier
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Kimberly Wiley	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Draw districts which encompass all communities north of San Gabriel Mountains. Do not include Lancaster with Ventura, Kern, San Bernardino
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Bill Wong	no	Asian American Education Institute, Executive Director	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	See attached map San Gabriel Valley Alhambra, Arcadia, Monterey Park, South Pasadena, San Gabriel, East San Gabriel, South San Gabriel, Rosemead, Temple City, San Marino

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Westchester	Jefferson Blvd, 405	no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Hawthorne, Gardena, Torrance, Wilmington	Imperial Hwy, Western Ave, Lomita Blvd.	no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Wilmington		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter		La Canada Flintridge, Montrose, Glendale		no	yes	Go to same doctors, retail stores	Business detail
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Ventura, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Alhambra, Arcadia, Monterey Park, South Pasadena, San Gabriel, East San Gabriel, South San Gabriel, Rosemead, Temple City, San Marino		no	yes	Shared languages, common transportation, common communication media	Shared living standards, similar work opportunities

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Robert Jjansen	no			Los Angeles	yes	San Fernando Valley is affected by what goes on in L.A. It should not go from 101 South to 118 North
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jo Chris	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Combine LA County north of San Gabriel Mountains
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Nick Dibs	no	Independent candidate for Congress (2008 and 2010 November elections), 37th district of California	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together with Port of Long Beach. Keep it separate from Port of City of Los Angeles. Include Signal Hill andor Lakewood, Compton, Carson, Bellflower, Avalon
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Diana Lejins	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	37 CD Long Beach, Signal Hill, Avalon, Lakewood, Bellflower, Paramount, Hawaiian Gardens; AD Long Beach, Signal Hill, maybe Avalon; SD proposed CD 37, Cerritos, Artesia, Norwalk, La Mirada, Santa Fe Springs
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Linda Jean Kraus	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep in tact 37 CD Carson, Compton, WattsWillowbrook, West North Long Beach, Signal Hill. For more population, add Wilmington
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Linda Paine	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Santa Clarita Valley then add Eastern Ventura County communities which include Simi Valley, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Moorpark, Porter Ranch
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Anush Ginosyan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley in one Congressional District Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Encino, Calabasas, Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Reseda, West Hills, Winnetka, Woodland Hills

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110523_5pmafter		101 South, 118 North		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Los Angeles	Lancaster		no	yes	common identity, rich history, shared destiny	
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Signal Hill, Lakewood, Compton, Carson, Bellflower, Avalon		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Long Beach	Long Beach, Signal Hill, Avalon, Lakewood, Bellflower, Paramount, Hawaiian Gardens, Cerritos, Artesia, Norwalk, La Mirada, Santa Fe Springs		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes	School districts work well together.	
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Simi Valley, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Moorpark, and Porter Ranch		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				Thanks Commissioners for time and consideration of extremely important issue
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Victor and Juanita Matranga	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not change shape of valley and give us fair representation for the amount of people and area we have in the San Fernando Valley
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Omar Corletto	no	Central American Federation (COFECA)			yes	North Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy) Griffith Park, L.A. Zoo, North Hollywood etc. South Century Blvd Hollywood Park Casino, right before the 105 fwy. LaCeinega, Fairfax Blvd. Sees Candy Company, Baldwin Hills, Kenneth Hahn Park
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Omar Corletto	no	Central American Federation (COFECA)			yes	East Los Angeles St. , 110 fwy, L.A. Live, USC, Exposition Park, Downtown Business District, L.A. City Bridge, City Hall, L.A. River, Olvera St., Dodgers Stadium, Boyle Heights, The Avenues, Lincoln Heights, Cypress, North East L.A. West
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Anonymous	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep COI High Desert as complete as possible. Palmdale and Lancaster together.
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Robert and Joanne Peppermuller	no		Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Draw lines to maximize the number of districts wholly within San Fernando Valley or in which San Fernando Valley is most influential voter bloc Burbank, Calabasas, Glendale, Hidden Hills, San Fernando, Valley portion of L.A.;
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Robert and Joanne Peppermuller	no		Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Borders Santa Susana Mountains to the north and west, the Mulholland Drive to the south, and the San Gabriel Mountains to the east.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter			Los Feliz Blvd, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, L.A. Zoo, North Hollywood, Century Blvd Hollywood Park Casino, 110 fwy, USC, Fairfax Blvd. LaCeinega, Baldwin Hills, Kenneth Hahn Park	no	yes	Free and reduced lunch programs in schools, gang issues, high crime rate, welfare support programs	Low socio economic families, welfare support
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Los Angeles	Palmdale, Lancaster		no	yes	Palmdale and Lancaster both serve as hubs for distribution of county and state resources	
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Los Angeles	Burbank, Calabasas, Glendale, Hidden Hills and San Fernando		no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Los Angeles		Santa Susana Mountains, Mulholland Drive, San Gabriel Mountains	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110528	5282011	Barbara Brookins	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
20110528	5282011	Barbara Brookins	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
20110528	5282011	Scott Thomas Wilk	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Support maps presented by Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
20110529	5292011	Douglas Johnson	no	Rose Institute of State and Local Government			yes	
20110530	5302011	Barbara Brookins	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110528				no	no		
20110528				no	no		
20110528				no	no		
20110529				no	no		
20110530				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110528			no				
20110528			no				
20110528			no				
20110529			no				Please provide equivalency file, shapefile, andor geographic file for the district visualizations presented to the Commission by Q2.
20110530			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110530	5302011	Barbara Brookins	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8alameda_20110526_2	5262011	Same file as 8alameda_20110526	no				no	
9dnorte_20110525	5252011	Jon Olson	no			Del Norte	yes	Group Del Norte with other rural counties in an east west direction.
9dnorte_20110525	5252011	Mary Wilson	no			Del Norte	no	
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jennifer Tyler	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Make sure High Desert is kept whole, within Los Angeles County and north of San Gabriel Mountains
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Daishon Margerum	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Palmdale in a district with Los Angeles
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Candice L. Weber	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep communities near Santa Monica Mountains together e West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, and Malibu

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110530				no	no		
8alameda_20110526_2				no	no		
9dnorte_20110525	Del Norte			no	yes	Rural	
9dnorte_20110525				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter	Los Angeles	Palmdale, Los Angeles	San Gabriel Mountains	no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Palmdale, Los Angeles		no	yes	Share school districts, variety of necessities	Share resources, commerce
4la_20110523_5pmafter			Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	Form Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments, Santa Monica Mountains Fire Safe Alliance, Sheriffs Station, 3 Fire Stations, 1 water district, schools	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110530			no				
8alameda_20110526_2			no				
9dnorte_20110525			no				Consider having a future meeting in Del Norte. Many want to see CRC in person, but meetings too far away.
9dnorte_20110525			no				Consider having a public meeting in Del Norte. Closest meeting 5, 6 hours away.
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jim Stanbery	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach should be grouped with Palos Verdes Pensisula to west and to Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Seal Beach
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Restituo Gerona	no				yes	People representing valley should live in San Fernando Valley
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Alex Sanchez	no	Homies Unidos			yes	North Los Feliz Blvd (101 Fwy) Griffith Park, L.A. Zoo, North Hollywood etc. South Century Blvd Hollywood Park Casino, right before the 105 fwy. LaCeinega, Fairfax Blvd. Sees Candy Company, Baldwin Hills, Kenneth Hahn Park
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Alex Sanchez	no	Homies Unidos			yes	East Los Angeles St. , 110 fwy, L.A. Live, USC, Exposition Park, Downtown Business District, L.A. City Bridge, City Hall, L.A. River, Olvera St., Dodgers Stadium, Boyle Heights, The Avenues, Lincoln Heights, Cypress, North East L.A. West
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Brian Smith	no		Valencia	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita Valley into two Assembly Districts. Join with North San Fernando Valley
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Susan Tanner	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Put Thousand Oaks with Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter			Los Feliz Blvd, 101 Fwy, Griffith Park, L.A. Zoo, North Hollywood, Century Blvd Hollywood Park Casino, 110 fwy, USC, Fairfax Blvd. LaCeinega, Baldwin Hills, Kenneth Hahn Park	no	yes	Free and reduced lunch programs in schools, gang issues, high crime rate, welfare support programs	Low socio economic families, welfare support
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	no		
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes	Watersheds, transportation improvements, cultural similarities	
4la_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes	Family communities, single family home residential neighborhoods	Soft business technologies

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Julie Hatch	no				yes	Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates, Rancho Palos, Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Palos Verdes Peninsula Rolling Hills, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach together
4la_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Carrie Scoville	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	See attached maps Keep Long Beach intact. Keep San Pedro, Harbor City, Wilmington, Terminal Island, Palos Verdes Peninsula together
4la_20110527	5272011	Alex Burrola	no		Long Beach	Long Beach	yes	Keep Long Beach and City of Signal Hill intact and in its own Assembly, Senate, Congressional, BOE and separate from L.A.
4la_20110527	5272011	Mary E. Wiesbrock	yes	Save Open SpaceSanta Monica Mountains, Chair			yes	Supports 1991 district boundaries of Santa Monica Mountains region Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu, Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Bel Air, UCLA, Beverly Hills, Studio City, Sherman Oaks, Encino
4la_20110527	5272011	Mary E. Wiesbrock	yes	Save Open SpaceSanta Monica Mountains, Chair			yes	Tarzana, Woodland Hills, West Hills (mostly south of 101)
4la_20110527	5272011	Brian Cameron	no				yes	MALDEF maps are an unacceptable example of political gerrymandering and should be rejected by the commission
4la_20110527	5272011	Rob Maffit	no				yes	Go against MALDEF maps, which violate intent of two propositions and go against what voters want-fair, compact, geographically meaningful districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110523_5pmafter		Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates, Rancho Palos, Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Palos Verdes Peninsula Rolling Hills, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach together		no	yes	Shop, dine together	Work together
4la_20110523_5pmafter		San Pedro, Harbor City, Wilmington, Terminal Island, Long Beach		no	no		
4la_20110527		Long Beach, Signal Hill		no	yes	World-class destination	Leader in commerce, tourism, industry
4la_20110527	Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu, Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Studio City, Sherman Oaks, Encino			no	no		
4la_20110527	Tarzana, Woodland Hills, West Hills		101	no	no		
4la_20110527				no	no		
4la_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110523_5pmafter			no				
4la_20110527			no				
4la_20110527			no				
4la_20110527			no				
4la_20110527			no				
4la_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110527	5272011	John Mika	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley separate from Los Angeles, separated by a mountain range.
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Carmen Ramirez	yes	City of Oxnard, Council Member	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	Keep Oxnard with West Ventura County, west of the Conejo Grade, Port Hueneme, Ventura, Santa Paula, Fillmore and the unincorporated areas of El Rio, Nyland Acres, and Piru. Supports map by CAUSE (Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy)
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Dianne Alexander	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Oak Park, Agoura, Westlake Village, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Newbury Park, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Somis, Hidden Valley and Santa Rosa Valley
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Helen Conly	no		Oakview	Ventura	yes	Include Ojai with neighbors to the east within County of Ventura or if necessary to north in Carpinteria and Santa Barbara
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Jim Gilmer	no	Black and Brown Alliance of Oxnard			yes	Support redistricting recommendations as set forth by Central Coast United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE), primarily for Ventura and Santa Barbara
5ventura_20110527	5272011	Bruce Feng	yes	Camarillo City Council, City Manager	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	See map Keep Camarillo whole. Ventura must remain a whole district. If must split Ventura, divide between West County (Fillmore, Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, Ventura) and East County (Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110527		Los Angeles		no	yes	San Fernando Valley open, less dense than Los Angeles. Represents different races and ethnic groups that get along rather well	
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter	Ventura	Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Ventura, Santa Paula, Fillmore	Conejo Grade	no	no		
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter	Ventura	Oak Park, Agoura, Westlake Village, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Newbury Park, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Somis, Hidden Valley and Santa Rosa Valley		no	yes	Same activities	
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter				no	yes	education, arts	family farms, tourism
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter	Santa Barbara, Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110527	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Fillmore, Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, Ventura		no	yes	West coastal areas, Naval Base, Guard Base, Oxnard Harbor District. East bedroomcommuter area	West agricultural. East manufacturing, professional management, wholesale, retail, leisure hospitality, biotech, science, technology

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110527			no				
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter			no				
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter			no				
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter			no				
5ventura_20110523_5pmafter			no				
5ventura_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110527	5272011	Adam 2	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Keep suburban communities together
7monterey_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	MaryEllen Dick	no	Legaue of Women Voters of the Salinas Valley, President		Monterey	yes	SD combine AD 27 and 28. Does not make sense to have San Benito County in same AD as Monterey County, but in a different SD. Underscore what Monterey Peninsula League of Women Voters said about governments of Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito.
7monterey_20110523_5pmafter	5232011	Richard Renard	no			Monterey	yes	Keep Monterey, San Luis Obispo counties together and Santa Cruz County as an entirely separate district
7sbenito_20110523_5pm	5232011	Margie Barrios	no	San Benito County Supervisor		San Benito	yes	Keep Monterey with Santa Cruz
7sclara_20110525	5252011	Thomas Tisch	no		Saratoga	Santa Clara	yes	See attached maps Cupertino, Saratoga should be together. In general, fix District 15
7sclara_20110526	5262011	Amber Sanchez	no			Santa Clara	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110527				no	no		
7monterey_20110523_5pmafter	San Benito, Monterey			no	no		
7monterey_20110523_5pmafter	Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz			no	yes	SLO, Monterey share water resources, military influences, hospitality industry, Highway 101 corridor, Big Sur Coastline	SLO, Monterey more agricultural based
7sbenito_20110523_5pm	Monterey, Santa Cruz			no	yes	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Watershed, Housing of Homeless,	Investment Boards, Broadband Consortium, Marketing Team, Imagination Coast, Small Business Development Center
7sclara_20110525		Cupertino, Saratoga		no	no		
7sclara_20110526				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110527			no				
7monterey_20110523_5pmafter			no				Impressied with process in Salinas meeting
7monterey_20110523_5pmafter			no				
7sbenito_20110523_5pm			no				
7sclara_20110525			no				
7sclara_20110526			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110526	5262011	Amber Sanchez	no			Santa Clara	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Neil Mamme	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Neil Mamme	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Victor Goodrum	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110526				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110526			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Victor Goodrum	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Alan Wolfer	no				yes	Support Bay Area Maps being submitted by California Conservative Action group
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Walter Trebick	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Walter Trebick	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Vitaly Luban	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Vitaly Luban	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Christine Merjanian	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Christine Merjanian	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Stepan Merjanian	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110527				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110527			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110527	5272011	Stepan Merjanian	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
7sclara_20110528	5282011	Richard O. Garcia	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
7sclara_20110528	5282011	Richard O. Garcia	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8alameda_20110524	5242011	Chris Graber	no		Livermore		yes	Support California Conservative Action Group Maps, Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, San Ramon Valley, Tri-Valley (Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore)
8alameda_20110524	5242011	Dave Kadlecek	no		Oakland	Alameda	yes	Do not divide Oakland, min number of Californians moved from even-numbered SD to odd-numbered SDs and vice versa; produce a public report on its experience that reflects on feasibility of meeting presumed goal of fair maps for single-member districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110527				no	no		
7sclara_20110528				no	no		
7sclara_20110528				no	no		
8alameda_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore		no	no		
8alameda_20110524				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110527			no				
7sclara_20110528			no				
7sclara_20110528			no				
8alameda_20110524			no				
8alameda_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110526	5262011	Billie Otis	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Put Tri-Valley (Pleasanton, Sunol, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon, Danville) together. Retain Pleasanton as a single Alameda County Supervisory District
8alameda_20110526	5262011	Glorian Crosslin	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8alameda_20110526	5262011	Glorian Crosslin	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8alameda_20110526	5262011	C. Edward Garrett	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8alameda_20110526	5262011	C. Edward Garrett	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110526		Pleasanton, Sunol, Livermore, Dublin, San Ramon, Danville		no	yes	Transportation networks, same sports leagues, local governments collaborate	Similar demographics, sources of employment, businesses and partnerships.
8alameda_20110526				no	no		
8alameda_20110526				no	no		
8alameda_20110526				no	no		
8alameda_20110526				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110526			no				
8alameda_20110526			no				
8alameda_20110526			no				
8alameda_20110526			no				
8alameda_20110526			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110526	5262011	Kris Urdahl	no		Oakland	Alameda	yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8alameda_20110526	5262011	Kris Urdahl	no		Oakland	Alameda	yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan
8alameda_20110526	5262011	William Fazakerly	no				yes	Support Bay Area maps being submitted by CA Conservative Action Group. Oppose Sierra Club Bay Area plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate Bridges. Do not carve up Tri-Valley. Reject San Joaquin Couny Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting Plan,
8alameda_20110526	5262011	William Fazakerly	no				yes	reject Latino Policy Forum maps, oppose CA Institute for Jobs, Economy, Education (CIJEE) plan, reject Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) plan. Reject Mex American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110526				no	no		
8alameda_20110526				no	no		
8alameda_20110526				no	no		
8alameda_20110526				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110526			no				
8alameda_20110526			no				
8alameda_20110526			no				
8alameda_20110526			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Marie J. Nemeth	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Zoe Schirmer	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Jim Obsitni	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Tom Preston	no		Moraga	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Philip and Rita Lindner	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Michael McFann	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Clair L. Hotten	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Dan Dodge	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Marjorie N. Meredith	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Thomas R. Castles II	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Bryan Daniels	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Stacy Fisher	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Robert F. and Janet A. Zupetz	no		Pleasanton	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Sandor Hites	no		Lafayette	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Edith Hites	no		Lafayette	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Jason Stewart	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Natalia Tocino	no			Contra Costa	yes	Recommend Central Contra Costa County cities of Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill be kept together. For enough population, join with Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek by expanding E,W along Highway 4, 680
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Ronald Grawer	no		Brentwood	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Linda Gonzalez	no			Contra Costa	yes	Recommend Central Contra Costa County cities of Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill be kept together. For enough population, join with Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek by expanding E,W along Highway 4, 680
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	David Kruegel	no		Moraga	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek	Hwy 4, 680	no	yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests	shared civic and business groups
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek	Hwy 4, 680	no	yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests	shared civic and business groups
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Dave and Sharon Selvy	no		San Ramon	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Heidi Ash	no		Concord	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Brenda Zwahlen	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Lynn Hopkins	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Carmen Zegarr	no			Contra Costa	yes	Recommend Central Contra Costa County cities of Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill be kept together. For enough population, join with Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek by expanding E,W along Highway 4, 680
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Caroline Tsuyuki	no		Lafayette	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Teresa Rossi	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Yevgeniya DeBoni	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Pacheco, Concord, Martinez, and Pleasant Hill, Antioch, Hercules, Pinole, and Walnut Creek	Hwy 4, 680	no	yes	shared regional priorities, transportation interests	shared civic and business groups
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Brian Kelley	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	David Pilkington	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Darrin Allison	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	Rich and Barbara Wilson	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110524			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110524	5242011	John Wittenbrink	no		Clayton	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Anne Blake	no		Danville	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Arthur and Patsy Ronat	no		Lafayette	Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Sandra Way	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110524		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110524			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Carol Gray	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Harold Bray	no		Brentwood	Contra Costa	yes	Core Lamorinda (Lafayette, Moraga, and Orinda), Walnut Creek, Clayton, Alamo, Danville, San Ramon, Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore (Tri-Valley), Discovery Bay, Brentwood, Bethel Island, Knightsen, Byron, Antioch and Oakley.
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Harold Bray	no		Brentwood	Contra Costa	yes	Bounded by 580 on S, BerkeleyOakland Hills in W, San Joaquin County line in E, and delta and SF Bay in North
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Emily Fowler	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Kris Parker	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Lafayette, Moraga, Orinda, Walnut Creek, Clayton, Alamo, Danville, San Ramon, Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore (Tri-Valley), Discovery Bay, Brentwood, Bethel Island, Knightsen, Byron, Antioch and Oakley.		no	yes	natural resources, government services, infrastructure, habitat conservancy	growing retail marketplace
8ccosta_20110525	San Joaquin	Berkeley, Oakland	580, SF Bay	no	yes		
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110525			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Al Donner	no				yes	Keep Orinda, Moraga, Lafayette, Walnut Creek, Central Contra Costa (Pleasant Hill, Concord, Clayton), 680 corridor (Alamo, Danville, San Ramon) together
8ccosta_20110525	5252011	Melissa Gallaway	no			Contra Costa	yes	Support Bay Area maps submitted by CA Conservative Action Group and California Citizens Redistricting Task Force. CD Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, the San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley
1sdiego_20110617_2	6172011	Steven K. Waldron	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Unify Escondido, no splitting issues with coastal or San Diego issues.
1sdiego_20110620_12	6202011	Marion Dodson	no			San Diego	yes	In North County, Rancho Santa Fe should not be grouped with National City, the new lines should not straddle two counties on side of Camp Pendleton
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Joyce Jewell	no			San Diego	yes	Do not redistrict East County
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Linda K. Armacost, Ed.D	yes	LMFDC		San Diego	yes	Keep the proposed boundaries for La Mesa, El Cajon, and Spring Valley
1sdiego_20110620	6212011	Bill Barcikowski	no			San Diego	yes	Imperial Valley, and East San Diego County suburbs have little in common. Borrego area of San Diego county, Coachella Valley, and East half of Riverside County have more in common with Imperial than San Diego Counties. Add parts of Escodido.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110525		Alamo, Danville, San Ramon, Orinda, Moraga, Lafayette, Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill, Concord, Clayton		no	yes	Transportation, education, recreation	
8ccosta_20110525		Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay		no	no		
1sdiego_20110617_2	San Diego	Escondido, San Diego		no	no		
1sdiego_20110620_12	San Diego	National City	Camp Pendleton	no	no		
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego	La Mesa, El Cajon, Spring valley		no	yes	La Mesa, El Cajon an Spring Valley should have the proposed boundaries to reflect Democratic registration numbers	
1sdiego_20110620	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110525			no				
8ccosta_20110525			no				
1sdiego_20110617_2			no				
1sdiego_20110620_12			no			Garricks and Wylands state districts are nuts. suggest you start all over.	
1sdiego_20110620			no				
1sdiego_20110620			no				
1sdiego_20110620	Borrego area, Coachella Valley, and Eastern half of Riverside county have more in common with Imperial County than San Diego suburbs		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Remigia Bermudez	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Oppose splitting Barrio Logan into two CA Assembly districts, keep it together.
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Pattie Williams	no			San Diego	yes	Lives in Lakeside, does not want to split up East County
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Diane Conklin	no			San Diego	yes	Wants to know where Ramona, CA falls in terms of the redistricting in San Diego
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Linda and Larry Hayes	no			San Diego	yes	Do not want East County San Diego redistricted and incorporated into Imperial State Assembly or Senate District. Areas Descanso, Jamul, Alpine Lakeside, El Cajon, La Mesa, Campo, Dulzura.
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Milton Cyphert	yes	Chamber of Commerce, East County Community Action Coalition		San Diego	yes	Does not want East County redistricted to include Imperial County.
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Shirley Kaltenborn	no			San Diego	yes	Citizen of Clairemont does not want county lines cut through clairemont. Boundaries are traditionally Hwy 5 to the West, Hwy 52 to the North, Hwy 163 to the east and the canyon to the south.
1sdiego_20110620	6202011	Mary Alice Mallen	no			San Diego	yes	Wants to continue to be in 77th district
1sdiego_20110620_12	6202011	Alyssa Wing	yes	Associated Students, University of California, San Diego	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Reconsider the splitting of La Jolla into two districts by 5 highway as it splits up students who live in La Jolla, Trieste, Casta Verde, and Regents Court from Warren College, Sixth College, Eleanor Roosevelt College.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego	San Diego	Pacific Ocean, San Diego Bay, I-5, 163 Corridor, I15, I-805, I-94	yes	yes	Diversity, museum, history, murals, churches, shopping	Proximity to transportation corridors, economic boon opportunity, houses military facilities and buisnesses
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego, Imperial		East County joined by geography vs Imperial countys desert	no	yes	East county has a cultural heritage, parks, bike trails, scenic corridors, equestrian heritage	Merging with Imperial County would hurt East Counties economy
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego	San Diego	Hwy 5, Hwy 52, Hwy 163, the canyon	no	no		
1sdiego_20110620	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110620_12	San Diego	San Diego	Highway 5	no	yes	Proposed redistricting prevents organizing of students and engagement in local community, could lead to political apathy	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110620	history,economics, community, people		no				
1sdiego_20110620	No splitting to lump sum East County		no				
1sdiego_20110620			no				
1sdiego_20110620			no				
1sdiego_20110620			no				
1sdiego_20110620	keep areas of interest together		no				
1sdiego_20110620			no				
1sdiego_20110620_12	would make education easier and engagement in the community smoother		no				thank you for your time and consideration

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110620_12	6202011	Heather A	no			San Diego	yes	Lives in Lakeside, CA and is against East County Redistricting Vote
1sdiego_20110620_12		Vice Mayor of National City	yes	Mayor of National City	National City	San Diego	yes	Wants National City to be separate from La Jolla, Solana Beach, Del Mar, Cornada
1sdiego_20110620_12	6202011	Mark T. Baker	yes	Lakesie Planning Group		San Diego	yes	Does not want East County cut in half. Wants one district.
2riverside_20110617	6172011	Cindy Roth	yes	Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce	Riverside	Riverside	yes	Riverside has been under-represented with respect to population, and the city of commerce supports the discricts the Commission is proposing
2riverside_20110619_2	6192011	Michael R. Newlon	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Congratulations on redistricting work in Coachella Valley greater Palm Springs- Palm Desert
2riverside_20110620	6202011	Albert L. Miller, Ph.D.	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Appropriate that you have chosen to keep Coachella valley and its desert cities as an entity in redistricting. Imperial County has more in common with San Diego
2riverside_20110620	6202011	Daniel Duardo	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Thank you for making the best decisions regarding The Coachella Valley.
2riverside_20110620	6202011	Linda Davis	no			Riverside	yes	Thank you for map of Desert Cities area

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110620_12	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110620_12	San Diego	National City, La Jolla, Solana Beach, Del Mar		no	yes	National City needs to be a separate district so that the Latino vote is not diluted by the other, less latino districts. Many of the residents are Latino and Filipino	The income levels of National City are significantly less than those of Solana Beach, La Jolla etc. This is an injustice to the Latino population
1sdiego_20110620_12	San Diego			no	yes	Community should not be split in half with neighborhoods, school districts, fire districts, and zip codes divided.	
2riverside_20110617	Riverside	Riverside		no	yes	Regions diversity, population growth	It is good for the Chambers 1,400 businesses representing more than 95,000 employees
2riverside_20110619_2	Riverside	Palm Desert		no	no		
2riverside_20110620	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	yes	Riverside has a rapidly aging population	Desert cities have a tourism economy in common. Imperial county is agricultural.
2riverside_20110620	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110620	Riverside			no	no	growing cohesive communites	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110620_12			no				
1sdiego_20110620_12	none		no				wants fair and equal representation
1sdiego_20110620_12	Single community of interest		no				Reconsider the 1st draft maps. Thank you
2riverside_20110617	best reflect the communities they would represent		no				Appreciates the Commissions efforts to listen to the concerns and priorities of voters and expresses its appareciation
2riverside_20110619_2	Population		no				Personal thanks for a job well done.
2riverside_20110620			no				
2riverside_20110620			no				Thank you for listening to concerns and making the best decision.
2riverside_20110620			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110620	6212011	Ana Rascon	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Leave lines as proposed, including Imperial Valley would be counter to demographic realities. Coachella Valley is a cohesive geographical unit
2riverside_20110620	6202011	Manuel M. Rios	no				yes	Leave first draft of maps as they are, leave Coachella Valley intact. Imperial Valley has more in common with San Diego.
2riverside_20110620	6202011	Christina Henny	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Right to district together Imperial and San Diego counties, splitting the Sea between districts was a good idea
2riverside_20110620	6212011	Al Vasquez	no				yes	Coachella Valley should be independent from Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110620	6202011	Sue Ann Young	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Lives at 131 Pioneer Trail, It appears my community has been cut out from being part of Palm Springs or the desert. Does not want to be cut off from Palm Sprins medical services.
2riverside_20110620_2	6202011	Manuel M. Rios	yes	Former Mayor of the City of Coachella	Coachella	Riverside	yes	In years of service to the City of Cochella, he has never had an occasion where any business was conducted to include any matter or issue that included Imperial Valley. Keep Coachella Valley intact.
2riverside_20110620_2	6202011	Mr. and Mrs. F. Pearl	yes	Rancho Mirage		Riverside	yes	Redistricting of Riverside County is an organized political effort with a lack of quality testimony. Leave the Desert Cities within Riverside County
2sbernardino_20110615_3	6152011	Jack Winsten	yes	Rim of the World Rotary Club		San Bernardino	yes	Oppose separating Crestline from the rest of the Mountain areas. Crestline would be the odd-community out. Let it remain part of the Mountain Assembly District

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110620	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110620	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110620	Imperial, san Diego, Riverside		Salton Sea	no	yes	Mexican border issues, heathcare, transportation, higher learning.	Coachella Valley has golf courses, resorts, casinos, hotels, casinos
2riverside_20110620	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110620	Riverside	Palm Springs	San Jacinto Cove, Windy Point, Hwy 11, Overture Drive	no	no	medical services, fires, polite help	depreciate home values
2riverside_20110620_2	Riverside, Imperial	Coachella		no	no		
2riverside_20110620_2	Riverside	Desert Cities		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110615_3	San Bernardino			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110620			no				
2riverside_20110620			no				
2riverside_20110620			no				Know there are complains but most in the desert are pleased with the preliminary outcomes
2riverside_20110620			no				
2riverside_20110620			no				
2riverside_20110620_2			no				
2riverside_20110620_2			no				No political power grabbing, please.
2sbernardino_20110615_3	Splitting off one Mountain community from the others weakens the remaining mountain areas, jeopardizes the well-being.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110617	6172011	Sylvia McNeal	yes	Golden Inland Empire Realty		San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110617	6172011	Judy Cresswell	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Opposed to redistricting of Highland, Yucaipa, Loma Linnda, and Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110617	6172011	Lori D. Rhodes	yes	Redlands Unified School District	Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Request revision of draft for purpose of retaining the Redlands Unified School District within a single Congressional district. East Valley is a geographically unique area distinguised from the urbanized areas to the west.
2sbernardino_20110617	6172011	Linda A. Davis	yes	Community Emergency Response Team	Lake Arrowhead	San Bernardino	yes	Do not break up local mountain communities of Crestline, Twin Peaks, Lake Gregory, Blue Jay and Lake Arrowhead. They comprise a very cohesive community.
2sbernardino_20110617	6172011	Marianne Buchanan	no			San Bernardino	yes	San Bernardino Mountain community bound together by common concerns. Westernmost unincorporated communities are held together with Rim of the World Unified School District. Appears Rim of the World USD will continue to split.
2sbernardino_20110617	6192011	Susan Nelson	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Inland Empire is being butchered.
2sbernardino_20110618_3	6182011	Brian Johsz	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Chino Hills, would be better served by being in an Inland Empire based district. Chino hills should be included within the Ontario-Pomona district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110617				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110617	San Bernardino	Highland, Yucaipa, Loma Linda, Redlands		no	yes	citizenry of Redlands will not receive adequate attention	
2sbernardino_20110617	San Bernardino	Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland, Mentone, San Bernardino		no	yes	retain school district within a single district,	
2sbernardino_20110617	San Bernardino	Crestline, Twin Peaks, Lake Gregory, Blue Jay and Lake Arrowhead		no	yes	cohesive communities share emergency volunteer teams	
2sbernardino_20110617	San Bernardino	Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, Rim of the World	Scenic Highway 18	no	yes	forest care, fire evacuations, recreational offerings	limited development
2sbernardino_20110617		Inland Empire		no	yes	cultures, intricately connected	areas of business
2sbernardino_20110618_3	San Bernardino, Ontario-Pomona	Chino Hills		no	yes	risk of Chino Hills being disenfranchised and marginalized	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110617			no				Please complete the maps as scheduled so that San Bernardino can get some Democratic representation.
2sbernardino_20110617			no				Sincere hope you will rethink this grave mistake.
2sbernardino_20110617	common demographics, contiguous geography, employment centers, transportation systems and the same school system		no				
2sbernardino_20110617			no				thank you
2sbernardino_20110617	school district		no				Great respect for the work you are doing
2sbernardino_20110617	all intricately connected		no				A city cannot survive when divided against itself, nor can a country.
2sbernardino_20110618_3			no				Thank you for your consideration

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110619	6192011	Chuck Wells	no		Crestline	San Bernardino	yes	Big Bear in the East to Cedar Pines Park in the West share common problems and need to be in one district.
2sbernardino_20110619	6192011	Irene Hernandez-Blair	yes	Chino Valley Redistrictinng	Chino	San Bernardino	yes	Pleased that Pomona is included with Chino, Montclair, and Ontario, but Chino Hills is neglected. Chino and Chino Hills are each a part of the Chino Valley. Remove Fontana.
2sbernardino_20110619	6192011	Jim Jed Dodgen	no			San Bernardino	yes	Mountain towns of Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, Big Bear together.
2sbernardino_20110620	6202011	Josh Contreras	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Commends commission for first draft. Chino Hills has more in common with Diamond Bar and San Gabriel Valley than Chino and Ontario.
2sbernardino_20110620	6212011	Samantha Davis	yes	Student Group, University of Redlands		San Bernardino	yes	University of Redlands should be added to the SBRIA congressional map that includes Cal State San Bernardino
2sbernardino_20110620	6202011	Hari Dhiman	no			San Bernardino	yes	Commission has done a great job keeping communities together in Pomona Valley area

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110619	San Bernardino	Big Bear, Cedar Pines Park		no	yes	Communities share common problems and needs	
2sbernardino_20110619	San Bernardino	Chino, Fontana, Chino Hills, Montclair, Ontario		no	yes	Chino Hills has shopping, recreation events, attend faith services, execute events that surround Non-Profit charitable foundations	
2sbernardino_20110619	San Bernardino	Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, Big Bear	live in same national forest	no	yes	share the same interests	
2sbernardino_20110620	San Bernardino	Diamond Bar, Ontario, Chino		no	yes		Chino Hills socioeconomically similar to Diamond Bar
2sbernardino_20110620	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes	unite student voices at University of Redlands	With a massive state defecit, hikes in student tuition fees, and cuts to financial aid, we need to unite student voices in order to leverage more clout with representatives
2sbernardino_20110620	San Bernardino			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110619			no				Link to ridge line communities on Google Maps
2sbernardino_20110619	Chino Hills should not be split up to ensure Minority voters receive an equal opportunity to elect candidates of our choice		no				Thank You
2sbernardino_20110619	to be aligned with the high desert would be wrong		no				Thank you
2sbernardino_20110620			no				Suspect Chino Hills officials are afraid of being placed in an ethnic majority-minority district and the possibility of electing a non-republican.
2sbernardino_20110620			no				
2sbernardino_20110620			no				Commission has made it practical for local businesses to encourage work opportunities and other benefits. Impressed by first draft.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110620	6202011	88 Spirits Corporation	yes	88 Spirits Corporation		San Bernardino	yes	Pomona Valley business is pleased with first draft.
2sbernardino_20110620	6202011	Gary L. Ostapeck, CSNA	yes	Merrill Lynch	Chino	San Bernardino	yes	Opposed to moving to the city of Chino into different congressional district. Should stay in 42nd district.
2sbernardino_20110620	6202011	Sylvia Robles	no			San Bernardino	yes	Orange and Los Angeles counties unfairly benefit from the fact that they abut the mountains and Nevada Arizona borders, leaving desert expanse. Populations abutting desert and Inyo-Mono Counties should be assisned to more populous districts.
3orange_20110616_2	6162011	Donald Rex and Nina E. Bessent	no		Crestline	San Bernardino	yes	Against redistricting which would result in the community of Crestline being included with San Bernardino instead of the other mountain communities.
3orange_20110616_2	6162011	Toni Veronick	no		Crestline	San Bernardino	yes	Crestline should be included in mountain communities.
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Yvonne Price	yes	Metro	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Rossmoor and Long Beach are in two different counties (Orange and Los Angeles)
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Thomas Needham	no		Rossmoor	Orange County	yes	Long Beach does not have issues concerning Rossmoor and vice versa. Would like to have rationale for why Los Alimitos and Rossmoor should be joined with Long Beach

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110620	San Bernardino			no	yes	healthy environment among staff	Work opportunities
2sbernardino_20110620	San Bernardino	Chino		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110620	San Bernardino, Inyo-Moyo, Orange County, Los Angeles			no	no		
3orange_20110616_2	San Bernardino	Crestline		no	yes	mountain communities should be together	
3orange_20110616_2	San Bernardino	Crestline		no	yes	mountain communties understand the needs of each other	
3orange_20110617_2	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Long Beach	San Gabriel River creates a natural division between the areas, and three man-made freeways (402, 22, and 605) create a physical division.	no	no		
3orange_20110617_2	Orange	Rossmoor, Long Beach, Los Alamitos		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110620			no				Sincerely appreciate the hard work put together by the commission
2sbernardino_20110620			no				Thank you
2sbernardino_20110620			no				
3orange_20110616_2			no				Thank you for noting our objection.
3orange_20110616_2	Cities and areas down the hill have no clue what mountain communities are about		no				
3orange_20110617_2			no				Thank you
3orange_20110617_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Alfred A. Coletta	no		Rossmoor	Orange County	yes	Upset that commission has moved Rossmoor and Los Alamitos from Orange County to Los Angeles County. San Gabriel River and 605 Freeway act as physical barrier.
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Eric Christensen	no		Rossmoor	Orange County	yes	Upset that commission has moved Rossmoor and Los Alamitos from Orange County to Los Angeles County. San Gabriel River and 605 Freeway act as physical barrier.
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Debbie Cotton, Esq. Board Member	yes	Ocean View School District	Huntington Beach	Orange County	yes	Concerned that the city of Huntington Beach is split from the neighboring cities of Westminster and Fountain Valley. Disagree that Irvine, Aliso Viejo and Laguna Niguel share a common interest with Huntington Beach.
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	William V. Loose, Ed.D Acting Superintendent	yes	Ocean View School District	Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Concerned that Huntington Beach is split from Westminster and Fountain Valley, it will make working together hard for the school districts, congressional officials. Also Irvine, Aliso Viejo and Languna Niguel have different demographics
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Cole J. Price	no		Rossmoor	Oranne	yes	Rossmoor and Long Beach are seperated by San Gabriel River and freeways 405, 22 and 605 which create a physical division
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Hap Burnett	yes	Pyramid Management LLC	Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Opposes adding Los Alamitos and Rossmoor into Long Beach District. Thinks Los Alamitos will be swallowed up by the bigger city

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617_2	Orange, Los Angeles	Long Beach, Rossmoor	San Gabriel River, 605 Freeway	no	yes	Rossmoor and Los Alamitos have strong community of interest with Seal Beach, Cypress, and Garden Grove.	training base
3orange_20110617_2	Orange, Los Angeles	Long Beach, Rossmoor	an Gabriel River, 605 Freeway	no	yes	Rossmoor and Los Alamitos have strong community of interest with Seal Beach, Cypress, and Garden Grove.	training base
3orange_20110617_2	Orange	huntington Beach, Westminster, Fountain Valley, Irvine, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Niguel		no	yes	Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley and Westminster share cultural bonds and school district boundaries	Share commercial bonds
3orange_20110617_2	Orange	Huntington Beach, Westminster, Fountain Valley, Irvine, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Niguel		no	yes	Share school district, educational and cultural ties	
3orange_20110617_2	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Long Beach	San Gabriel River, Freeways 405, 22, and 605	no	no		
3orange_20110617_2	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617_2			no				Congressman Ed Royce has done an incredible job representing their interests in Washington and Orange County
3orange_20110617_2			no				Congressman Ed Royce has done an incredible job representing their interests in Washington and Orange County
3orange_20110617_2			no				Apologize for not being there in person. Thank you in advance.
3orange_20110617_2	unify school districts		no				
3orange_20110617_2			no			Rossmoor and Long Beach have different character, interests and goals.	Ed Royce has been good to Rossmoor.
3orange_20110617_2			no			Los Alamitos will lose representation.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Stephen Stepanovich, Esq	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor and Los Alamitos have no common interests with Long Beach. Rossmoor and Los Alamitos have commonality with Seal Beach, Westminster, Cypress, La Palma
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Ellery Deaton, Councilwoman	yes	Seal Beach District 1	Seal Beach	Orange	yes	Link Seal Beach and Huntington beach under the same represenative. Seal Beach and Aliso Viejo have nothing in common. Also Seal Beach and Irvine have nothing in common.
3orange_20110617_2	6172011	Zoeann Dorame, Teacher	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Makes no sense that Rossmoor would be placed in an L.A. County area district (Long Beach).
3orange_20110617_3	6172011	J. Scott Schoeffel, Mayor	yes	Dana Point City Council	Dana Point	Orange	yes	DPCC feels city should be grouped with other south Orange County cities for Senate and Assembly purposes because of the common issues these cities face.
3orange_20110618_2	6182011	Lizabeth McNabb	no		Costa Mesa	Orange	yes	We need to maintain the one district in Orange County that is willing to elect a woman to Congress. Having only 17 percent female representation is hurting our nation.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Casey Wollenberg	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617_2	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach, Seal Beach, Westminster, Cypress, La Palma	Seperated by the 605 freeway	no	no		
3orange_20110617_2	Orange	Seal Beach, Irvine, Huntington Beach, Aliso Viego		no	yes	school districts, water districts, community college districts, policing	
3orange_20110617_2	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110617_3	Orange.	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regianal transportation	land use planning, affordable houseing
3orange_20110618_2	Orange	Costa Mesa		no	no		
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617_2			no			No common interests with Long Beach re shared services or joint ventures.	Does not want to change Representative Ed Royce
3orange_20110617_2			no				
3orange_20110617_2			no			Major change of political boundaries, school districts, property taxes, and protection services	Why change something that is working?
3orange_20110617_3	common issues, working relationships		no				Contact us if you have questions.
3orange_20110618_2			no			We need to maintain the one district in Orange County that is willing to elect a woman to congress	Having 17 percent female representation is hurting our nation greatly. Men care about war, money, sex and power. Women and children continually get short shrift because they are not at the table to voice their concerns.
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Brian Phillips	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Dick Lee	no		Grand Rapids	Kent MI	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Ryan Bradley	no		Greenbelt	Prince Georges MD	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Lori Weber	no		Johnson City	Carter, TN	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Isabella Diaz	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Jameson Wu	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Leno Sislin	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	James M Nordlund	no		Fargo	ND	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Jesus Arguelles	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Saykin Foo	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Mike Antone	no		Sacaton	AZ	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110606_2	662011	William Dance	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110607_3	672011	Haiping Chen (duplicate)	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities
4langeles_20110607_3	672011	John Gallogy (duplicate)	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities
4langeles_20110607_3	672011	Tamela Mullin (duplicate)	no		St Joseph	MI	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110606_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110607_3	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110607_3	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110607_3	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LAHollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110606_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110607_3			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110607_3			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110607_3			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_3	672011	Kristoffer Martin (duplicate)	no		Eau Claire	WI	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities
4langeles_20110608_2	682011	Donna Mock	no		Medford	Jackson OR	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Toan Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Thanh Ngyuen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Thanh Nguyen (duplicate)	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Kevin Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	dat quoc tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	thanh quoc tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Susan Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_3	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110608_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_3			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110608_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011		no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Bau Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Johnny Truong	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Erickson Nguyen	yes	Kingston Technology Inc	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	vien ngoc huynh	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Cuc Kim Huynh	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Phi Dang	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Thao Dang	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Tiffany Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Thuy Nga Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Lap T. Hua	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.Regards
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Leanh Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Tony Truong	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Khanh Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Van Thu Bui-Vo	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Tai Phan	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Mekayla Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Khanh Ly	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Cindy Vu	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Hung Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	June Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	nguyen cao thuy-giao	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607_3	672011	Emily Beshlian (duplicate)	no		La Vista	Sarpy NE	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Khanh Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Thompson Pham	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Lap T. Hua	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Nhan Dac Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011		no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Linh Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	John Ngo	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Louis Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Tinh D. Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.(the Vietnamese Voices)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607_3	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LAHollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607_3			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				Sincerely yours
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				Thank you so much

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	nhandactran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Duong Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	John Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011		no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	Vy Vo	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_1	692011	erick	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Lily Nguyen C.	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Thach Bich	no			Santa Clara	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Hoa Dang	no			Los Angeles	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Khanh nguyen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Le, Viet Dieu	no			Santa Clara	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Tot Van Ho	no			Los Angeles	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	quang bui	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	khanh nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	uong	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	TRANG BUI	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	loc nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Phu Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Quang Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Frank Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Steven Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Lucie Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Le Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	thao tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	ducdao	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	danny	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	quang bui	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Long Dao	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	quang-hong-Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Long Vu	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	James Dao	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Ngoc thanh Vu	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Emily Vu	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				Thank you for your Consideration
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	kiet tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	nancy phan	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	thanh t bui	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Ha Phan	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Hung B. Huynh	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Eli	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Cuong Hung Dang	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Quan Lam	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	john nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Kim Ngo, Sr. Accountant	yes	Pacific Wave Systems, Inc	Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Sony Thien C	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.Best Regards
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	nancy phan	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	John Pham	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Rommy Hue	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Thanh Trung Mai	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
3orange_20110619_2	6192011	Theodora Howell	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Wants to know if 91304-3003 area code is part of Ventura county.
3orange_20110619_3	6192011	Lawrence P. Watson	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Absolutely opposed to the re-assignment of Rossmoor and Los Alamitos to the Long Beach congressional district
3orange_20110619_3	6192011	Jeanne Galindo, Craig Rosenberg	no		Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Fountain Valley shares a community of interest with Huntington Beach and Costa Mesa, not Santa Ana
3orange_20110619_3	6192011	Leise Zamora	no		Anaheim	Orange	yes	Keep district lines the way they are and loop in Orange as well. Orange and Anaheim share the same transportation and housing needs.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
3orange_20110619_2	Ventura	West Hills		no	no		
3orange_20110619_3	Orange, LA	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110619_3	Orange	Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Santa Ana	405 fwy links Fountain Valley to malls and entertainment with Huntington Beach and Costa Mesa neighbors	no	yes	Share high school district, sports teams, shopping, restaurants, 405 freeway, service groups, bedroom community, libraries, community college, sanitation districts	
3orange_20110619_3	Orange	Orange, Anaheim		no	yes	transportation and housing needs	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.I am VietAm
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd. Keep the map please
3orange_20110619_2			no				
3orange_20110619_3			no			Interests of Rossmoor are not aligned with those of Long Beach, and Rossmoor would be tragically ill-served by such a re-assignment.	
3orange_20110619_3			no				Thank you for your consideration
3orange_20110619_3	transportation, housing		no				Happy with Ed Royce, supporter of High Speed Rail

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110619_3	6192011	Lonie Washburn	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Reconsider splitting up Dana Point into two districts, small community depends on unity
3orange_20110619_3	6192011	Kathleen Tousignant	no		Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Lives in Fountain valley, worried about redistricting plan for Orange County
3orange_20110620	6202011	Pam Tappan	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Lives in Dana Point 31 years, small community. Nothing in common with North Orange County.
3orange_20110620	6212011	Mrs. Karen Joyce	no		Fullerton	Orange	yes	The testimony at the meeting in Fullerton was not reflective of the North Orange County average citizen opinion.
3orange_20110620	6202011	Mike Horn	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes redistricting that would divide Dana Point geographically or place Dana Point outside of any state Senate or Assembly districts that do not inclue neighboring South Orange county cities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110619_3	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110619_3	Orange	Fountain Valley		no	no		
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110620	Orange	Fullerton		no	no		
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planning	affordable housing

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110619_3			no			Making positive advances in city improvments and rely on this unity (of districts) to continue to succeed	
3orange_20110619_3			no				Concerned that there were few non-Asian or non-Latino voices in Orange County Register Article. Thinks non-Asians, non-Latinos are being disenfranchised.
3orange_20110620	Do not cut our city in half		no			Small community that does not have ability to grow. There are plenty of borders that can be used to redistrict.	
3orange_20110620			no			Hopes commission will see through what was an organized effort to save Loretta Sanchezs congressional district. Hope commission will emphasize the non-partisan criteria of city county boundaries	
3orange_20110620			no			Dividing city doubles difficulty in getting interests represented	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110620	6202011	Steve Hwangbo, City Councilman	yes	City of La Palma	La Palma	Orange	yes	Opposes grouping with Long Beach Port. Communties of interest are Cypress, Buena Park, Fullerton, Los Alamitos, and Cerritos.
3orange_20110620	6202011	Kent Wellbrock	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes dividing Dana Point as it would not serve best interests.
3orange_20110620	6212011	James Goda	no		San Clemente	Orange	yes	Sees no sense in cutting San Clemente off from Dana Point, Laguna Beach, other Coastal orange county cities.
3orange_20110620	6202011	David and Karin McPherson	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes dividing Dana Point geographically or placing Dana Point outside south Orange County city districts.
3orange_20110620	6202011	Richard Mackaig	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Splitting Dana Point in half will cause enormous problems. Problems of Dana Point have a lot in common with San Clemente and San Juan Capistrano.
3orange_20110620	6202011	Alvin J. Glatt	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes dividing Dana Point geographically or placing Dana Point outside south Orange County city districts.
3orange_20110620	6202011	Leland W. Wight MD	no		Laguna Woods	Orange	yes	Is vital to keep Anaheim and Santa Ana together
3orange_20110620	6202011	G.G. Miller	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor and los Alamitos should be in Orange County, not part of Long Beach
3orange_20110620	6202011	David Ontiveros	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes dividing Dana Point geographically or placing Dana Point outside south Orange County city districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110620	Orange	La Palma, Cypress, Buena Park, Fullerton, Los Alamitos, Cerritos		no	yes	Community events, school districts, joint programs	shop at businesses in each others cities
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110620	Orange	San Clemente, Dana Point, Laguna Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planning	affordable housing
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano		no	yes		
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planning	affordable housing
3orange_20110620	Orange	Anaheim, Santa Ana		no	yes	Latino communities deserve nothing less	
3orange_20110620	Orange	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planning	affordable housing

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110620	cities are homogenous		no				
3orange_20110620	small city		no				Will work aggressively to oppose this process
3orange_20110620			no				
3orange_20110620			no			dividing city doubles difficulty in represntation, achieving consensus	
3orange_20110620	similar problems		no			Reconsider your las proposal and leave Dana Point intact	
3orange_20110620			no			dividing city doubles difficulty in represntation, achieving consensus	
3orange_20110620			no				
3orange_20110620			no			Redistricting is political ploy, sick of politicians lying, cheating and spinning stories	
3orange_20110620			no			dividing city doubles difficulty in represntation, achieving consensus	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110620	6202011	Todd Wallin CEO	yes	Wallin Enterprises, LLC	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes dividing Dana Point geographically or placing Dana Point outside south Orange County city districts.
3orange_20110620	6202011	Stephen Rinella	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor best served by Rep. royce in Orange county. No commonality with Long Beach
3orange_20110620	6202011	Roy F. Dohner	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes dividing Dana Point geographically or placing Dana Point outside south Orange County city districts.
3orange_20110620_2	6202011	Deborah Miller	yes		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor and los Alamitos should be in Orange County, not part of Long Beach
3orange_20110620_2	6202011	Suzanne Enis	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposes dividing Dana Point geographically or placing Dana Point outside south Orange County city districts.
3orange_20110620_3	6222011	Charles A. McLuen	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Objects to Gerrymandering of Rossmoor and Los Alamitos into Los Angeles county District.
4langeles_20110605_2	652011	Jon Spinac	no		New York	New York	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110609_1	6102011	Quang Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planning	affordable housing
3orange_20110620	Orange	Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110620	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planning	affordable housing
3orange_20110620_2	Orange	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos		no	no		
3orange_20110620_2	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planning	affordable housing
3orange_20110620_3	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos		no	no		
4langeles_20110605_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110609_1	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110620			no			dividing city doubles difficulty in represntation, achieving consensus	
3orange_20110620			no			Rossmoor has no commonality with Long Beach	
3orange_20110620			no			dividing city doubles difficulty in represntation, achieving consensus	
3orange_20110620_2			no			Redistricting is political ploy, sick of politicians lying, cheating and spinning stories	
3orange_20110620_2			no			dividing city doubles difficulty in represntation, achieving consensus	
3orange_20110620_3			no			Orange county residents have views goals and concerns that are not compatible with those of LA county	
4langeles_20110605_2			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110609_1			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Diane T Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	minh tuyen (duplicate)	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Mike Do	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Kim Ngo	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Sam Carl	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	Sinh Cao	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_2	692011	David Tong	no		Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110609_3	692011	Franziska Wittenstein	no		Woodacre	Marin	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110609_3	692011	Edward Laurson	no		Denver	Denver CO	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110609_3	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110609_3	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd. Thanks. OC voter.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_2	please dont change June 2nd Zone		no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110609_3			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110609_3			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	vicky tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Hiep Ton	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Thu Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Vu Bich Phuong	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Chanh Phan	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Pham Van	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Tram Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Cynthia Ton	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Thai Nguyen	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Phuong Nguyen	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Isaac Lee	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Brendan Fizerald	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Loan Nguyen	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Dung Kim Tran	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Lynn Bach	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Thai Vu	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Thu-Thuy Nguyen, RN	yes	OCHCABHS			yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Amy Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Sony Van Phi	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	mingnga bui	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Dinh, Thanh Trang	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Nina Tran	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd. Your consideration is greatly appreciated.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011		no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Sang Thi Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Van Bui-Vo	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Thomas Truong	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6112011	Holly Hoang	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110610_2	6102011	Kimberly Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110611	6112011	ailien tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110611	6112011	Thuy T Nguyen	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110611	6122011	Tuyen Tran	no			Orange	yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.
4langeles_20110611	6112011	Thu Minh Tran	no				yes	Happy with district drawn for Little Saigon. Please keep this district to protect our voices.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110610_2	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110611	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110611	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110611	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	
4langeles_20110611	Orange			no	yes	Keep district to protect our voices.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110610_2			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110611			no				On June 2nd. Little Saigon is our sweat, tears, and effort. Thank you for your consideration.
4langeles_20110611			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110611			no				On June 2nd.
4langeles_20110611			no				On June 2nd.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110615_4	6152011	Karen Tucker	no		Pensacola	Escambia FL	yes	It will be difficult for representatives to represent a lumped together Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, and East L.A. East L.A. and Lincoln Heights should be together with other eastside communities.
4langeles_20110616_2	6172011	Erin Culling	no		Sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Sherman Oaks should not be divided. Southern border of district should be Mullholland Drive, not Ventura Blvd.
4langeles_20110616_2	6162011	Garrett Schneider	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	South Pasadena and Pasadena should be in the same congressional district
4langeles_20110616_2	6162011	Frank Huttinger	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Proposed Assembly Districts split Altadena away from Pasadena into San Bernadino County, and splits South Pasadena in half, and Pasadena in half, along 210 Freeway, with southern half down to La Habra Heights, Diamond Bar, Whittier, Chino Hills.
4langeles_20110616_2	6162011	Daniel Mansouri	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Appreciates including Calabasas in West Valley. Concerned parts of Northridge are being chunked off from city proper, with Reseda split in half.
4langeles_20110616_2	6162011	Elizabeth A. Pollock, President	yes	Del Rey Homeowners and Neighbors Association	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Neighborhoods Palms, Mar Vista and Del Rey are all in same community plan within Los Angeles. Playa Vista is not in the same plan.
4langeles_20110616_2	6162011	Barbara Bair	no				yes	Wants one congressional district for Altadena and Pasadena
4langeles_20110616_2	6152011	Ed Washatka	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Proposed districts splits Altadena from Pasadena, combines it with San Bernardino County. Also Spits South Pasadena and Pasadena in half.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110615_4	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, East LA	The district lines cross the Los Angeles River and dart around Downtown LA	no	yes	East L.A. should be with other eastside communities	
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles	Sherman Oaks	Mulholland Drive should be southern border, not Ventura Blvd	yes	yes	Sherman Oaks is close knit neighborhood	
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, South Pasadena		no	yes	historically, culturally	economically
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Altadena, Pasadena, South Pasadena, La Habra Heights, Diamond Bar, Whittier, Chino Hills	210 Freeway	no	yes	Foothill communities of San Gabriel Valley have century old common interest	
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles	Calabasas, Reseda, Northridge		no	yes	Reseda and Northridge are integral parts of Valley.	
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes	Palms, Mar Vista and Del Rey share community plan	
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles	Atltadena, Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Altadena, Pasadena, South Pasadena		no	yes	Should remain intact so that constituent interests are best served.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110615_4			no			East Los Angeles state assembly district is a farce, bizarrely shaped and illogical.	
4langeles_20110616_2			no				
4langeles_20110616_2	they are cousin cities		no				
4langeles_20110616_2	political integrity		no			Should not be dismantled.	
4langeles_20110616_2	They are traditional communities that are elements of the West Valley		no				Otherwise, appreciates hard work in making redistricting process fair.
4langeles_20110616_2			no				Best Regards
4langeles_20110616_2			no				
4langeles_20110616_2			no			We need your help to keep our communities together	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110616_2	6162011	Marvin and Esther A. Schachter	no				yes	Dividing Pasadena, cutting off Altadena violates intent of Prop 11.
4langeles_20110616_2	6162011	Lori O Bryan	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita together. Seperating South Santa Clarita from the rest of Santa Clarita is wrong
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Tor Hyams, Board Member	yes	Los Feliz Improvement Association	Los Feliz	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned that Los Feliz, including Griffith Park, is proposed to be attached to communities that are different demographically, economically, characteristically. Should be with Hollywood Hills, Glendale.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Susan J. Abato	no		Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned with district that runs from santa Clarita to the ocean. San fernando valley had no common interest with santa Clarita Valley.
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Dale Lehman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole as one district. Add Newhall to Antelope Valley.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Gina Wong	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Whittier, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs and Los Nietos are one community. Map including Diamond Bar is outrageous and politically motivated.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Beverly and Bruce Gladstone	no		Sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Sherman Oaks intact as an involved and active community

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Altadena		no	yes	cultural, organizational, shopping, religious, single school district	economic, shopping
4langeles_20110616_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, South Santa Clarita	Mountain range seperates from other valleys	no	yes	Weather problems, school districts, junior college, court system, radio station and community tv station, shopping areas, family values, sports and aquatic center, geology	water companies, electric companies, tv companies,
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Glendale		yes	yes		High property values shared with Hollywood Hills and Glendale
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angles	Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley	San Fernando Valley	no	yes		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Pico Rivera, Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, Los Nietos, Diamond Bar		no	yes	Rio Hondo College, shopping, eateries, church, senior center, horse boarding	
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Sherman Oaks		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110616_2	Common sense, proposition 11		no			We urge quick reconsideration.	
4langeles_20110616_2			no			Please keep us together so we can work together for our valleys needs instead of taking away our voice.	
4langeles_20110617_2	redistricting will disenfranchise our residents who have different concerns from proposed district communities		no				
4langeles_20110617_2	Latino Representation		no				Listening to stream while typing with broken wrist.
4langeles_20110617_2	Add Newhall to Antelope Valley		no				
4langeles_20110617_2	They are gateway cities		no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Sherman Oaks residents for over 50 years

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Jeffrey Colin Swartz	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	District 25 has base in Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley. Rest of district includes eastern Sierra Nevada. Has more in common with San Fernando Valley. Cities of Newhall, Stevenson Ranch, Valencia, Saugus, Canyon Country, and Castaic have been built.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Lance Slimmer	no		Rossmoor, CA	Orange	yes	Opposed to placing Rossmoor in same district as Long Beach. Are in school district with Seal beach, and share cultural programs with Cypress, West Garden Grove.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Charles Nichols	no				yes	Lawndale belongs in 36th Congressional District, 28th Senate District, and 53rd Assembly District. Shares Western border with Redondo Beach and Southern border with Torrance. Draft maps go too far east.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Elizabeth Pollock, President	yes	Del Rey Homeowners and Neighbors Association	Del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Del Rey is part of Los Angeles, not Santa Monica or Culver City. Should be with LA and Marina del Rey
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Celeste Zabala	no		Pico Rivera	Los Angeles	yes	Pico Rivera should be kept together with Whittier.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Carrie Scoville (duplicate)	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned about shredding of Los Angeles. Harbor Freeway (I110) is unfair boundary. Port of LA is main feature in region, but it has been cut off. Waterfront has little to do with areas north of Carson. Broaden district at coastline.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Antelope Valley, Newhall, Stevenson Ranch, Valencia, Saugus, Canyon Country, Castaic		no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and San Fernando Valley work, sports games, burbank airport, politics	similar economies
4langeles_20110617_2	Orange	Long Beach, Rossmoor, Seal Beach, Cypress, West Garden Grove		no	yes	Share cultural programs and school district with Seal Beach, Cypress, West Garden Grove	
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Lawndale, Redondo Beach, Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Del Rey, Los Angeles, Santa Monica Culver City, Marina del Rey		no	yes	school districts	
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Pico Rivera, Whittier		no	yes		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	LA, San Pedro, Carson, Wilmington, Harbor City, Harbor Gateway, Port of Los Angeles.	Harbor Freeway, waterfront, coastline	no	yes	preserve waterfront, keep LA whole, include community	equitable income balance

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110617_2	change and growth		no			Santa Clarita Valley needs representation that is fair and plural to majority of residents.	
4langeles_20110617_2	These cities make up our community		no				We have had the same Member of the House of Representatives for many years.
4langeles_20110617_2	Lawndale is the Heart of the South Bay		no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2	Economically and socially cannot be divided up into different districts		no				thank you for your time
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Maps included

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	David Herbst	yes	Mercury Air Group	Westchester, Playa del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester with rest of South Bay. Keep with El Segundo, Beach Cities, Torrance, Palos Verdes Peninsula
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Tess Nelson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Concerns that Los Feliz district is grouped with a district with low property values and home ownerships. Traditionally been part of Hollywood Hills, and Glendale communities
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Timothy P. Wendler	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena, East Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, Glendale and Burbank should be in the same district. Duarte, Monrovia, Azusa, La Verne and Glendora should not be split, and should add Claremont. Balwin park should be shifted from lower part of COVNA.
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Elena Perez	no		Griffith Park	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Hollywood, Burbank, Griffith park together in one assembly district
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Robynn A. Creitz	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita into two districts. Add Newhall to Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley district.
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Dennis Lord	no			Los Angeles	yes	Gardena is misspelled on Hawthorne-Gardena-Compton map.
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Lisa Lehman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole and add Newhall and Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Arpi Kevorkian	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Hollywood, Burbank, Griffith park together in one assembly district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	El Segundo, Westchester, Beach Cities, Torrance, Palos Verdes Peninsula.		no	yes		Economic an tax concern, socioeconomic differences, Air Force Base
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Glendale	Griffith Park and neighborhoods South of the park	yes	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, East Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, Glendale, Burbank, Duarte, Monrovia, Azusa, La Verne, Glendora, Claremont, Baldwin Park	Keep cities in Eastern part of San Gabriel valley together and move to COVNA district	no	yes	school district, African American Community	
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Griffith Park, Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Hollywood, Burbank		yes	yes	history culture, shopping	employment patterns, key industries,
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall, Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Gardena, Compton		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall, Antelope Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Griffith Park, Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Hollywood, Burbank	Griffith Park and neighborhoods South of the park	yes	yes	history culture, shopping	employment patterns, key industries,

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110617_2	have interests well-represented		no				chart included
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2	geography and compactness, balance out population		no				
4langeles_20110617_2	state issues of concern		no				please honor our requests
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Just helping you look professional
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2	state issues of concern		no				Thank you and God bless.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Darlene Zavalney	no		Port of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Port of Los Angeles and San Pedro together. Do not split into haves and have nots
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Chris Townsley	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Newhall and Santa Clarita Valley Whole. Do not split Santa Clarita into two congresisonal districts. Newhall should be added to Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Brian	no				no	
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Joan Baumann	no				yes	Supports keeping Sara Clarita Valley whole. Do not split into two districts. Add Newhall.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Micheal DeNeal	no			Los Angeles	yes	Supports keeping Sara Clarita Valley whole.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Debi Statland	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Foothills communities should be placed in mapping group Tujunga, La Crescenta, Burbank, Glendale, Montrose, La Tuna Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Yvonne E. Pine	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Unaceptable to have So. Pasadena joined with LA and cities to the south. History of association with Pasadena and San Marino.
4langeles_20110617_2	6182011	Rebecca A. Basham	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, Add Newhall to Antelope valley- Santa Clarita valley
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Larry Wims	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not let Valencia be moved from Santa Clarita to San Fernando
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Willard C. Gekler	no		Los Alamitos Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Los Alamitos and Rossmoor have no COI with Long Beach. Are in Orange, not LA county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Port of Los Angeles, San Pedro	Port	no	yes		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall	large mountain range and newhall pass seperates	no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Tujunga, La Crescenta, Burbank, Glendale, Montrose, La Tuna Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills	foothills	no	yes	interact as functional group. Interest in maintaining green views and animal friendly environment	do business
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	South Pasadena, Pasadena, San Marino	physically divided by the Arroyo Seco	no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Valencia, Santa Clarita, San Fernando		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles, Orange	Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110617_2	Town draws strength from being a town united and passionate about its future.		no				Thank you for consideration
4langeles_20110617_2			no			geographically divided area	
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Suggests using Google maps style maps that allow users to zoom in on houses.
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Thank you
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no			no connection with Senator Gilbert Cedillo.	
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no			Voice in congressional manners would be squelched	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	John Haggard	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley as unified as possible. In past have shared with places as far flung as Malibu.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Joan Curd	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita. Keep Newhall in Santa Clarita Valley
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Farid Enrique Ben Amor	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Thanks for attaching Sunland and Tujunga to neighbors to SW. Valleys districts should run contiguous from northern to southern mountain range crests (mulholland). Extend east San Fernando Valley districts to crest of Santa Monica mountains, Mulholland.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	David Crowley	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Ann Tomkins	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	William D. Creitz	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa clarita. Add community of Newhall to Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita valley district
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Mikie Maloney	no		Sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Sherman Oaks one community. Natural boundary is not Ventura Blvd, but Mulholland. Hills residents are alligned with flatland residents.
4langeles_20110617_2	6122011	Joan Levine	no			Los Angeles	yes	Attached Holly-wood centered, Griffith-Park respectful district map.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Malibu		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Sunland, Santa Monica, Tujunga,	northern and southern mountain range crests, Mulholland Drive, Santa monica Mountains	no	yes	COI goes to Universal City and Mulholland Drive	
4langeles_20110617_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Sherman Oaks	Ventura Boulevard, Mulholland	yes	yes	hills and flatlands are aligned	
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood, Griffith Park		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110617_2			no			Different interests	
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Thank you
4langeles_20110617_2	Similar networks and concerns		no				Spent a couple of months contracted to assist Rob Wilcox with communication and outreach efforts.
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Hard to see what areas are covered in maps because no street names are given in specific areas. Major boundary streets should be named at least. Please correct this.
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Put better maps on website; cant tell where home is. Need street level maps
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2		does not violate VRA	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Genevieve Estrada	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Split Redlands along I10 into North and South.Include North Redlands in SBRIA distritct
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	William Koelsch	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena, South Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre should be in the same district, along with La Canada-Flintridge. Also Arcadia.
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Darla Dyson	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena in one congressional district and keep Pasadena and Altadene in one assembly district. Keep South Pasadena united
4langeles_20110617_2	6172011	Glenda Johnson	no		Newhall	Santa Clarita	yes	Newhall should be with Santa Clarita, not part of San Fernando Valley and west to Simi Valley nor East to Antelope Valley. Leave Santa clarita whole
4langeles_20110619_2	6192011	Danielle Smith	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa clarita. Add community of Newhall to Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita valley district
4langeles_20110619_2	6192011	Linda Pursell	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Lives in Newhall. Do not separate Newhall from rest of Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110619_2	6192011	Michael G. Evanns	yes	Law Office of Michael G. Evans	Valencia	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa clarita. Add community of Newhall to Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita valley district. Community is not contiguous with SFV.
4langeles_20110619_2	6192011	Joy Bliss	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthone is part of South Bay and does not belong in Compton, Gardena, Athens, Inglewood area district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110617_2	San Bernardino	Redlands	I10	no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, South Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre, La Canada-Flintridge, Arcadia		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Atladena, South Pasadena		no	yes	same school district	
4langeles_20110617_2	Los Angeles	Newhall, Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110619_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110619_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall	Mountain range seperating Newhall from San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall.		no	no		
4langeles_20110619_2	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Compton, Gardena, Athens, Inglewood, South Bay		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110617_2			no			residents north of freeway deserve representation that matches their urban lifefstyle.	
4langeles_20110617_2			no				La Canada has a different area code.
4langeles_20110617_2			no				
4langeles_20110617_2			no				Lived in Newhall 40 years
4langeles_20110619_2			no				
4langeles_20110619_2			no			cant get adequate attention from a SFV representative	
4langeles_20110619_2			no			Newhall voters have different issues and concerns	Thank You
4langeles_20110619_2			no			Hawthorne has nothing in common with Compton and those areas North and east of us.	Please give my families vote a chance to be heard

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110619_2	6192011	Gina Sanders	no			Los Angeles	yes	No sense for Hollywood Hills to be in one district, Los Feliz and Silver Lake in another, Hollywood flats in another, and North hollywood in another. Keep neighborhoods adjacent to Griffith Park in the same district
4langeles_20110619_2	6192011	James and Patricia Riner	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Newhall and Valencia from SCV district and put into West SFV district. Keep in Antelope valley
4langeles_20110619_2	6192011	Laura Martel	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not change the 8th district. Do not split atlantic avenue
4langeles_20110620_2	6202011	Dennis Buckley, Chair of the Board of Directors (duplicate)	yes	Pasadena Chamber of Commerce	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Place entirety of Pasadena in congressional district that includes Burbank and Glendale. Also include Altadena. South Pasadena has little in common with Chino Hills.
4langeles_20110620_2	3102011	Vance Pomeroy, VP and Lorie Weatherbie, VP	yes	Juniper Hills Town Council	Juniper Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Requests revising southern boundary line using Angeles Crest highway (hwy 2) to provide more even representation.
4langeles_20110620_2	6182011	Warner Chabot, CEO (duplicate)	yes	CA League of Conservation Voters and CLCV Education Fund		Los Angeles	yes	Consider a Los Angeles Santa Clarita Valley district that nests the two contiguous assembly districts of West Side- Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains. Create geographically compact district by nesting two districts
4langeles_20110620_2	6202011	Janet Wight	no			Orange	yes	Anaheim and Santa Ana should be kept together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110619_2	Los Angeles	Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, Hollywood flats, North Hollywood.	Griffith Park	yes	yes	fire	
4langeles_20110619_2	Los Angeles	Newhall, Valencia		no	no		
4langeles_20110619_2	Los Angeles		Atlantic Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110620_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, South Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale, Altadena		no	yes	Colleges, hotels airport	water, power utility
4langeles_20110620_2	Los Angeles	Juniper Hills	Hwy 2	no	yes	more even representation	
4langeles_20110620_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Santa Clarita, Santa monica		no	yes	share coast, mountains, watershed, wildlife, open space, and recreational values	infrastructure interests
4langeles_20110620_2	Orange	Anaheim, Santa Ana		no	yes	Latino community	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110619_2	same issues		no				We need this togetherness
4langeles_20110619_2			no				
4langeles_20110619_2			no				Gabelich has been wonderful represenative. Johnson go away
4langeles_20110620_2	public safety, school districts, higher education, Armenian, Latino, African-American and white citizens.		no				
4langeles_20110620_2			no				included map of juniper hills
4langeles_20110620_2		including greater percentage of West Side-Santa Monica Assembly district into LASCV district will respect COI and uphold VRA	no				
4langeles_20110620_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110620_2		Francine Diamond, Chair	yes	California Regional Water Quality Control Board	Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Westside-Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica Mountains should be nested within one Senate District to meet the needs of the interconnected communities within.
4langeles_20110620_2	6212011	Victor M. Chavez, Jr	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep VRA in mind as you draw lines. First draft pit Latinos against African Americans in South LA and you eliminate a Latinoa distric in Central and SE Orange County. Do not disenfranchise Latinoa political power in San Diego County
4langeles_20110620_2	6202011	Gail DeMario	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	West Valley is 405 Fwy west to LA county line, includes Conejo Valley. East Valley goes 405 Fwy East to BurbankGlendale. West Valley should be contained in West San Fernando Valley. Needs are different from WLA, Malibu Torrence, etc.
4langeles_20110620_3	6172011	Angelica M. Solis, Executive Director	yes	Alliance for a Better Community		Los Angeles	yes	New maps would disempower minority and socio-economically disadvantaged communities. Put Pico Union in with neighborhoods to the south of it. It is included now with Malibu and Beverly Hills, which do not share the same interests or needs.
4langeles_20110620_4	6152011	Jean Good Lietzau, Founding Mayor	yes	La Habra Heights	La Habra Heights	Los Angeles	yes	La Habra Heights should not be cut off from similar LA County cities. La Habra Heights has always been closely involved with La Mirada, Whittier, and Downy.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Michael Grossman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa clarita into two districts, add Newhall to Antelope Valley- Santa clarita valley district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110620_2	Los Angeles		Mountains of Santa Monica	no	yes		
4langeles_20110620_2	Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego			no	yes	latinoa communities	
4langeles_20110620_2	Los Angeles	West Valley, Conejo Valley, East Valley, Burbank, Glendale, Malibu, Torrence	405 Fwy	no	no		
4langeles_20110620_3	Los Angeles	Pico Union, Malibu, Beverly Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_4	Los Angeles	La Habra Heights, La Mirada, Whittier, Downey City		no	yes	Always been closely involved with the city councils since incorporation	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110620_2	contiguous district should be together		no				Please preserve critical environmental and coastal areas in California.
4langeles_20110620_2		keep VRA in mind as you draw your lines and do not disenfranchise communities of color	no				
4langeles_20110620_2			no			West Valley needs own representatives	Stop pretending you are doing a big job, get down to honest division of districts.
4langeles_20110620_3		maps as drawn now violate VRA	no			Pico Union needs to be alligned with areas to the south of it, not Malibu and Beverly hills	
4langeles_20110620_4	better working arrangement for all of us, needs are similar		no				Thank you for the work you are doing
4langeles_20110620_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Susan Lloyd	yes	Lloyd Lloyd and Holmes Accountancy Corporation	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Encino needs to be in West Valley
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Linda and Gary Starr	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Chatsworth assembly and districts should be contained in West Valley and NOT east valley. San Fernando Valley is divided by 405. West valley ends at LA county Line, East vally is from 405 to BurbankGlendale
4langeles_20110620_5		Maggie Darett	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Resides in Glassell Park. Supports uniting Northeast area.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Betty Breneman	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Resident of San Fernando Valley, which is bounded on east by 405 fwy and on west by L.A county line and includes Conejo Valley. West San Fernando Valley residents should be represented by intact districts and not divided up.
4langeles_20110620_5	6172011	Marge Nichols	no		Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	Altadena and Pasadens should not be seperated. South Pasadena should not be divided or assigned to districts in LA or to the south.
4langeles_20110620_5	6172011	Marge Nichols	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Encino		no	yes		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Chatsworth, West Valley, East Valley, Burbank Glendale	405	no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Glassell Park		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley	405, LA County Line	no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Altadena, Pasadena, South Pasadena		no	yes	cultural, Black residents in Altadena and Pasadena. South Pasadena has strong association with communities in West San Gabriel Valley	
4langeles_20110620_5				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110620_5	specific needs that are different from east valley communities		no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no			East valley should have their own representation	
4langeles_20110620_5			no				New map is a fair representation of my communities and allows stronger political representation. Thankyou for your hard work.
4langeles_20110620_5			no			West and East San Fernando Valley should have own, separate representation	Trust youll not ingore our plea for a fair and just decision
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Prepared statement with map for hearing in whittier on june 17. Wanted to make sure it was on file with commission.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Gretchen Martin	no		San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley intact (405 fwy to L.A. county line).
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Victor Lindenheim	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita into two separate districts, add Newhall to Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Tom and Karen Zimmerman	no		La Crescenta	Los Angeles	yes	Foothills communities of Sunland-Tujunga, Kagel Canyon, La Tuna Canyon, and Shadow Hills should be in district wiwth La Crescenta, Glendale, Burbank, and La Canada. Stronger bond with foothills and greater Crescenta Valley than with Eastern San Fernando
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Matt Berkelhammer	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Whittier, East Whittier, South Whittier, West Whittier should all be included in same district. Also Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Montebello, Norwalk, Downey, La habra, and La habra heights should be the nucleus of the same district.
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Ruth Evans	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa clarita and do not take newhall and lump it with a city 40 miles away. Newhall works with Saugus, Stevenson Ranch and Valencia. Divide should remain below the 514 split. Entire Santa Clarita Valley should be in one district.
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Tonia Reyes Uranga	no			Los Angeles	yes	Spoke regarding Long Beach.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley	405 fwy, LA County line	no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Sunland-Tujunga, Kagel Canyon, La Tuna Canyon, and Shadow Hills, La Crescenta, Glendale, Burbank, La canada		no	yes	Crescenta Valley Community Association, share the valley and the mountains North and south of our valley	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Whittier, pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Montebello, Norwalk, Downey, La Habra, La habra Heights	san gabriel river, 605 freeway	no	yes	hispanic populationhistory, homestead, state historic park, family migration patterns, shopping recreation, educational, health care, schools	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall, Saugus, Stevenson Ranch, Valencia	514 split	no	yes		
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110620_5			no			Need own representation in assembly, senate, congress. Stop unfair redistricting practices	thank you for your attention in this matter
4langeles_20110620_5			no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Hope you will explore this designation
4langeles_20110620_5	Light rail project will draw closer together		no			New assembly district proposal for Whittier does not correspond to community realites, and appears to be politically motivated	thank you for consideration
4langeles_20110620_5	should not divide, work together		no				
4langeles_20110620_5			no				Provides links to two documents regarding Long Beach.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110620_5	6212011	Ricky Grubb	no		Sunland Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Supports map which puts Sunland Tujunga with Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale and Burbank.
4langeles_20110620_5	6202011	Olga Kaczmar	no			Los Angeles	yes	Newhall should stay intact with Santa Clarita. Makes no sense to add it to San Fernando Valley
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Benjamin Gamboa	no		Highland	San Bernardino	yes	Combining City of Riverside into single Senate district will minimze importance of the Corona-Norco aea and all of Moreno Valley and Perris. Place Moreno Vally and Perris in the same district as Murrieta and Temecula
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Benjamin Gamboa	no		Highland	San Bernardino	yes	The comission proposed CCHTM district will create a splot in communities. Choachella and Banning contain a more developed community of interest.
2sbernardino_20110618	6172011	Gary C. Ovitt	yes	Board of Supervisors County of San Bernardino	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	yes	Include Chino Hills into Ontario-Pamona Congressional District

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Sunland Tujunga with Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale and Burbank.		no	yes	Access to Vedugo mountains and hills, open spaces, rural lifestyle	
4langeles_20110620_5	Los Angeles	Newhall, Santa ClaritaSan Fernando Valley	there is a mountain inbetween	no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110618		Riverside, Corona, Norco, Moreno Valley, Perris,Murrieta, Temecula		no	yes	Seat will be more competitive between parties	
2sbernardino_20110618		Banning, Coachella, Temecula, Palm Springs	i10	no	yes	More competitive seat between the parties	electrical utility corridor, tourism
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino	Chino Hills, Chino		no	yes	shared school district, county supervisor, fire protection district, community college district, water agency, and chamber of commerce with Chino	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110620_5	part of Crescenta Valley and San Gabriel Foothills		no				
4langeles_20110620_5	mountain		no				Someone must have been driving heavy when they drew the lines.
2sbernardino_20110618			no				
2sbernardino_20110618			no				I truly appreciate the work the Commission is doing and hope my testimony assists in its considerations.
2sbernardino_20110618			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110618	6172011	Ed Graham	yes	City of Chino Hills	Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Include Chino Hills into San Bernardino County district and City of Chino
2sbernardino_20110618	6192011	Bob Hendrix	no			San Bernardino	yes	Univeristy of Redlands should be in the San Bernardino-Rialto Congressional District with Cal State San Bernardino
2sbernardino_20110618	6172011	Michael Rath	no		Hesperia	San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110618	6192011	Anthony Pelayo	no		Montclair	San Bernardino	yes	Thank you for keeping Pamona, Montclair, Chino, and Ontario together
2sbernardino_20110618_2	6192011	Marcos Pelayo	yes	Universal Solar Auto Glass and Tint		San Bernardino	yes	Keep the communities of Chino, Pamona, Montclair, and Ontario united.
2sbernardino_20110618_2	6152011	Jay P. Ebershol	no		Highland	San Bernardino	no	Do not include the community of East Highland with San Bernardino. The CA-30 splits the city of Highland in half. East Highland should be included in the IMNSB district.
3orange_20110617	6152011	Gayle Posner	no			Orange	yes	Object to assigning Los Alamitos and Rossmoor to the Long Beach congressional district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Chino Hills, Chino		no	yes	Contractual relationship with San Bernardino services - Sheriffs dept.,Emergency operations, Library system. Transportation system and water delivery system challenges are shared with Chino. Army Corp of Engineers owns property along border of Chino Hills	
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino			no	yes	Education	
2sbernardino_20110618				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110618		Pamona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario		no	yes	Same representation	
2sbernardino_20110618_2		Chino, Pamona, Montclair, Ontario		no	yes	common interest	
2sbernardino_20110618_2	San Bernardino	Highland, Redlands, Yucipia	Ca-30	yes	yes	quality of life	
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110618	Both Chino and Chino Hills are served by the Chino Valley Fire Dept., They share a School District and a Chamber of Commerce.		no				
2sbernardino_20110618	Both are 4 year college campuses		no				I want to get involved and be kept abreast of the hearings and input for redistricting for District II.
2sbernardino_20110618			no				
2sbernardino_20110618			no				Thank you for your work on the first drafts
2sbernardino_20110618_2			no				Thank you
2sbernardino_20110618_2			no				
3orange_20110617			no			Los Alamitos and Rossmoor have no Community of Interest with Long Beach	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617	6182011	Preston Zeigler	no			Orange	no	
3orange_20110617	6182011	Sue Mills	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Against moving Rossmoor from Orange County distric to Long Beach District
3orange_20110617	6182011	Lorraine Porter	no			Orange	no	
3orange_20110617	6182011	Patricia Wells	no			Orange	yes	Against redistricting Rossmoor to Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6182011	Shirley A. Bailey	no			Orange	yes	Doesnt make sense to move Rossmoor and Los Alalmitos into Long Beach district. They are seperated by a freeway and a forest.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Henrietta Carteer	no			Orange	yes	Most do not want to merge Rossmoor with a neighboring city or two
3orange_20110617	6172011	Dorothy Martin	no			Orange	yes	Leave Rossmoor with Ed Royce
3orange_20110617	6172011	Roger Waterman	no			Orange	yes	Opposed to the redistricting of Los AlamitosRossmoor to Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Joan L. Griffiths	no			Orange	yes	Oppose the proposed Congression District change. Rossmoor and Los Alamitos have no Community of Intrest with Long Beach

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617				no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange	Long Beach, Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110617				no	no		
3orange_20110617		Long Beach, Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach	Freeway, forest	no	no		
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110617				no	yes	with to keep Ed Royce and representative	
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	wish to keep Ed Royce as representative	
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Angeles, Los Alamitos		no	yes	Wish to keep representation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617			no			Rossmoor should not be moved into Laura Richardsons congressional District.	
3orange_20110617			no			Rossmoor has nothing in common with Long Beach	
3orange_20110617			no			Ed Royce should remain representative. We have no contact with Long Beach; we are in different counties; our problems are not the same.	
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no			VERY LITTLE in common	
3orange_20110617			no			Leave us in our current district with our current representative.	We had our commercial tax base finessed away from us decades ago.
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no			No common interest in county issues, or citylocal issues.	This is a very bad idea.
3orange_20110617			no			Rossmoor and Los Alamitos have no community of interest with Long Beach	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617	6182011	Julie Olin	no			Orange	yes	Opposition to the redistricting of Rossmoor and Los Alamitos to the congressional district of Long Beach.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Sandra Lamoureux	no			Orange	yes	Los Alamitos and Rossmoor wish to remain in the same congressional district as Orange County and not to move to Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Neil E. Allgood	no			Orange	yes	Opposed to the move of Los Alamitos into the Long Beach sphere of influence for political representation
3orange_20110617	6172011	Edwin Goldberg	no			Orange	yes	Object to assigning Los Alamitos and Rossmoor to the Long Beach congressional district.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Robert Rudesill	no			Orange	no	
3orange_20110617	6172011	Natanya Sutherland	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor has no affiliation with Long Beach.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Jonathan W. McGaw	no			Orange	yes	Reconsider proposed redistricting of Rossmoor and Los Alamitos to Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Joanne Angstadt	no			Orange	yes	Strongly object to redistricing Los Alamitos and Rossmoor to Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6152011	J. Scott Schoeffel(duplicate)	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617	Orange	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	wish to keep Ed Royce as representative	
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	Should remain a part of Ed Royces congressional district	
3orange_20110617		Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamiros, Rossmoor,, Long Beach		no	yes	Ed Royce has been effective in representing area	
3orange_20110617				no	no		
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	Pleased with current representation	
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos,Long Beach		no	yes	Do not want to change representation	
3orange_20110617				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617			no			These areas do not have communities of interest with Long Beach or Los Angeles county	
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no			Look at redistricting US ZIP code system to determine boundaries. This would solve problem of gerrymandered districts and be completely logical.	
3orange_20110617			no			No Affiliation between Rossmoor and Long Beach	
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617	6172011	Robert Kaplan	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Thank you for including Rossmoor in the same congressional district and Long Beach.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Michael Maynard	no			Orange	yes	It doesnt balance districts to move Los Alamitos and Rossmoor into the same congressional district as Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Timothy Obryan	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Keep congressional district with Ed Royce
3orange_20110617	6172011	Michael Posner	no			Orange	yes	Object to assigning Los Alamitos and Rossmoor to the Long Beach Congressional District.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Yen Jane Chen	no			Orange	yes	Rossmoor has no community of interest with Long Beach State and Assembly districts
3orange_20110617	6172011	John Adams	no			Orange	yes	Do not split the cities of Dana Point, San Juan, and San Clemente into different districts. Dana Point has no shared interests with Newport Beach.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Dale Van Steenis	no			Orange	no	Rossmoor has not shared interests of government with Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Susan Adams	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Dana Point should be placed in a district with South Orange County districts such as San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente not with Huntinton Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Gordon Anderson	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Do not change the district of Los Alamitos out of Orange County to Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Kristen Wesley	no			Orange	yes	Opposed to moving Rossmoor and Los Alamitos from Orange County congressional district to Long Beach congressional district
3orange_20110617	6172011	David Lara	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Object to placing Rossmoor in the same district as Long Beach to keep Ed Royce as representation

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617	Orange	Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	Close connections of communities	
3orange_20110617	Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	same demographic	
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor		no	yes	same representation	
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	Same representation	
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	same congressional representation	
3orange_20110617		Huntington Beach, Dana Point, San Juan, San Clemente, Newport Beach		no	yes	opposed El Toro airport	
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor, Orange		no	yes	no shared interests of governement with Long Beach	
3orange_20110617	Orange	Dana Point,Huntington Beach, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente		no	yes	issues, concern, coastal way of life	
3orange_20110617	Orange	Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	nothing in common with Long Beach	
3orange_20110617	Orange	Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	Keep congressional district	
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	Richardson will not work for Rossmoor but Royce will	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617	corrects gerrymandering		no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617	6172011	Erica m. Seipker	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Do not want Rossmoor, Los Alamitos to be redistricted with Long Beach
3orange_20110618	6182011	Greg Sowards	no		Placentia	Orange	yes	Pleased with proposal 29th Senate District. Spliting Placentia from Anaheim, Brea, and Fullerton will be detrimental.
3orange_20110618	6192011	Heidi Wills	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Oppose redistricting of Rossmoor to share district with Long Beach
3orange_20110618	6182011	Karen Gardner	no			Orange	yes	Opposed to districting Rossmoor and Los Alamitos out of Ed Royces district into Long Beach
3orange_20110618	6182011	Greg Sowards(duplicate)	no				no	
3orange_20110618	6182011	Curt Castagna	no			Orange	yes	Opposed to redistrict Los AlamitosRossmoor into Long Beach District
3orange_20110618	6192011	Carolyn Cavecche	yes	City of Orange	Orange	Orange	yes	Keep city of Orange in one Senate District and not split between Santa Ana and Irvine. Have a majority of the bridges connecting 2 cities of East Garden Grove with Orange border being no further e. then the Santa Ana River or 57 fwy. Not W. of the 55 fwy
3orange_20110618	6192011	Dr. Rosa Leung	no			Orange	yes	Opposed to redistrict Rossmoor with Long Beach
3orange_20110619	6192011	Randy Zaitz	no			Orange	yes	Oppose redistricting Los Alamitos and Rossmoor to Long Beach Los Angeles County
3orange_20110619	6192011	Jacob Lee	no			Orange	yes	Agree with the way you are drawing the lines.
3orange_20110619	6192011	Alfonso Weilbach	no		La Habra	Orange	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110618		Placentia, Anaheim, Brea, Fullerton		no	yes	education	
3orange_20110618		Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	representation	
3orange_20110618		Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	represetation	
3orange_20110618				no	no		
3orange_20110618		Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	no community of interest with Long Beach	
3orange_20110618	Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego	Orange, Santa Ana, Irvine, Los Angeles, Long Beach, East Garden Grove, Anaheim,	Santa Ana River, 57 freeway, 55 freeway	no	yes	shared city	
3orange_20110618	Orange, Los Angeles	Long Beach, Rossmoor		no	yes	representation	
3orange_20110619	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	representation	
3orange_20110619				no	no		
3orange_20110619				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110618			no				
3orange_20110618			no				
3orange_20110618			no				
3orange_20110618			no				
3orange_20110618			no				
3orange_20110618			no				thanks for all the work you are doing
3orange_20110618			no				
3orange_20110619			no				We have no voice.
3orange_20110619			no				
3orange_20110619			no				At the website given below the cities of La Habra and Yorba Linda are spelled incorrectly.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110619	6192011	Richard Garcia	no		Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Please continue redrawing districts as you are doing.
3orange_20110617	6172011	Charles Feistman	no			Orange	yes	It does not make sense to put Rossmoor with Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6172011	Mary Trotter	no			Orange	yes	It makes no sense to put Rossmoor and Los Alamitos into Long Beach district
3orange_20110617	6162011	Steve A. Nagel	yes	City of Fountain Valley	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Align City of Fountain Valley with the coastal district and City Of Huntington Beach
3orange_20110617	6162011	Joanne Knell	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Wish to remain in Congressional district served by Ed Royce and not moved to Long Beach area.
3orange_20110617	6162011	Pamela McVicar	yes	La Habra Heights County Water District	La Habra Heights	Orange	yes	Appreciate the lines drawn for the State Assembly and Senate Districts. Want the same congressional district as La Mirada, Whittier, and Downey.
3orange_20110617	6162011	Voter	no			Orange	no	
3orange_20110617	6152011	Jim Murphy	no			Orange	yes	Should keep Rossmoor and Los Alamitos in Orange County congressional district
3orange_20110617	6162011	Everett W. Knell	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Wish to remain in the same congressional district and not be moved to Long Beach
3orange_20110617	6162011	Emily Knell	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Want to remain in the same congressional district as Orange County and not be moved into Long Beach

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110619				no	no		
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	concern with changing of repesentative	
3orange_20110617		Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110617		Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach		no	yes	share school districts, service orgainizations, neighborhoods	
3orange_20110617	Orange	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	wish to keep represenative Ed Royce	
3orange_20110617	Los Angeles	La Habra Heights, Whittier, La Mirada, Downey		no	yes	city councils are very involved	
3orange_20110617				no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange	Rossmoor, Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes	keep same congressional representation	
3orange_20110617	Orange	Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Seal Beach, Long Beach		no	yes	keep same congressional representative	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110619			no				Dont only listen to lulac . Do what is fair for everyone of all race not just Latino and Asians. Thank you
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617	shared services, school districts, interests, neighborhoods		no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				Thank you for the work you are doing and thank you for considering my request during the public comment phase of the redistricting process.
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no			Nothing Los Angeles foes beneifits Los AlamitosRossmoor	If I have to go door to door to oppose this horrible potential transfer of districts- I will.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617	6162011	Wendy Grose	no			Orange	yes	It is a horrible transfer of districts to move Los AlamitosRossmoor s congressional district from Orange County into Los Angeles County
3orange_20110617	6162011	Jackie Littler	no	City of Dana Point	Dana Point	Orange	no	
3orange_20110617	6152011	Mark McCurdy	yes	Fountain Valley City Council	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Fountain Valley-does not share a COI with Santa Ana but it does with Huntington Beach
3orange_20110617	6162011	Renee Cox	no		San Clemente	Orange	yes	San Clemente does not relate Riverside County
3orange_20110617	6162011	Alan Boinus	no		Laguna Beach	Orange	yes	Laguna Woods is integral to Laguna Beach community do not redistrict out.
3orange_20110617	6162011	Matt Mogensen	no			Orange	no	
3orange_20110617	6172011	Penny Maynard	no			Orange	yes	Would like copies of the boundaries of the Assembly Districts, Senate Districts and Congressional districts that are in Dana Point
3orange_20110617	6172011	Mondragon Miguel	no			Orange	yes	Keep the cities of Anaheim, Graden Grove, and Santa Ana together
3orange_20110617	6162011	Larry R. Crandall	yes	Fountain Valley City Council	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Keep Fountain Valley in the same congressional district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos, Rossmoor,Long Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110617				no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange	Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Santa Ana		no	yes	Share santitation, school districts, cultutal and community service clubs, and sports teams	
3orange_20110617	Orange, Riverside	San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan, Capistrano, Laguna Beach, Camp Pendleton, Oceanside		no	yes	shopping, recreation	
3orange_20110617		Laguna Beach, Laguna Woods		no	yes	same election districts	
3orange_20110617				no	no		
3orange_20110617		Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange	Anaheim, Garden Grove, Santa Ana		no	yes	Provide neccessities of food, clothes, and resturaunts and representation	
3orange_20110617	Orange	Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa		no	yes	keep same representation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				Please see attached letter from Mayor Scott Schoeffel.
3orange_20110617	share resources		no				thank you for your consideration
3orange_20110617			no				Thank you
3orange_20110617			no				Thank you
3orange_20110617			no				Please find the attached two letters detailing the comments of Mayor Steve Nagel and Council Member Larry Crandall.
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617	6182011	Mark McCurdy(duplicate)	no				no	
3orange_20110617	6132011	J. Scott Schoeffel	yes	City of Dana Point	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Opposed to redistricting proposal wich devides city
3orange_20110617	6162011	Steve A. Nagel(duplicate)	no				no	
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Robynn A. Creitz	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita into two congressional districts. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley- Santa Clarita Vallet congressional district
4langeles_20110617	6182011	Elena Perez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, the Hollywood Hills, Hollywood proper and Burbank in one assembly districts
4langeles_20110617	6182011	Lisa Lehman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole as Newhall and Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110617	6182011	Dale Lehman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole as Newhall and Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110617	6182011	Brain	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Carrie Scoville	no			Los Angeles	yes	The boundary line of the i110 through Graffy st. it will split Los Angeles.Broaden district at coastline to include San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City and Harbor Gateway.Add Palos Verdes if neccesary.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617				no	no		
3orange_20110617	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	historical working relationships	
3orange_20110617				no	no		
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita, Antelope Valley		no	yes	same city	
4langeles_20110617		Burbank	Griffith Park, Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Hollywood	yes	yes	history,culture, shopping, state issues of concern	employment, key industries
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Antelope Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Antelope Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110617				no	no		
4langeles_20110617		Los Angeles	Port of Los Angeles, San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City, Harbor Gateway, Palso Verdes, Carson, I110, Gaffey st.	no	yes		port

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
3orange_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				thank you
4langeles_20110617			no				thank you
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				Suggest you provide your maps on Google Maps-style that allow users to zoom in and out with a more detailed understanding of which houses fall in which districts.
4langeles_20110617			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Yvonne E. Pine	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include South Pasadeno with Pasadena and San Marino not Los Angles as divided by the Arroyo Seco.
4langeles_20110617	6182011	Arpi Kevorkian	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep the communities that touch Griffith Park in one AssemblySenate district. Include Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, All Hollywoods, and Burbank
4langeles_20110617	6182011	Dennis Lord	no			Los Angeles	yes	On the Hawthorne-Gardena-Compton map Gardena is misspelled
4langeles_20110617	6182011	Rebecca A. Basham	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita into two congressional districts. Add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita congressional district
4langeles_20110617	6162011	Tim Wendler	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena, East Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, Gelndale, and Burbank should be in the same district. Duarte, Monrovia, Azusa, La Verne, and Gendora should not be split. Add Claremont to the COVNA district. Keep togeter cities of E. San Gabriel Valley
4langeles_20110617	6162011	Tim Wendler	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	and moved into COVNA district. Shift Baldwin Park or another city from lower or western COVNA into SGVDB district will balance population
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Michael DeNeal	no			Los Angeles	yes	Support keeping Santa Clarita Valley whole
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Tor Hyams	yes	Los Feliz Improvement Association		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Los Feliz and other neighborhoods south of Griffith Park separate from neighborhoods of low income
4langeles_20110617	6172011	David Crowley	no			Los Angeles	yes	Hard to see maps in depth. On the 33rd congressional map cannot tell if N border above 10 fwy is Pico Blvd, Olympic Blvd, or other st.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110617		Los Angeles, South Pasadena, Pasadena, San Marino	Arroyo Seco	no	yes	history	
4langeles_20110617		Burbank	Atwater Village, Griffith Park, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, The Hollywood Hills, Hollywood	no	yes	History, culture, shopping, state issues of concern	empolyment,industry
4langeles_20110617				no	no		
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Antelope Valley	no	yes	same city	
4langeles_20110617		Pasadena, East Pasadena,Altadena, Sierra Madre,Glendale, Burbank, Duarte, Monrovia, Azusa, La Vern, Glendora, Claremont, Baldwin Park	San Gabriel Valley	no	yes	community, geographically	
4langeles_20110617				no	no		
4langeles_20110617				no	no		
4langeles_20110617		Los Angeles	Griffith Park, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Glendale	no	yes		property values
4langeles_20110617				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				Misspelled Gardena on map
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				Correct maps on the second version

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Joan Curd	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not splt city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts. Keep Newhall in Santa Clarita Valley
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Debi Statland	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep foothill communities of Tujunga, La Crescenta, Burbank, Glendale, Montrose, La Tuna Canyon, Lake View Hills Terrace, and Shadow Hills in same district
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Chris Townsley	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Newhall-Valencia apart of the Santa Clarita congressional district
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Glenda Johnson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Leave Newhall in Santa Clarita and not included in San Fernando Valley and w. to Simi Valley nor E to Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Ann Tomkins	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110617	6172011	William D. Creitz	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the City of Santa Clartia into two congressional districts. Add communities of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Darlene Zavalney	no			Los Angeles	yes	Please include San Pedro in same district as the Port
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Larry Wims	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not move Valencia from Santa Clarita to San Fernando
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Willard C. Gekler	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not move Rossmoor and Los Alamitos to Long Beach Congressional District.
4langeles_20110617	6172011	John Haggard	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley as unified and autonomous as possible.
4langeles_20110617	6172011	Joan Baumann	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not spilt city of Santa Clarita in two separate congressional districts. Add Newhall to Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley Congressional district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Santa Clarita Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110617		Burbank, Glendale	Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Tuna Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills	no	yes	green views, animal friendly	business
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	San Fernando Valley, Newhall Pass,	no	yes	geographical	
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Newhall, San Fernando Valley, Simi Valley, Antelope Valley	no	yes	established government	
4langeles_20110617				no	no		
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Antelope Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110617			San Pedro, Port	no	yes	heart of city is port	
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Valencia, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos,Long Beach	Rossmoor	no	yes	representation	
4langeles_20110617			San Fernando Valley	no	yes	interests	
4langeles_20110617		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Antelope Valley	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				Put better maps on Website. Can not tell where home is on maps. Why arent there street level maps.
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110617			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110617	6172011	Farhad Farjami	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Please reconsider moving Rossmoor and Los Alamitos Orange county into the Long Beach congressional district
3orange_20110617	6172011	Lorna Farnum	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor needs to be incorporated into an Orange County district not Los Angeles County.
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Richard Tomasheski	no			Los Angeles	yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu nest it with East Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousands Oaks, Moorpark, and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate seat.
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Robert Cantin	no			Los Angeles	yes	Combining Inglewood with Southgate is bad idea.
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Geoff Wilson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split City of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts. Add Newhall to Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Charles Walker	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Susan Murphy	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts. Add communities of Old Orchard 1,2, and 3, Newhall, Happy Valley, and Hidden Valley into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district
4langeles_20110618	6192011	E.W. Alexander	no		Inglewood	Los Angeles	yes	Inglewood should not be in same district as Southgate. Instead it should stay with LAX communities, Westchester, Hawthorne, Gardena, Lawndale, and Crenshaw district.
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Ed Fonnerga	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not change the boundaries of the Santa Clarita Valley. Keep all of the valley in the same district with the Antelope Valley.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110617	Orange	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110617	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes	geographicgeopolitical similarities	
4langeles_20110618	East Ventural	Santa Clarita, Maibu, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark,Simi Valley		no	yes	historically shared senate seat	
4langeles_20110618		Inglewood, Southgate		no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Antelope Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110618				no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Newhall, Antelope Valley, Old Orchard 1,2, and 3, Hidden Valley, and Happy Valley.	no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Inglewood, Southgate, Hawthorne,Gardena,Lawn dale,	Crenshaw, Westchester, LAX communties.	no	yes	transportation, living standards, media access, common goals	
4langeles_20110618			Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110617			no			No Community of Interest with Long Beach	
3orange_20110617			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				Why does it take so long to send this
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				How are the districts drawn.
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Michael Anderson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Support keeping the Santa Clarita valley whole.
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Lynn	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Ericson Dunstan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Peter Tigler	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Proposed new district is just fine.
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Sabine Petersen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Griffith Park, Atwater, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, the Hollywood Hills, all of Hollywood, and Burbank
4langeles_20110618	6192011	Judith Demsky	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Joy Bliss	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not include W. Hawthorne into same district as Inglewood, Athens, and Compton. Exclude area west of Hawthorne blvd. Deserve to be in 36th district.
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Roger E. Basham	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Linda and Wayne Pursell	no			Los Angeles	yes	Newall should be included in Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernanado Valley and Calabasas district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110618			Santa Clarita Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	yes	values	
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Burbank	Griffith Park, Atwater, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, the Hollywood Hills, Hollywood, Burbank	no	yes	history, culture, shopping, state issues of concern	employment, industries
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Hawthorne, Inglewood, Compton	Athens, Hawthorne blvd,	no	yes	race, concerns	
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110618			Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley, Calabasas, Newall, Lyons Bl.	no	yes	interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Javier Amezcua	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Griffith Park in same congressional district as Atwater, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, Hollywood hills and flates, and S. Burbank.
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Ann Notthoff	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Alamos Lane Homeowners Associations	yes	Alamos Lane Homeowners Association		Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Cheryl Phillips	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Richard Tomasheski	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Austina Cho	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include Cerritos and Artesia grouped with sourrounding cities in SE Los Angeles County and N Orange County
1sdiego_20110617	6182011	Richard Gridwold	no			San Diego	yes	Include Mission Hill with CD-53 and not with Poway
2riverside_20110619	6192011	Anita Hoag	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Move district lines east away from Moreno Valley, Include Imperial County, Coachella Valley, and Blythe, Keep Salton Sea in one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110618		Burbank	Griffith Park, Atwater, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, Hollywood Hills and flates	no	yes	outlook, history,enviromental concerns, state issues	industry
4langeles_20110618				no	yes	enviromental	
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	yes	transportation	
4langeles_20110618		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110618	Los Angeles, Orange	Cerritos, Artesia		no	yes	geographic	
1sdiego_20110617		Poway, Northpark, Hillcrest, Mission Hills, Old Town, Bankers Hill		yes	yes	LGBT community	
2riverside_20110619	Imperial County	Blythe, Coachella,	Salton Sea	no	yes	Enviromental	Energy

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				Take California enviromental leadership into account. Henry Waxman, Shiela Kuehl, Fran Pavley and others are national leaders.
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
1sdiego_20110617	Common support of LGBT		no				
2riverside_20110619	More involvement in the Salton Sea		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110618		Anonymous	no			San Bernardino	yes	Chino and Chino Hills should be in the same district
2sbernardino_20110618	6152011	Sal Carlos Jr.	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split up Chino Hills
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Larry Anderson	no			San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Christine Jarreau	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Chino Hills one district
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Fran Wermerskirchen	no			San Bernardino	yes	Lake Arrowhead, Crestline, Twin Peaks, and Running Springs should all be in the same boundary
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Peter Giacoletti	no			San Bernardino	yes	Keep the mountain communities of Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs and Big Bear together
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Debora Biddick	no			San Bernardino	yes	Keep communitis of Mentone, Redlans, Loma Linda, Highland, Yucaipa, San Bernardino, northern mountains, and BeaumontBanning together
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Dan Stipp	yes	Crestline Chamber of Commerce		San Bernardino	yes	Do not split up the communities of Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, and Running Springs
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Benjamin Gamboa	no		Highland	San Bernardino	yes	Combine San Bernardino, Rancho Cucamonga, and FontanaRialto assembly districts.
2sbernardino_20110618	6162011	Benjamin Gamboa	no		Highland	San Bernardino	yes	Combine Pamona and Riverside

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110618		Chino, Chino Hills		no	yes	Shared newspaper, rural atmosphere, cultural and demographic	Agricultural
2sbernardino_20110618		Chino Hills, La Verne, San Dimas		no	yes	Congress Representation	
2sbernardino_20110618				no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110618				no	yes	Keeping current voted representatives to remain representatives of that district	
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino	Lake Arrowhead, Crestline, Twin Peaks, Running Springs	the mountain	no	yes	Shared school district, diverse communities	
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino	Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, and Big Bear	San Bernardino Mountains	no	yes	Rural community issues	
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino	San Bernardino, Loma Linda,Highland, Yucaipa,Beaumont, Banning		no	yes	geographic and cultural relations	
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino		Highway 18, Highway 330	no	yes	Shared school district, roadway access, community interests	business interests
2sbernardino_20110618	San Bernardino	San Bernardino,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110618	Riverside	Pomona, Chino, Ontario, Corona, Norco, Riverside	i10, highway 60, highway 91	no	yes	First communities entered when traveling from urban centers to Inland Empire	Shopping and entertainment

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110618	cultural and demographic aspects in common		no				
2sbernardino_20110618	Congress representation for one city		no				
2sbernardino_20110618	Leave well enough alone		no				
2sbernardino_20110618			no				
2sbernardino_20110618	Geographically more conducive to community		no				
2sbernardino_20110618			no				
2sbernardino_20110618			no				Thank you for taking on this challenging task as requested by the voters
2sbernardino_20110618			no				Thank you. I am available for question or further comment
2sbernardino_20110618	more competitive seat between party		no				
2sbernardino_20110618	More competitive seat between parties		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110616	6162011	Miguel Figueroa	yes	Calexico New River Committee, Executive Director	Calexico	Imperial	yes	Imperial and Coachella Valleys share naturalrenewable resources, waterways and canals, desert locations. This gives them a unique farming and business culture distinct from San Diego.
1imperial_20110622	6222011	Randall Morton	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Exclude Coachella Valley from Imperial Valley (and San Diego) because it does not share agricultural interests
1sdiego_20110621	6212011	Karen L. Dale	no		Coronado	San Diego	yes	Coronado is placed with other coastal cities
1sdiego_20110621_3	6212011	Karen L. Dale	no		Coronado	San Diego	yes	Coronado is placed with other coastal cities
2riverside_20110621_2	6212011	Jodie D. Christopher	no		Temecula	Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Pamela Jean Pence	no		Coachella	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley should be kept as part of Riverside County because it does not share agricultural interests with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110616	Imperial, Riverside (Coachella Valley), San Diego	Calexico, San Diego		no	yes	shared waterways, cultural ties between families, shared utilities	agricultural and business interests, potential to develop unique renewable energy resources
1imperial_20110622	Imperial, Riverside	San Diego	Coachella Valley should be considered distinct from Imperial Valley and San Diego	no	yes	resortretirement community	
1sdiego_20110621		Coronado		no	no		
1sdiego_20110621_3		Coronado		no	no		
2riverside_20110621_2				no	no		
2riverside_20110621_3	Riverside, Imperial	Coachella	Coachella Valley	no	yes		tourist and retail interests in Coachella Valley are shared with Riverside County

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110616	COI will not be served by being put with San Diego simply due to a proximity to the US-Mexico border	No	no			Current district maps will disenfrancise the desert community	
1imperial_20110622	Coachella has no overlapping interests with Imperial Valley or San Diego	No	no			Supports the draft maps	
1sdiego_20110621		No	no			Supports the draft maps because Coronado is placed with other coastal cities	
1sdiego_20110621_3		No	no			Supports the draft maps because Coronado is placed with other coastal cities	
2riverside_20110621_2		No	no			No reason to split Temecula from the its inland empire neighboors. Would be better to place Temecula with Murrieta, Menifee, Wildomar, Lake Elsinore, and Perris and NOT with South East San Diego County	
2riverside_20110621_3	Redistricting Coachella into Imperial County would harm the tax benefits it receives due to its urban location	No	no			Supports the draft maps	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Terry Kay	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley should be kept separate from Imperial County
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Jean Nelson	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Coachella should be kept with Riverside County because of its desert location
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Renee M. DeVolt	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Enitre Coachella Valley shares common interests
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	John R. Mead	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Entire Coachella Valley should be located within Riverside County and not with Imperial County
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Richard and Nancy Single	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Rodolfo J Maldonado	no		Calexico	Imperial	yes	Imperial County should include the Coachella Valley because it shares a border with the Salton Sea
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Priscilla Fraschetti	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio within the Coachella Valley district
2riverside_20110621_3	6212011	Neil Huether	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110621_3	Riverside, Imperial		Coachella Valley	no	no	Coachella Valley and Riverside County share local government agencies (CVAG)	Coachella Valley and Riverside share economic interests
2riverside_20110621_3	Riverside, Imperial	Coachella	Coachella Valley	no	no		
2riverside_20110621_3		Palm Springs, Cathedral City	Coachella Valley	no	no		
2riverside_20110621_3	Riverside, Imperial	Indio, Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, La Quinta, Cathedral City, Palm Desert	Coachella Valley	no	yes	Coachella Valley shares transportation, medical, education, sports, and leisure interests with Riverside County	
2riverside_20110621_3				no	yes		Desert Cities share tourism and retirement industry interests with Riverside County
2riverside_20110621_3	Riverside, Imperial		Coachella Valley	no	yes	Coachella Valley shares the irrigation and utility facilities found in Imperial County, also shares a water source.	
2riverside_20110621_3	Riverside	Indio	Coachella Valley	no	no		
2riverside_20110621_3				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110621_3		No	no			Adding Imperial County to Riverside County would be counterproductive. Supports the draft maps.	
2riverside_20110621_3		No	no				
2riverside_20110621_3		No	no				
2riverside_20110621_3		No	no			Coachella Valley needs to be represented as a singular community with Riverside County. Supports draft maps.	To draw lines to accord with political activism is wrong.
2riverside_20110621_3	Desert Cities should not be with Imperial County because it does not have similar economic, agricultural, and other interests unique to its demographic	No	no				
2riverside_20110621_3	Imperial County and Coachella Valley need to work together to resolve lingering politicalsocial problems	No	no				
2riverside_20110621_3		No	no				
2riverside_20110621_3		No	no			Supports the preliminary maps.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Michelle Markel	yes	Inland Action	Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Dividing Redlands EastWest into two districts will make issues worse. Redlands has no relation to towns of Mono, Bishop.Keep Redlands intact, with Loma Linda and Highland.
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Allen B. Gresham	yes	Inland Action			no	support inland action maps
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Ann Bryan	yes	Inland Action			no	support inland action maps
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Ross French	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do split city of Redlands in two. Because redlands is one community.
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Michael Burrows	yes	Inland Action			yes	support inland action maps for San bernardinoriverside
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Donald L. Rogers	yes	Inland Action			yes	Keep Redlands in one congressional district
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	James R. Appleton	yes	University of Redlands, Inland Action	Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Redlands in one congressional district.
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Kirk Stitt	yes	Inland Action			no	
3orange_20110621	6212011	Beverly Maybrier(duplicate)	no		Los Alamitos	Orange County	yes	Keep Los Alamitos, Cypress and Seal Beach in Orange. This tri city works well..Do not change to Los Angeles County because LA would not represent us.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110622	San Bernardion, Riverside	Redlands, Mono, Bishop, Loma Linda, Highland		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622	San bernardino, Riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622	San BernardinoRiverside	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622				no	no		
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos, Cypress, Seal Beach, Long Beach		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110622			no			Inland action maps are good.	
2sbernardino_20110622			no			please consider maps proposed by Inland Action	
2sbernardino_20110622			no			Support inland actions plan for inland empire including riverside and san bernardino counties	
2sbernardino_20110622			no				
2sbernardino_20110622			no			Support inland action maps	
2sbernardino_20110622			no			support inland actions recommended guidelines	
2sbernardino_20110622			no			Support Inland actions proposed maps	
2sbernardino_20110622			no			support inland actions maps for san bernardino and riverside	
3orange_20110621	Los Alamitos, Cypress, Seal Beach work well together.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110621	6212011	Shirley Morgan	no		Laguna Woods	Orange County	yes	Keep Laguna Hills in Orange County along with other South County cities such as Lake Forest,Mission Viejo, Laguna Hills,Laguna, Niguel,Aliso Viejo.Do not mix with more developed North County Areas like Costa Mesa.
3orange_20110621	6212011	Tanya Gilliam	no				no	
3orange_20110621	6212011	Billie Gordon	no				yes	Do not combine Orange county with Los angeles County.Doing so will override votes from Orange county because LA county and Orange are very different. Keep them as two separate communities.
3orange_20110621	6212011	William Hermelin	no		Cypress	Orange	yes	Cypress has no common interests with cities of Fountain Valley and Santa Anna.Keep Cypress in Orange.Respect the county line, keep Cypress with West Orange.Cypress has nothing in common with Santa Ana and City of Orange.Cypress should stay in West Orange
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Rudy Maldonado	no		Calexico	Imperial Valley	yes	Imperial Valley senate and assembly districts should include the eastern part of Coachella Valley.because salton sea and all american canal are in both counties,shared irrigation.
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Nancy Carter	no				yes	Opposed to grouping with Imperial County. Deserts concerns will not be addressed.
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Priscilla Fraschetti	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	leave Indio in the Coachella Valley district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110621	Orange, South, North	Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, Aliso Viejo, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa		yes	yes	Water districts, Community college districts, Shopping areas. Senior Community. Level of development	
3orange_20110621				no	no		
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles			no	yes		
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles	Los Alamitos, La Palma, Seal Beach, West Garden Grove, Buena Park, La Palma, Cypress. Cerritos, Artesia	Respect county line.	no	no		
2riverside_20110621	Riverside, Imperial	Calexico, Palm Desert, La Quinta, Indio, Coachella, Mecca, Thermal	Imperial Irrigation district, Salton Sea, all american canal	no	no		
2riverside_20110621	Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110621	Riverside	Indio, Sun City, Shadow Hills		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110621	share common interests		no			Support the Dewane Map.	
3orange_20110621			no			Pleased wih Tom Harmon as congressmen.Leave our district as is.	If it aint broke, dont fix it
3orange_20110621			no			Orange and LA counties are different. Should be separate	
3orange_20110621			no			Assembly and Congressional Maps more on target.Aside from Cerritos and Artesia in L.A. County. State Senate Map does not make sense. Cypress has nothing in common with Santa Ana	
2riverside_20110621			no				
2riverside_20110621			no			leave our district as is	
2riverside_20110621			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110621	6212011	John R. Mead	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not include Indio and other eastern Coachella Valley communities with Imperial County.Keep Indio and other major cities in Coachella valley with Riverside. They share common interests.
2sbernardino_20110621_1	6212011	Tim Parrott	no				yes	Morongo Valley should be included with low desert areas rather than hi desert areas.
2sbernardino_20110621_1	6212011	Nancy Barnes	yes	Inland Action			yes	support inland actions proposed maps for san bernardinoriverside counties
2sbernardino_20110621_1	6212011	John Mirau	yes	Inland Action			yes	opposed to splitting the city of Redlands into two different districts.Do not split communities within the inland empire because they share common interests. San Bernardino and riverside are both communities of interest.each with different common interest
2sbernardino_20110621_1	6212011	Judith T. Rogers	no				yes	Crestline area should be in same district as rest of areas in Rim of the world Unified School District which includes Arrowbear,Green Valley Lake on eastern part of San B. Mountains. Because areas are a single community
2sbernardino_20110621_1	6212011	Philip Southard	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110621_1	6212011	Edward B. Lasak	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110621	Riverside, Coachella	Indio, Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, La Quinta, Cathedral City, Palm Desert		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621_1	San Bernardino	Morongo Valley, Palm Springs	Hilow desert	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621_1	san bernardino, riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621_1	San Bernardino, Riverside, los angeles, san diego, orange			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621_1	San Bernardino		San Bernardino Mountains	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621_1				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110621			no			Keep draft map the final Map	
2sbernardino_20110621_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110621_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110621_1		inland action maps comply with it	no				
2sbernardino_20110621_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110621_1			no			Support inland actions proposed maps for San BernardinoRiverside counties. Fair balance of representation for region	
2sbernardino_20110621_1			no			support inland actions proposed maps for San BernardinoRiverside Counties	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110621_1	6212011	Beverly Powell	no				yes	inland actions map addresses problem of dividing City of Redlands into its congressional districts
2sbernardino_20110621_2	6152011	Gary C. Ovitt	yes	SCAG,San Bernardino County Government Center			yes	Chino Hills should be included in Ontario-Pomona Congressional DistrictSan Bernardino County because Chino Hills is its own COI.Chino Hills shares commonalities in line with San Bernardino, not Los Angeles county
2sbernardino_20110622	6222011	Paul Shimoff	yes	Inland Action			no	
2sbernardino_20110622	6232011	William Valle	no		San Bernardino	San Bernardino	yes	Keep cities of Highland, Redlands and San Bernardino together. They are a COI. Should not be seperated solely to meet population requirements or create districts.Do not split city of S.B. from east to west down Waterman Ave. Proposal to Eliminate city

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110621_1		City of Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621_2	San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Chino Hills		no	yes	County Supervisor, Community College district, water agency, fire protection.	chamber of commerce
2sbernardino_20110622				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622	San Bernardino	Highland, Redlands and San Bernardino	Waterman Ave	no	yes	Historic Orange Groves shared by cities. Stater Bros brings people to show off classic cars,	Retail centers in each city, San Manuel Casino between san bernardino and highland. Rail development projects to connect Redland and San Bernardino.Similar transit lines.State universities in S.B. and University of Redlands fulfill needs of East Valley.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110621_1			no			Support inland action maps. It addresses the problem of dividing city of redlands	
2sbernardino_20110621_2			no				
2sbernardino_20110622			no			Strongly support Inland Actions proposed maps.	
2sbernardino_20110622	meet needs of area. Should be COI		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110622	6232011	William Valle	no		San Bernardino	San Bernardino	yes	Cont. of Wrightwood by shifting boundary south and adding in San Bernardino population. Refer to map. Other alternative is to rearrange Rancho Cucamonga boundaries, shifting lines eastward. These two communties are not in proposed COI and share little
3orange_20110621	6212011	Ron Woodward	no				yes	Keep La Habra in Orange County
3orange_20110621	6212011	Arianna Barrios	no		city of orange	Orange	yes	Do not split City of Orange into multiple districts to create stronger latino districts.latino vote is already prominent in area.no need to split to create prominent latino districts.
3orange_20110621	6212011	Kenneth and Patricia Brown	no		Rossmoor	West Orange	yes	Do not move Rossmoor into same district as Long Beach, Los Angeles County.Because interests of Rossmoor voters would be overwhelmed by Long Beach Musicipal and L.A. The 605 freeway seperates Rossmoor and West Orange from L.A. County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110622	San Bernardino	Highland, Redlands, San Bernardino,Fontana, Rancho Cucamonga, Wrightwood	Waterman Ave	no	yes	Historic Orange Groves shared by cities. Stater Bros brings people to show off classic cars,	Retail centers in each city, San Manuel Casino between san bernardino and highland. Rail development projects to connect Redland and San Bernardino.Similar transit lines.State universities in S.B. and University of Redlands fulfill needs of East Valley.
3orange_20110621	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110621	Orange	orange		no	no		
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Long Beach	605 Freeway seperates Rossmoor from L.A.	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110622	meet needs of area. Should be COI		no				
3orange_20110621			no				
3orange_20110621			no			do not create ethnic strongholds rather than entrust people to choose leaders through prism of unique needs and concerns of the community.voter trends are forming naturally with latinos.no need to split orange to manufacture them.	
3orange_20110621			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110621	6212011	Martin Canavan	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Opposed to redistricting of Rossmoor and Los Alamitos to join Long Beach. Rossmoor has outstanding school district, safe community. Moving Rossmoor into Long Beach district would be bad move for community
3orange_20110621	6212011	Glen Gaubatz	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not divide Dana Point geographically and or place outside senateassembly districts that do not include neighboring orange county cities.because they face common issues.
3orange_20110621	6212011	James Flanagan	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Opposition to moving Rossmoor from Orange to Los Angeles County because local services and govt agencies are located in Orange, not L.A. Rossmoor will lose voice if placed in district where it has no connection or say.
3orange_20110621	6212011	George Watts	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Opposed to being placed in Long BeachLos Angeles district. Rossmoor is Orange. Keep Rossmoor in current.
3orange_20110621	6212011	John A. Mitchell	no				yes	Do not include Rossmoor and Los Alamitos with Long Beach. These two areas have nothing in common. Strongly oppose move to include these areas in Los Angeles County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Long Beach, Los Alamitos		no	no		
3orange_20110621	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocea water quality, regional transportation at local and state levels, regional land use planning and affordable housing.	
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Long Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles	Long Beach, Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110621	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110621			no				
3orange_20110621			no			reconsider state senate and assembly district boundaries proposed in first draft.Town the size of Dana Point should never be considered for a split in representation.	
3orange_20110621	Rossmoor shares issues and interests with Orange county		no				Appreciate opportunity to have input submitted in this email. Did not receive notice of public hearing.
3orange_20110621			no				
3orange_20110621			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110621_1	6152011	Jim Adams	no		Anaheim	Orange	yes	Seperation of Anaheim and Santa Ana would discredit ethnic make up of the two cities as well as the working class majority.Do not group with Anaheim Hills because it is mainly wealthy business type families.
3orange_20110621_1	6152011	John Briscoe	no				yes	Endorse compact district in NW corner of Orange County that includes COI of Seal Beach,Los Alamitos,Stanton,Westminster,Midway City,Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley,Rossmoor.Santa Ana, Garden grove do not fit with Fountain Valley COI.Coastal Congressional
3orange_20110621_1	6152011	John Briscoe	no				yes	cont. district stretching from Dana Point to Seal Beach makes no sense.Huntington Beach has little in common with Dana Point but much more in common with Fountain Valley.
3orange_20110621_1	6152011	J. Scott Schoeffel	yes	Dana Point City Council	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Dana Point city council opposes split of city.Dana Point should be grouped with south Orange county Cities because of the common issues these cities face as well as cooperative relationships and arrangements the cities have developed.
3orange_20110621_1_1	6222011	Joseph Manfro (duplicate)	no				yes	we are part of orange county. Keep it that way
3orange_20110621_1_2	6222011	Vera Manfro	no				yes	We have always been a part of orange county and we would like to keep it that way.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110621_1	Orange	Anaheim, Anaheim Hills, Santa Ana		no	yes	AnaheimSanta Ana share churces and parks, shopping mall.Seperation of two cities would discredit ethnic make up and class.Anaheim and Santa Ana are Latino	
3orange_20110621_1	Orange	Seal Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley,Midway City,Huntington Beach,Garden Grove,Dana Point.		no	no		
3orange_20110621_1	Orange	Seal Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley,Midway City,Huntington Beach,Garden Grove,Dana Point.		no	yes	school districts	
3orange_20110621_1	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Ocean water quality,regional transportation at local and state level,regional land use planning and affordable housing.	
3orange_20110621_1_1	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110621_1_2	Orange			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110621_1			no				
3orange_20110621_1			no				
3orange_20110621_1	common interests		no				
3orange_20110621_1	common interests bind dana point with rest of Orange county.		no			first draft map not approved.	
3orange_20110621_1_1			no			We are part of Orange County and want to keep it that way.	
3orange_20110621_1_2			no			Keep us in orange county	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110621_1_3	6222011	Janet W. Watts	no				yes	Rossmoor should stay in Orange county, not put into Los Angeles County.suggest including park estates and El Dorado in Ms. Richardsons district.
3orange_20110621_1_4	6222011	Sylvia Robles	no				yes	Rancho Cucamonga has no COI with City of San Bernardino.Counties of Orange and L.A. unfairly benefit from Mountains.Populations abutting the desert and InyoMono Counties should be assigned to districts in more populous areas.
3orange_20110621_1_5	6222011	Alan Wickstrom	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Object to commissions first draft maps.Support Dana Point City Councils proposal which opposes any plan to divide city geographically or place city outside of districts that do not include neighboring south Orange County cities.
4langeles_20110617_3	6172011	Cam Noltemeyer	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Clara into two separate congressional districts. Instead, add community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley Congressional district.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Luana Law	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley in tact. Do not move Newhall into San Fernando Valley District.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Sam Kbushyan	no		East Hollywood	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Garo Keurjikian	yes	Little Armenia Chamber of Commerce	Little Armenia, Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110621_1_3	Orange, Los Angeles	Park Estates,Rossmoor, El Dorado		no	no		
3orange_20110621_1_4	San Bernardino, Orange, Los Angeles, Inyo, Mono	San Bernardino, Redlands, Loma Linda, Mentone	Mountains, Desert	no	yes	Hispanic Population	
3orange_20110621_1_5	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	business issue, ocean water quality, regional transportion, regional land use planning and affordable housing.	
4langeles_20110617_3	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall, San Fernando		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1				no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110621_1_3			no				If you want to dilute Ms. Richardsons influence I suggest including Park estates or El Dorado Estates in her district.
3orange_20110621_1_4	Having huge numbers of Hispanics in congress only in LAOrange county dilutes ability raise level of focus on issues		no				
3orange_20110621_1_5			no				
4langeles_20110617_3			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no			thank you for keeping community whole.District boundaries for Armenian American community look good.	thanks for flawless work and commitment to make voices heard in state legislature
4langeles_20110621_1			no			Newly crafted district maps present equality in democratic process.	Thank you for commiment to helping individual communities.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Matt Takahashi	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not include Venice and Santa Monica in our district. But do include Palo Verdes Peninsula, Hawthorne and Lawndale.Thank you for placing peninsula cities in districts with beach cities to the north.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Gary and Michelle Johnson	no				yes	new redistricting for Topanga leaves us in a district completely unlike ours.Topanga is connected to L.A. And west San Fernando Valley by many things.Do not connect Topanga to Santa Clarita that have different needsinterests.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Sue M. Forbes	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Reconsider pairing of Topanga Canyon with Santa Clara.Keep Topanga paired with the west side because it has similar problems and goals.No benefit in pairing with Santa Clara.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Benjamin Landau	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Remove Venice and Santa Monica from Southbay community, and return Lawndale and Hawthorne to COI. Palo Verdes has nothing in common with Venice and Santa Monica.Southbay residents do not visit these cities,work or shop in them.Include Lawndale Hawthorne.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Benjamin Landau	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Add Section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 Freeway and north of Sepulveda.All of San Pedro in CD, as well as Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave. Eliminate WestchesterMarina Del Rey from map, addition of Lawndale,Del Aire-south of El segundo BLVD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Los Angeles	Desert	no	yes	land preservation, fighting smog, fighting for clean water for beaches.	
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clara		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angles	Lawndale, Hawthorne, Lennox, Santa Monica,Wilmington, San Pedro, Palo Verdes, Venice, Harbor City, Harbor Gateway		no	yes	Shopping, Aerospace industry, friendsrelatives, businesses.	
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Del Aire, San Pedro,Westchester, Marina Del Rey	El Segundo BLVD, 405 Freeway, Western Ave.	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				take historical needs and interests into account.
4langeles_20110621_1			no				thank you for your service, im sure its a huge job.
4langeles_20110621_1	share similar interests. Work together		no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Linda Vernick	no				yes	Santa Monica and Venice be excluded from 36th Congressional District and that Gardena,Hawthorne,and Lawndale be included.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Rolanda Mendelle	no				yes	Keep Topanga with coastal comission, Santa Monica Mountains, and westside.Keep separate from Santa Clarita because its an entirely different area
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Greg Maas	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Wynne Ritch	yes	Chamber, VFW, Rotary and Boy Scouts of America	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	I will be unhappy if a line is drawn through Granada Hills dividing us in two.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Amanda Donovan	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Richard Fisk	no				yes	Do not divide community of Granada Hills in Santa Clarita with the boundary line running south down Balboa BLVD from 5 Freeway and connects with 118 and then 405 going south.Readjust by following the 5 Golden state freeway
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	C. R. Hudson	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Do not take Newhall out of our congressional district.Please keep Santa Clarita Valley whole.
4langeles_20110621_1	6212011	Marc Stirdivant	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep cities of Burbank,Glendale,and Pasadena together in one congressional district.These cities should not be joined with Pasadena.Leave Pasadena whole not joined with these.It is a foothill city, not san gabriel valley city.Reduce districts SW,NW corner

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Venice, Gardena,Hawthorne, Lawndale,		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains, Coastal Commission, Westside.	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Granada Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	boundary line south down Balboa Blvd from the 5 Freeway and connects with 118 and then the 405 as it goes south. Readjust border there by follow the 5 Golden State Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Santa clarita, San Fernando, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_1	Los Angeles	Burbank,Glendale, Pasadena		no	yes	shopping, common standard of living, airport,public safety, shared freeway	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				Lets be smart here.
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				Get your act together and come up with another solution
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				
4langeles_20110621_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110621_1	6212011	Terry Leimbach	yes	Lakeside Chamber of Commerce	Lakeside	East County	yes	Do not merge East county with Imperial county
1sdiego_20110621_2	6162011	Joe Mackey	yes	San Diego East County Chamber of Commerce			yes	Keep East San Diego County communities together.
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Renee M. DeVolt	yes	business located in Palm Springs	Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Entire Coachella Valley shares common interests and needs.Keep county together.
2riverside_20110621	6212011	John R. Mead	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in same vote district. Do not merge with Imperial County.Recent map draft good.
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Terry Kay	yes	CVAG			yes	Do not add portions of Imperial County to Coachella ValleyRiverside
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Richard and Nancy Single	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Keep desert cities together in one district, they have own common interest. Do not mix with imperial county and its own interests..
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Neil Huether	no				yes	Happy with the preliminary maps for Coachella Valley, Riverside
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Pamela Pence	no				yes	Keep Coachella Valley as part of Riverside County
2riverside_20110621	6212011	Jean Nelson	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	leave desert cities of riverside county intact by keeping coachella with the others.Do not include Coachella with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110621_1	East and Imperial	Lakeside	Desert and farm land divided from mountains, trails and scenic parks	no	no		
1sdiego_20110621_2	East San Diego			no	yes	Cultural qualities, public safety,school districts,fire protection	major transportation networks, water and energy infrastructure, economic development programs
2riverside_20110621	Riverside	Cathedral city, Palm Springs		no	yes	keep preliminary map the same for Coachella.common interests and needs	
2riverside_20110621	Riverside, Imperial	Palm Springs, Desert hot Springs, La Quinta, Cathedral City, Palm Desert, Indio		no	yes	transportation, medical, education, sports, leisure	
2riverside_20110621	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110621	Riverside, Imperial	Cathedral City		no	yes	Retirement communities	tourism,agriculture,
2riverside_20110621	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110621	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes		retail interests, tourism, agriculture.
2riverside_20110621	Riverside, Imperial	Indio		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110621_1			no			preserve western heritage	
1sdiego_20110621_2		process is in compliance with VRA	no				
2riverside_20110621	similarities		no				
2riverside_20110621			no			Keep draftmap the same.	
2riverside_20110621			no			agree with first draft maps	
2riverside_20110621			no				
2riverside_20110621			no			happy with preliminary maps	
2riverside_20110621	same interests		no			Happy with preliminary maps. Do not change	
2riverside_20110621			no			thanks for redistricting lines already drawn	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110621_2	6152011	Phil Nyberg	yes	Fortuna City Council	Fortuna	Humboldt	yes	support east-west boundary because much more in common with rural north CA counties than with Bay area.Shared headwaters.continue with initial east-west, coast to seirra district.
9humboldt_20110622	6222011	Albert Nelson	no			Humboldt	yes	district should run west to east, not north to south.Sonoma and marin counties would have complete control over rural humboldt.we have issues here that need addressing that urban areas would not care about.
9mendocino_20110621	6212011	Larry Hanson	no			Mendocino	yes	coastal communities should be kept together.
9mendocino_20110621	6212011	Mary Rezner	no				yes	I support lines drawn for the north coastal district.
9mendocino_20110621	6212011	Morris Kaplan	no				yes	coastal counties of northern california that have common interests should have own representatives in d.c.
9mendocino_20110622	6222011	Stephen Scalmanini	no			Mendocino	yes	I will enjoy being in same district as other coastal communities north of san francisco without being influenced by inland winegrape areas.
9sacramento_20110621	6212011	Gary Passmore	yes	Congress of California Seniors	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	please keep city of sacramento within one congressional district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110621_2	Humboldt			no	yes	shared headwaters. Rural not urban.	
9humboldt_20110622	Humboldt, Sonoma,Marin.			no	no		
9mendocino_20110621	Mendocino			no	yes	shared rivers,support for ocean and shore protection,redwood parks, 101 corridor for transit, shares coastal climate and agriculture.	
9mendocino_20110621				no	no		
9mendocino_20110621				no	no		
9mendocino_20110622				no	no		
9sacramento_20110621	Sacramento			no	yes	elderly. Do not split them up. They share housing and transportation and need it to be under one district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110621_2			no				
9humboldt_20110622			no				
9mendocino_20110621			no				
9mendocino_20110621			no				
9mendocino_20110621			no				
9mendocino_20110622			no			first drafts look great.	
9sacramento_20110621			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110621	6212011	William Powers	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	keep sacramento in one congressional district.residents most often live,work,go to school, shop, church within cities boundaries.splitting the city would dilute voice.
9sacramento_20110621	6212011	Christine Umeda	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	retain single 5th congressional district.new challenges are coming like flood control,transit and they need fed. Participation,do not dilute voice.
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Loran G. Berck	yes	Fort Jones City Council	Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	opposed to split of county into separate cong,SA, SS districts.split will affect citizens.Will divide voice of education districts,college,fire protection districts.
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Heidi Martin	no				yes	Do not split siskiyou country.we are a close community connected to etna and fort jones down to klamath river area. Do not include us with coastal region.
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Chet Adamick	no				yes	keep siskiyou county intact. Do not link with easten counties.
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Louise Gliatto	no			Siskiyou	yes	opposed to splitting siskiyou.nothing in common with coastal communities.
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Irene Graham	no			Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to slit of siskiyou.we have nothing in common with del norte and mendocino counties.
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Bill Eiler	no				yes	do not split siskiyou.no common values with del norte or humboldt.voices would never be heard.Do not remove us from rest of siskiyou,this could ruin our environment by bringing development.
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Cheri Beck	no				yes	Do not split siskiyou county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110621				no	no		
9sacramento_20110621				no	yes	rich ethnicity in sacramento, works, lives, plays, goes to school and shops within boundaries	
9siskiyou_20110621	siskiyou	Fort Jones		no	yes	school districts,fire protection,boards,	
9siskiyou_20110621	siskiyou	Etna, Fort Jones		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110621	siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110621	siskiyou			no	yes	Rural. Rivers,farmland	
9siskiyou_20110621	siskiyou, del norte, mendocino			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110621	siskiyou,del norte,humboldt.	fort jones, etna, greeview, callahan		no	yes	forestry, agriculture	
9siskiyou_20110621				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110621			no				
9sacramento_20110621			no				
9siskiyou_20110621			no				
9siskiyou_20110621			no				
9siskiyou_20110621			no				
9siskiyou_20110621			no				
9siskiyou_20110621			no				
9siskiyou_20110621	if not together, new representation could ruin what is siskiyou.		no				
9siskiyou_20110621			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110621	6212011	Dorinda Thompson	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou into two districts.no shared interests with del norte or mendocino counties.we belong with eastern counties like sierra,lassen.
9siskiyou_20110621_2	6162011	James	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	please do not split etnaft jones area from rest of siskiyou.this would create problems and costs to govt.the split would force rural people to make long trips to urban areas.
9siskiyou_20110621_2	6162011	Ross and Bev Slaughter	no			Siskiyou	yes	do not move scott valley out of siskiyou and into coastal area.keep us in assembly district 2, Ca state senate dist. 4, and congressional dist. 2
9siskiyou_20110621_2	6172011	Fred Scott	no			Siskiyou	yes	do not split siskiyou county.nothing in common with tourist counties we would be re grouped with.
9siskiyou_20110622	6222011	Eric Black	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	we do not want to be part of a different district that is so far and different in values.
9trinity_20110621	6212011	Carol Rogan	no			Trinity	yes	lines should represent the watershed and where it drains. Ours goes westward then northwest.seperate us from the central valley.lines must consider watersheds and where they go.
9yolo_20110621_1	6212011	Carl Schmid	no		davis	Yolo	yes	Consolidate Yolo in one or at most two districts.not three.yolo is defined by a floodplain. Use that boundary.keep woodland and davis together..
9yolo_20110621_2	6142011	Jim Provenza	yes	Yolo county board of supervisors		Yolo	yes	proposed districts do not reflect yolo being a COI.do not split it into three parts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110621	siskiyou,del norte, mendocino, sierra, lassen		divided by moutanin range	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110621_2	Siskiyou	fort jones, etna, redding,		no	yes	rural, farming, agriculture, nature	
9siskiyou_20110621_2	siskiyou			no	yes	we are rural, ranchers.we are seperated from coast by mountains.	
9siskiyou_20110621_2	siskiyou			no	yes	agricultural economy, close proximity to other areas in county.we never leave our region.	
9siskiyou_20110622	siskiyou			no	no		
9trinity_20110621	Trinity			no	no		
9yolo_20110621_1	Yolo	Davis,woodland		no	yes	COI with woodland.connected by road, shopping.	
9yolo_20110621_2	Yolo			no	yes	Yolo is tied together by rich farmland, agricultural communities.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110621			no				
9siskiyou_20110621_2	if not together, development could come		no				
9siskiyou_20110621_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110621_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110622		splitting our county is not right	no				this is not democracy, just political maneuvering.
9trinity_20110621			no				
9yolo_20110621_1			no				
9yolo_20110621_2			no				also, give yolo an odd number so that senate can be chosen and county not disenfranchised.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110620_3	6202011	Dev Mahadevan	no				no	
20110620_3	6202011	Jon Spitz	no		laytonville	Mendocino	yes	
20110621	6212011	Deanna Kitamura,Daniel Ichinose,Joanna Lee	yes	asian pacific american legal center			no	
8sonoma_20110609	692011	Janet Orchard	yes	Cotati City Council	Cotati	Sonoma	yes	Include Cotati in a district with Penngrove,Petaluma,Sebastopol.All linked by US Hwy 1.COI with these neighboring cities.all north coast cities
8sonoma_20110621	6212011	Gary Wysocky	yes	Santa Rosa City Council	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa COI is North Coast,not central valley.We have much more in common with Marin,mendocino,napa,solano counties that anywhere else.Adjust districts to be with these communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110620_3				no	no		
20110620_3				no	no		
20110621				no	no		
8sonoma_20110609	Sonoma	Cotati, Penngrove, Sebastopol, Petaluma	us 101.Shared coast.linked by railroad.all adjacent to Laguna de Santa Rosa	no	yes	common geography-shared watershed,common ancestry,historically connected,environmental concerns,shared transit,North Coast Railroad	production of food,chicken,eggs,milk,beef,hay,wine
8sonoma_20110621	Sonoma,Marin,Mendocino, Napa, Solano	Santa Rosa		no	yes	COI with North Coast. Transit-significant north to south transit. Marin to sonoma.connected.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110620_3			no				I support your work.thank you for being impartial and working within rules to keep this open and public.process may not be perfect though
20110620_3			no			Newly proposed congressional, state senate and assembly districts look great for mendocino,humboldt, del norte,siskiyou	
20110621			no				Extend deadline for submission of comments to june 28th. Thank you for your work..
8sonoma_20110609			no				
8sonoma_20110621	very much in common with north coast.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110621_1	6212011	Elizabeth Watson	no		Kneeland	Humboldt	yes	support north coast communities in one district.Hwy 101 links all together.
9humboldt_20110621_1	6212011	Ronda Ambrosini	no				yes	Do not lump rural Humboldt with Bay Area.We are rural and have nothing in common with the city.leave district 1 with only humbolt in it.
9humboldt_20110621_1	6212011	Colleen Hedrick	no				yes	Do not put ruralagricultural county of humboldt with densely population sonoma and marin.This would outnumber humboldt voices.
9humboldt_20110621_2	6212011	Carol	yes	Humboldt Tea Party Patriots	Ferndale	Humboldt	yes	Group Humboldt with the Eastwest district not north south sanfrancisco area.
9humboldt_20110621_2	6212011	Roxie Christiansen	yes	Humboldt Tea Party Patriots			yes	do not group humboldt with sonoma and marin counties.
9humboldt_20110621_2	6212011		yes	Humboldt Tea Party Patriots		Humboldt	yes	do not group humboldt with marin or sonoma counties
9humboldt_20110621_2	6212011	Jeremiah R. Scott	yes	Humboldt Tea Party Patriots		Humboldt	yes	group humboldt east-west, not north-south.more similar constituents and common problems.
8smateo_20110615_2	6152011	Andy Cohen	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not divide Menlo Park into two CDs
8smateo_20110615_2	6162011	Mark Leach	no			San Mateo	yes	Keep small towns and school districts in one piece
8sonoma_20110616	6102011	Elizabeth Gatley	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not cut Larkfield and Wikiup away from Santa Rosa in CD.
8sonoma_20110616	6142011	Sharon Robison	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Put the whole of Santa Rosa into Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110621_1	Humboldt	Kneeland,Western Siskiyou	Hwy 101.	no	yes	Linked by 101, shared extensive park system, ocean protection, improving salmon habits,high schools play each other in sports.shopping,entertainment.	
9humboldt_20110621_1	Sonoma	San Francisco, Del Norte, Trinity, Mendocino		no	no		
9humboldt_20110621_1	Humboldt, Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
9humboldt_20110621_2	Humboldt			no	no		
9humboldt_20110621_2	Humboldt, Sonoma, Marin			no	no		
9humboldt_20110621_2	Humboldt, Sonoma, Marin			no	no		
9humboldt_20110621_2				no	no		
8smateo_20110615_2	San Mateo	Menlo Park		no	no		
8smateo_20110615_2				no	no		
8sonoma_20110616		Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110616	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	coastal	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110621_1			no				
9humboldt_20110621_1			no				
9humboldt_20110621_1			no				
9humboldt_20110621_2			no				
9humboldt_20110621_2			no				
9humboldt_20110621_2			no				
9humboldt_20110621_2			no				
8smateo_20110615_2			no				
8smateo_20110615_2			no				
8sonoma_20110616			no				
8sonoma_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110616	6142011	Matthew Danielczyk	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with majority of Sonoma and Marin
8sonoma_20110616	6142011	Sandy Chapman	no			Sonoma	yes	Feels there is no North Bay region. North Coast district is too big.
8sonoma_20110616	6172011	Valerie Eisman	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with Marin and Sonoma. Keep Trinity County separate from SonomaMarin
8sonoma_20110616	6162011	Carol Taylor	no				no	
9dnorte_20110616	6142011	Jaime Yarbrough	no			Del Norte	yes	Approve of Assembly maps
9dnorte_20110616	6152011	Toni Radle	no			Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte with eastern counties rather than with southern sophisticated counties
9dnorte_20110616	6142011	Patti Kraft	no			Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte with eastern counties rather than with southern sophisticated counties
9dnorte_20110616	6152011	Steve Crockett	no			Del Norte	yes	Include Del Norte with Humboldt, Mendecino, Trinity, Siskiyou. Keep Del Norte separate from SonomaMarin
9dnorte_20110616	6152011	Grant Weschkull	no			Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte with other coastl communities
9dnorte_20110616	6152011	Marlow Thompson	no			Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte with counties to east, not with Bay Area
9dnorte_20110616	6172011	Jon Olson	no			Del Norte	yes	Group Del Norte with Trinity, Siskiyou, and eastern counties
9humboldt_20110616	6162011	Sue Pierce (duplicate)	no			Humboldt	yes	Put Humboldt with Del Norte, Siskiyou, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110616	Marin, Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Tied politically, culturally, geographically, with Marin and Sonoma	Tied economically to Marin, Sonoma
8sonoma_20110616				no	no		
8sonoma_20110616	Sonoma, Marin, Trinity	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Rural v. metropolitan, geographically different.	
8sonoma_20110616				no	no		
9dnorte_20110616				no	no		
9dnorte_20110616	Del Norte			no	no		
9dnorte_20110616	Del Norte			no	yes		Ruralagricultural, not urbanindustrial
9dnorte_20110616	Del Norte, Humboldt, Menedcino, Trinity, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Marin			no	no		
9dnorte_20110616	Del Norte			no	yes	Coastal, recreational opportunities, native habitats, landscapes, transportation system	
9dnorte_20110616	Del Norte			no	yes	Rural, less influence if grouped with Bay Area	
9dnorte_20110616	Del Norte, Trinity, Siskiyou			no	yes	Rural	
9humboldt_20110616	Humboldt, Del Norte, Siskiyou, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc			no	yes	Small town, agricultural area	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110616			no				
8sonoma_20110616			no				
8sonoma_20110616			no				
8sonoma_20110616			no				Cannot read 1st draft maps. Want a clearer map and written descriptions of new districts.
9dnorte_20110616			no				Applauds creation of Commission
9dnorte_20110616			no				
9dnorte_20110616			no				
9dnorte_20110616			no				
9dnorte_20110616			no				
9dnorte_20110616			no				
9dnorte_20110616			no				
9dnorte_20110616			no				
9humboldt_20110616			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110616	6162011	Maggie Carey (duplicate	yes	Briceland Winery		Humboldt	yes	Put Humboldt with Mendocino, Lake
9sacramento_20110615	6152011	Kevin McCarty, Steve Cohn	yes	District 3, 6 Councilmembers		Sacramento	yes	Do not split East Sacramento, Tahoe Park, Elmhurst, College Glen, Colonial Manor, Campus Commons, Sierra Oaks, Power Inn from City of Sacramento
9sacramento_20110616	6162011	Glenn and Sandra Schweickert	no		Elk Grove	Sacramento	yes	Include all of Elk Grove in District 3, but if insistent on keeping East, then anything east of Highway 99 should be in District 3.
9sacramento_20110616	6162011	William H. Edgar	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Put east Sacramento with Sacramento City. Leave out El Dorado Hills, Roseville, Loomis, Lincoln. Include with Sacramento CSU Sacramento and UC Davis Medical Center
9siskiyou_20110616	6162011	Russell Porterfield	no			Siskiyou	yes	Leave Siskiyou intact and take necessary population to make coastal district work from southern end of that district
9siskiyou_20110616	6162011	Anonymous	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County
9siskiyou_20110616	6152011	Ed Valenzuela	yes	Siskiyou County, Second District Supervisor		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110616	Humboldt, Mendecino, Lake			no	yes	School district, athletic league	Wine industry
9sacramento_20110615		Sacramento		no	yes	Historical ties, similar interestsissues, school districts whole, higher education opportunity, hospital synergy	business activity, economic development
9sacramento_20110616		Elk Grove	Highway 99	no	yes	Church First Baptist Church of Elk Grove, Brad Shaw Christian School, do not want Democratic representative	
9sacramento_20110616		Roseville, Lincoln, Sacramento		no	yes	UC Davis Medical Center, CSU Sacramentocritical City assest and frequent collaborative City partners.	
9siskiyou_20110616	Siskiyou			no	yes	Voters from western Siskiyou have no way to get up and down coast. Too far to drive to coast	
9siskiyou_20110616	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110616	Siskiyou			no	yes	Unique, diverse, already a small voice in governance	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110616			no				
9sacramento_20110615			no				
9sacramento_20110616			no				
9sacramento_20110616			no				
9siskiyou_20110616			no				
9siskiyou_20110616			no				
9siskiyou_20110616			no				Appreciate Commissions hard work and efforts

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110616	6152011	Jon E. Lopey	yes	Siskiyou County, Sheriff		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County
9siskiyou_20110616	6162011	Meredith Perry	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County.
9siskiyou_20110616	6162011	Jim Friden	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not move Scott Valley into coastal distict.
9siskiyou_20110616	6162011	Anonymous	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou
9trinity_20110615	6152011	Patrick Truman	no			Trinity	yes	Put Trinity with north coastal counties, not with counties in Sacramento Valley
9trinity_20110616	6162011	Paul Helwig and Katherine Bauer-Helwig	no			Trinity	yes	Put Trinity County with existing coastal CD and SD. Keep separate from ReddingCentral Valley area.
20110616	6142011	Lou Bone	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110616	Siskiyou			no	yes	Would split school districts, fire protection districts, excellent working relationship with current Senator Nielsen, Assemblyman LaMalf and Congressman Herger. Very hard to drive all the way to coast.	Mining, general land use, dam removal, foresting, agriculture
9siskiyou_20110616	Siskiyou			no	yes	Not coastal, need representation in state, county, school systems as well as cities and voting districts.	
9siskiyou_20110616				no	yes	Not coastal, quality of education will and ability to get representation is less than before	
9siskiyou_20110616	Siskiyou			no	yes	Would take 4.5 hours to get to city that would be conducting business for us	
9trinity_20110615	Trinity, Sacramento			no	yes	Coastal	
9trinity_20110616	Trinity	Redding		no	yes		Do not let elected representatives take Trinitys resource (water) and send it south.
20110616				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110616			no				
9siskiyou_20110616			no				
9siskiyou_20110616			no				
9siskiyou_20110616			no				
9trinity_20110615			no				
9trinity_20110616			no				
20110616			no				Drawings are gerrymandered

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110616	6162011	Bob McCleary	no		Orinda	Contra Costa	yes	See attached letter Support boundaries for ADs EALAMEDA, PITT-ANTIOCH, WEST CONTRA COSTA, SDs EALAWCONTRA, OAK-RICH. Make CDs match ADsSDs more.
20110616	6162011	Helen Salandra	no				yes	Does not specify where Want communities left as is
20110616	6152011	Tony Quinn	yes	Capitol Morning Report, political analyst			no	
20110616	6142011	Gregory Hunter	yes	City of St. Helena, former Councilmember	St. Helena	Napa	yes	Do not remove American Canyon from Napa
20110616	6162011	Anonymous	no				yes	Does not specify where No division please
20110616	6162011	Karen Robinson-Stark	no		Burbank	Los Angeles	yes	Happy with new district surrounding Burbank.
20110616	6142011	Anonymous	no		Fresno	Fresno	no	
20110616	6152011	Michelle M itchell	no		Claremont	Los Angeles	yes	Approve of districts surrounding Claremont.
4langeles_20110618	6182011	Austina Cho	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include Cerritos and Artesia grouped with surrounding cities in SE Los Angeles County and N Orange County
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Daniella Smith	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110616				no	no		
20110616				no	no		
20110616				no	no		
20110616	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
20110616				no	no		
20110616				no	no		
20110616				no	no		
20110616				no	yes	Claremont will receive representation now.	
4langeles_20110618	Los Angeles, Orange	Cerritos, Artesia		no	yes	geographic	
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110616			no				
20110616			no				
20110616			no				Possibility of a referendum against Commissions maps
20110616			no				
20110616			no				
20110616			no				Support redistricting for greater good of citizenry. This process has been very best plan for redistricting since ever
20110616			no				Have proportional representation for a real democracy
20110616			no				
4langeles_20110618			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110619	6202011	Michael G. Evans	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Marcia Boles	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Tom and Jane Hanson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita Valley by incorporating some of s. SC valley into San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Gina Sanders	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep neighborhoods adjacent to Griffith Park Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, Hollywood flats, and North Hollywood together.
4langeles_20110619	6202011	Roger Redel	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Laura Martel	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Atlantic Avenue into separate districts
4langeles_20110619	6202011	Michael Barnes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Unite Lancaster and Palmdale into the same congressional district instead of splitting Lancaster into two.
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Jack S. Gordo	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Richard Smykle	no			Los Angeles	yes	Support Santa Clarita zip code 91321 into San Fernando Valley district
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Michael Peevey	no			Los Angeles	yes	The Foothills Senate district should not include Upland but should include Arcadia

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	yes	issues	
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619			Mountain range	no	no		
4langeles_20110619			Griffith Park Hollywood Hills, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, Hollywood flats, and North Hollywood	no	yes	fire	
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619				no	yes	same representation	
4langeles_20110619		Palmdale, Lancaster, Moore Park, Simi Valley	Antelope Valley	no	yes	school district	
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619		Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank,		no	yes	community interest	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110619	6202011	Larry Martin	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110619	6192011	James and Patricia Riner	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not want Newhall and parts of Valencia split from SCV congressional district and put into San Fernando VellyCalabassas District.
4langeles_20110619	6192011	Laren Walker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley not San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110619	6202011	Carla Greene	no			Los Angeles	yes	Against chopping up parts of Valencia and Newhall and aligning them with San Fernando Valley
5ventura_20110620	6142011	Cheryl Ackermann	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Do not redistrict Thousand Oaks out of Ventura County into Los Angeles
6kern_20110618	6182011	Derek Hance	no			Kern	yes	Bakersfield is being broken up.
6stanislaus_20110619	6192011	Sally Olsen	no			Stanislaus	yes	Do not divide Modesto into 2 assembly districts. It would be more effective to give Turlock to the CeresPatterson district.
7sclara_20110617	6172011	anonyomous	no			Santa Clara	no	
7scruz_20110617	6172011	Joseph Farmer	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Northern Santa Cruz County has nothing in common with Santa Clara and San Mateo and should not be districted together.
7scruz_20110617	6182011	Louise West	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Residents of the San Lorenzo Valley have more in common with communities up and down San Lorenzo River and Hwy. 9.
7scruz_20110617	6172011	Robert Obrien	no			Santa Cruz	yes	The border of the Congressional district of Scotts Valley should be at the county line

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita, Calabasas	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619		Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita Valley-Antelope Valley, Newhall, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110619		Valencia	Newhall, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley	no	no		
5ventura_20110620	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	no		
6kern_20110618	Kern	Bakersfield		no	yes	voting	
6stanislaus_20110619	Stanislaus	Modesto, Turlock, Ceres, Patterson		no	yes	one city needs on representative	
7sclara_20110617				no	no		
7scruz_20110617	Santa Cruz	Santa Clara, San Mateo,	San Lorenzo Valley	no	yes	voting	
7scruz_20110617	Santa Cruz		Hwy 9, San Lorenzo Valley, San Lorenzo River	no	yes	emergency conditions	
7scruz_20110617	Santa Cruz, Santa Clara	Scotts Valley		no	yes	voting	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
4langeles_20110619			no				
5ventura_20110620			no				
6kern_20110618			no				
6stanislaus_20110619			no				
7sclara_20110617			no			happy your district keep our voices Little Saigom	
7scruz_20110617			no				
7scruz_20110617	geographical issues		no				
7scruz_20110617	COI		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110617	6182011	Pam Newbury	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Bonny Doon, Boulder Creek, Davenport, Zayante, Lompico, Mount Hermon, Scotts Valley, Ben Lomond, and Santa Cruz are a COI
7scruz_20110618	6182011	Janet Stainton	no			Santa Cruz	yes	San Lorenzo Valley belongs with Santa Cruz. Use HWY 236 at HWY 9 or HWY 35 as boundary.
7scruz_20110618	6182011	Maryellen Boyle	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Like that coastal areas are consolidated in congressional and senate districts
7scruz_20110618	6192011	Harry Landers	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Communities of San Lorenzo Valley should be in same district with Santa Cruz, Capitola, Aptos
7scruz_20110618	6182011	Paul Lazaga	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Does not fit guidelines to separate communities in San Lorenzo Valley from other Santa Cruz Mountain community
8alameda_20110617	6172011	Rich Lindstrom	no			Alameda	yes	Castro Valley should be excluded from Oakland Congressional District
8ccosta_20110618	6182011	Carol M Hehmeyer	no			Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110618	6182011	Leonard E. Lloyd	no			Contra Costa	yes	Dont separating Oakley into a district outside of Contra Costa county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110617	Santa Cruz	Bonny Doon, Boulder Creek, Davenport, Zayante, Lompico, Mount Hermon, Scotts Valley, Ben Lomond, Santa Cruz, Saratoga, Cupertino, Santa Clara, Mountain View, Palo Alto	San Lorenzo Valley	no	yes	media, voting, representatives, issues	
7scruz_20110618		Santa Cruz	San Lorenzo Valley, HWY 236, HWY 9, HWY 35	no	yes	shop	employment
7scruz_20110618				no	no		
7scruz_20110618		Santa Cruz, Capitola, Aptos, Saratoga, Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Mountain View, Palo Alto		no	yes	geographic	
7scruz_20110618	Santa Cruz	Scotts Valley, Santa Cruz	San Lorenzo Valley, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, Felton, Santa Cruz Mountain, Boulder Creek	no	yes	community	
8alameda_20110617		Castro Valley, Oakland		no	yes	representation	
8ccosta_20110618				no	no		
8ccosta_20110618	Contra Costa, Alameda	Oakley, Livermore, Pleasanton, Stockton, Manteca		no	yes	voting, schools, churches, medical	retail, employment

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110617	COI		no				
7scruz_20110618	COI		no				
7scruz_20110618			no				
7scruz_20110618	geographic issues		no				
7scruz_20110618	shared communities		no				
8alameda_20110617	keep representation		no				
8ccosta_20110618			no				Clumped comments with CCAG title.
8ccosta_20110618	COI		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110617	6172011	Thomas Bires	no			Marin	no	
8marin_20110619	6192011	Michael S. Wayman	no			Marin	yes	Dont chop up Marin, Sonoma, Solano and Lake counties.
8napa_20110617	6172011	Thoman McNicholas	no			Napa	yes	American Canyon should maintain its position as a part of Napa County.
8napa_20110618	6182011	Bernhard Krevet	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon within Napa county state and federal districts
8napa_20110618	6182011	Robert Agnlin	no			Napa	yes	American Canyon should no be redistricted out of Napa County
8napa_20110620	6152011	City Council Of Napa	yes	City Of Napa	Napa	Napa	yes	Urge to keep American Canyon included in the same legislative district as Napa County
8sonoma_20110617	6172011	Margaret Clary	no			Sonoma	yes	It is a disservice to lump together Sonoma and Yuba due to geographical interests
8sonoma_20110617	6172011	Gina Belforte	no			Sonoma	yes	Dont refer to Southern Sonoma County as Marin
8sonoma_20110617	6172011	Pedro Garcia	no			Sonoma	no	
8sonoma_20110618	6182011	Lyn Riley	no			Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa has very little in common with the inland valleys. Are most concerned with the North Coast, Russian River, and San Francisco Bay
8sonoma_20110618	6192011	Anna Paul	no			Sonoma	yes	Please keep Santa Rosa within North bayHwy 101 corridor districts since the interests of the people are the same.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110617				no	no		
8marin_20110619		Marin, Sonoma, Solano		no	yes	tradition	
8napa_20110617	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	state and federal programs	
8napa_20110618	Napa	American Canyon	Napa River	no	yes	effort	
8napa_20110618	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes		Industry, wine
8napa_20110620	Napa	Napa, American Canyon		no	yes	housing. Transportation, use of resources	Economic
8sonoma_20110617	Sonoma, Yuba	Sonoma,		no	yes	geographic	
8sonoma_20110617	Sonoma, Marin			no	no		
8sonoma_20110617				no	no		
8sonoma_20110618		Santa Rosa,	North Coast, Russian River, and San Francisco Bay	no	yes	political views	
8sonoma_20110618	Marin, Sonoma,	Santa Rosa,	North Bay, Hwy 101,	no	yes	demographics	business, agricultural

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110617			no				Do not let the politician sway you in your creation of district based on geography and economy. Thank you for your important work.
8marin_20110619	tradition		no				
8napa_20110617	shared state and federal programs		no				
8napa_20110618	It has taken so much effort to keep Napa River and American Canyon a whole		no				
8napa_20110618	American Canyon is an integral part of Napa County due to shared industry		no				
8napa_20110620	It would do hard to communities and regional economy		no				
8sonoma_20110617			no				
8sonoma_20110617			no				
8sonoma_20110617			no				The Mexican people do not get anything at all
8sonoma_20110618	more concerned with the coastal community		no				
8sonoma_20110618	Santa Rosa has similar COI as North BayHwy 101 corridor		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110618	6182011	Kathryn Maxwell	no			Sonoma	yes	Object to isolation of Santa Rosa from local issues pertinent to the whole of Sonoma County such as Russian River, coastal preservations, wine productions, organic gardening, the SMART rail, act.
8sonoma_20110618	6182011	Priscilla Forward	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa in the North Bay not in the Valley
8sonoma_20110618	6192011	Lois Benson	no			Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa is a part of a coastal community and the Russian River not the towns over the hills in the agricultural area.
9dnorte_20110618	6182011	Lorie Carter	no			Del Norte	yes	Del Norte should be grouped with smaller rural counties rather then semi-urbanized coastal counties.
9dnorte_20110619	6192011	Terril R. Gray	no			Del Norte	yes	Combine counties to the E. of Del Norte along the Oregon State line. They are more rural and have more in common.
9dnorte_20110620	6152011	Philip Gobel	no			Del Norte	yes	Consider counties East to West not North to South.
9placer_20110617	6172011	John H. Paulsen	no			Placer	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110618	Sonoma	Santa Rosa	Russian River	no	yes	enviroment,gardening, transportation	agriculture, wine production
8sonoma_20110618		Santa Rosa	North Bay	no	no		
8sonoma_20110618		Santa Rosa	Russian River,	no	yes		wine, technology
9dnorte_20110618	Del Norte	Santa Rosa		no	no		
9dnorte_20110619	Del Norte			no	yes		agricultural
9dnorte_20110620	Del Norte			no	yes	voting	
9placer_20110617				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110618	Santa Rosa has more of a COI with Sonoma County		no				
8sonoma_20110618	Santa Rosa belongs in the North Bay		no				
8sonoma_20110618	Santa Rosa has more in common with North Bay and Russian River including geographic similarities and economic interests		no				
9dnorte_20110618	It is in the countys benefit to have an East to West line drawn rather then North to South		no				
9dnorte_20110619	Small rural communities have more in common with each other then more industrialurban areas		no				
9dnorte_20110620	Del Norte does not have a COI with Bay Area counties		no				
9placer_20110617			no				Believe your approach is the correct manner to address the issue of re-drawing districts that have common regional interests.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110620	6152011	City Council of Sacramento	yes	City of Sacramento		Sacramento	yes	Concerns about the separation of eastern portion of the city of Sacramento.
9sacramento_20110620	6152011	Jerry Vorpahl	yes	Power Inn Alliance		Sacramento	yes	Disappointed that Power Inn is being separated from Sacramento because there is a COI.
9siskiyou_20110617	6172011	Tom Wetter	yes	Lake Shastina Community Services District		Siskiyou	yes	The proposed NOCSTDELMENDO district splits the western part of Siskiyou County into coastal communities that are remote and have little in common. The MTCAP district would group eastern part with desert communities and all have different priorities
9siskiyou_20110617	6182011	Anna Kay Short	yes	Golden Eagle Charter School	Weed	Siskiyou	yes	Proposed new district would split school system
9sjoaquin_20110619	6192011	George Riddle	no			San Joaquin	yes	San Joaquin should be its own district for the State Assembly, State Senate, and Federal Congressional District.
20110613	6132011	David Payne	no		Studio City		no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110620		Sacramento		no	yes	historical, interests, education, hospitals, neighborhood	business
9sacramento_20110620		Sacramento		yes	yes	education, medical facilities, neighborhood associations	business
9siskiyou_20110617	Siskiyou			no	yes	geographic similarities, traditions, relationships, voting	economic
9siskiyou_20110617	Siskiyou	Yreka, Weed, and Mt. Shasta, Happy Camp, Toelle Lake, Dunsmuir		no	yes	shared school districts, environmental geographical concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110619	San Joaquin			no	yes	geographic boundaries	
20110613				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110620	Sacramento has a COI with eastern Sacramento and Tahoe Park, Elmhurst, College Glen, Colonial Manor, Campus Commons, Sierra Oaks, and Power Inn.		no				
9sacramento_20110620	Power in has a COI with Sacramento		no				
9siskiyou_20110617	Siskiyou County has a tradition and should not be split		no				
9siskiyou_20110617	Siskiyou County shares a school district.		no				
9sjoaquin_20110619	San Joaquin should be its own district because it has enough of a population to support all representative		no				
20110613			no				What are you thinking dividing communities into arbitrary districts.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110616_2	6162011	Josh Jacobs	no				no	
20110616_2	6162011	Tony Quinn	no				no	
20110616_2	6202011	Lou La Monte	yes	Malibu City Council	Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Malibu should stay with Santa Monica, Santa Monica Mountain and Valley. Not Ventura County.
20110616_2	6152011	Thomas Belin	yes	UCLA Department of Biostatistics	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	
20110616_2	6162011	Gail Hirsch	no				no	
20110617	6162011	Iku Kiriyama	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Gardena and Torrance in the same district due to Japanese American community history.
20110617	6172011	Kathi Wolfsohn	no		Millbrae	San Mateo	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110616_2				no	no		
20110616_2				no	no		
20110616_2	Ventura, Kern,	Malibu, Santa Monica	Santa Monica Mountain	no	yes	School districts, water issues, traffic, fire, police, environmental efforts	
20110616_2				no	no		
20110616_2				no	no		
20110617		Gardena, Torrance		no	yes	Schools, churches, neighborhoods	
20110617				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110616_2			no				Urge you to draw congressional and state assembly and senate lines along the community rather then according to racial andor political party quota.
20110616_2			no				How the Redistricting Commission Screwed Latinos
20110616_2	Shares services with Santa Monica and Santa Monica Mountains		no				
20110616_2			no				CCRC should publish DVC scores with redistricting plans.
20110616_2			no				Remove political bias from process, Use natural boundaries such as city of county borders, school districts, or zip codes
20110617	Gardena and Torrance have a COI due to schools and culture		no				
20110617			no				Not doing a good job redistricting. Not using existing divisions.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110617	6172011	Cirenio A. Rodriguez	no				no	
20110617	6172011	Lani Eklund	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	It does not make sense to place Lodi and Lockeford in the same district as Yolo, Napa, Marin, and Solano. Lodi, Lockeford and Clements should be kept in a single Senate District and should compose entire Assembly District.
20110617	6172011	Brian Lawson	no				no	
20110617	6172011	Leonel Leal	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
20110617	6172011	anonymous	no				no	
20110617	6172011	Eugene Starr	no			Los Angeles	yes	Request that Venice and Santa Monica be eliminated. Request Lawndale and Hawthorne be added to Palos Verdes E. Assembly district.
20110618	6162011		no				no	
4langeles_20110620	6152011	Jean Good Lietzau	yes	La Habra Heights City Council	La Habra Heights	Los Angeles	yes	La Habra Heights is closely involved in La Mirada, Whittier, Downey, and greater Los Angeles county communities. Please align Congressional District to cities included in State Assembly and Senate Districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110617				no	no		
20110617	Napa, Yolo, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Lockeford, Clements		no	yes	housing, geographic, recreations, cultural heritage	Agriculture, manufacturing, commerce, development
20110617				no	no		
20110617				no	no		
20110617				no	no		
20110617	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Palos Verdes, Westchester, Playa Del Rey, Marina Del Re		no	no		
20110618				no	no		
4langeles_20110620	Los Angeles	La Habra Heights, La Mirada, Whittier, Downey		no	yes	similar need, City councils work together	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110617		Draft does not provide sufficient opportunities for fair Latino representation as required by the VRA	no				
20110617	Lodi has a COI with Lockeford and Clement		no				
20110617		Drafts do nothing to allow Latinos in new growth areas to voice their electoral progress.	no				Mistake in comment.
20110617			no				
20110617			no				Maps I have been able to see for district V look good to me.
20110617			no				
20110618			no				
4langeles_20110620			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110619	6192011	Clair Beck	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Senseless to split Lompoc, Vandenberg Village, Mesa Oaks, and Mission Hills
5sbarbara_20110619	6192011	Kenneth Main	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into two different districts for state senate and state assembly
5sbarbara_20110619	6202011	Cathy Gregory	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Ynez, Solvang, and Buellton have closer ties to Santa Barbara city then Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110619	6192011	Alice Milligan	no			Santa Barbara	yes	City of Lompoc, Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, and Vandenberg Air Force Base should be in the same district. Interests are more in line with Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo
5ventura_20110617	6172011	Richard Douglas	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Consider grouping Ventura County cities of Simi Valley and Thousands Oaks with Santa Clarita and the connecting cities of the Northwest San Fernando Valley
5ventura_20110618	6182011	Jerry H. Miller	no			Ventura	no	
5ventura_20110618	6182011	Mark Urkwick	no			Ventura	yes	Please keep Oxnard together.
5ventura_20110618	6182011	Jana Covell	no			Ventura	yes	Thousand Oaks needs to stay in Ventura County and not be moved to Los Angeles County
5ventura_20110618	6182011	Steve Covell	no			Ventura	yes	Thousand Oaks needs to stay in Ventura County and not be moved to Los Angeles County
5ventura_20110619	6192011	Raymond LaChapelle	no			Ventura	yes	Against redistricting Thousand Oaks into Los Angeles district
5ventura_20110619	6192011	Verna Mandel	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	East Ventura Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo, and Thousand Oaks should not be split and placed in different districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110619		Lompoc	Vandenberg Village, Mesa Oaks, Mission Hills	no	yes	one community	
5sbarbara_20110619		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110619		Lompoc, Solvang, Buellton, Santa Barbara, Santa Maria	Santa Ynez,	no	yes	commuting	
5sbarbara_20110619	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Lompoc, Mission Hills	Vandenberg Village, Vandenberg Air Force Base	no	yes	interests	
5ventura_20110617	Los Angeles, Ventura,	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Malibu, Santa Barbara, Santa Clarita	San Fernando Valley	no	yes	similarities	
5ventura_20110618				no	no		
5ventura_20110618		Oxnard, Los Angeles		no	no		
5ventura_20110618	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	yes	voting	
5ventura_20110618	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	yes	representatives	
5ventura_20110619	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Los Angeles		no	yes	vote	
5ventura_20110619	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Camarillo		no	yes	social, education	economic

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110619			no				
5sbarbara_20110619			no				
5sbarbara_20110619			no				
5sbarbara_20110619			no				
5ventura_20110617			no				
5ventura_20110618			no				commend the commission for the work accomplished thus far in the proposed maps.
5ventura_20110618			no				
5ventura_20110618			no				
5ventura_20110618			no				
5ventura_20110619			no				
5ventura_20110619			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110619	6192011	Alexis Teplitz	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Thousand Oaks should not be split in two out of Ventura County into Los Angeles.
7sclara_20110618	6182011	Sarah Wilson	yes	Freelance editor and writer, Homeschool Review	Ben Lomond	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, Boulder Creek, and Bonny Doon in Santa Cruz
7sclara_20110621_2	6212011	Caroline Roth	no		Milpitas	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Milpitas in Santa Clara, not Alameda
7sclara_20110621_2	6212011	Melanie Espino	yes	Director, Community Education Council on Aging Silicon Valley	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep San Jose together
7scruz_20110621	6212011	Rebecca J. Garcia	yes	Trustee, Cabrillo Community College	Watsonville	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Salinas and Watsonville in the same district
8alameda_20110621_2	6212011	Bob Howe	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Combine Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore with San Ramon, Danville, Walnut Creek
8alameda_20110621_3	6212011	Andrea Schacter	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont with Newark and Union City
8alameda_20110622_2	6222011	Ann Schultz	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro together
8alameda_20110623	6232011	Elissa Kartman	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro together
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Joanne Peterson	no		Martinez	Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Sasha L. Robinson	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Berkeley, Oakland, Richmond together
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Cheryll Grover	no			Contra Costa	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110619	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Los Angeles	Palmdale	no	yes	health	
7sclara_20110618	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Meto	Sunnyvale, Ben Lomond, Mountain View, Saratoga, Keep Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, Boulder Creek, Bonny Doon	Highway 9	no	yes		
7sclara_20110621_2	Santa Clara, Alameda			no	yes		
7sclara_20110621_2	Santa Clara, Alameda, Monterey, San Benito	San Jose		no	yes	Shared political voice	
7scruz_20110621	Santa Cruz	Watsonville, San Jose		no	yes		
8alameda_20110621_2	Alameda	Plesanton, Dublin, Livermore, Union City, Hayward, San Leandro		no	yes		
8alameda_20110621_3	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes	Common interests	
8alameda_20110622_2	Alameda	San Leandro, Oakland, Berkeley		no	yes		
8alameda_20110623	Alameda	San Leandro, Oakland		no	yes	Unique small-city issues	
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez, Oakland, Richmond, Berkeley		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110619			no				
7sclara_20110618			no				
7sclara_20110621_2			no				
7sclara_20110621_2			no				
7scruz_20110621			no				Let other Latino populations have the same representation we do
8alameda_20110621_2			no				
8alameda_20110621_3			no				
8alameda_20110622_2			no				
8alameda_20110623			no				
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110621_2	6212011	Neil Janes	yes	Lead clerk specialist, Contra Costa County Conservation and Development		Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110622	6222011	Greg Feer	yes	CEO, Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council	Martinez	Contra Costa	no	
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Patricia and Lewis Zuelow	no			Marin	yes	Make Marin one district or combine with Sonoma
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Chris Brown (duplicate)	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Do not combine San Francisco with Marin
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Chris W.	no			Marin	yes	District 1 Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, Lake, western Siskiyou; District 6 Mill Valley, Sausalito, Marin city, Tiburon, San Rafael, Strawberry, Belvedere, Corete Madera, Larkspur, San Anselmo, Fairfax, Ross, Terra Linda Marinwood, Novato
8marin_20110622_2	6222011	Sondra S. Wuthnow	no			Marin	yes	Do not include Marin and Sonoma with north coast counties
8napa_20110622_2	6222011	Nan Vaaler	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110622_2	6222011	John Stephens	no			Napa	no	
8sfrancisco_20110621	6212011	Terry Turrentine	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110621_2	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110622	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes		
8marin_20110622_2	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes		
8marin_20110622_2	Marin	San Rafael		no	no		
8marin_20110622_2	Marin, Siskiyou, Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, Lake, Sonoma	Cloverdale, Healdsburg, Windsor, Geyserville, Sebastopol, Santa Rosa, Guerneville, Occidental, Graton, Annapolis, Monte Rio, Jenner, Bodega, Bay, Two Rock, Cazadero, Sausalito, Marin city, Tiburon, San Rafeal, Strawberry, Belvedere, Corte Madera, Larkspur	cities continued San Anselmo, Fairfax, Ross, Terra Linda Marinwood, Novato	no	no		
8marin_20110622_2	Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, Siskiyou	San Rafeal, Novato, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Different transportation issues,	Different industries
8napa_20110622_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	Shared library system	
8napa_20110622_2	Napa			no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110621	San Francisco	San Francisco		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110621_2			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator
8ccosta_20110622			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys Senator
8marin_20110622_2			no				
8marin_20110622_2			no				
8marin_20110622_2			no				
8marin_20110622_2			no				
8napa_20110622_2			no				
8napa_20110622_2			no				Good job
8sfrancisco_20110621			no				San Francisco needs an odd senate seat

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110621_2	6212011	Diane Hichwa	yes	Conservation chair, Madrone Audubon Society	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Sonoma County should contain the west county, the north county and the coast
8sonoma_20110621_2	6212011	Efren Carrillo	yes	Chair and Fifth District Supervisor, Sonoma County Board of Supervisors		Sonoma	no	Combine Sonoma with Marin, Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Humbolt, Del Norte
8sonoma_20110622	6222011	Gary Wysocky	yes	Councilman, Santa Rosa City	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with the north coast, not the central valley
8sonoma_20110622	6222011	Barbara Cates	no		Healdsburg	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with the North Bay, not with the valley
8sonoma_20110622	6222011	Kimberly Kunkel	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with Sonoma
9dnorte_20110622	6222011	Rob Miller	yes	President, DN County Farm		Del Norte	yes	Keep current Del Norte district the same
9humboldt_20110622_2	6222011	Nancy Nieboer	no			Humbolt	yes	Keep North Coast Counties together
9humboldt_20110622_2	6222011	Greg Dale	no		Marin	Marin	yes	Keep Marin with San Francisco
9mendocino_20110621_2	6212011	Larry Hanson	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep coastal communities together
9mendocino_20110621_2	6212011	Mary Rezner	no			Mendocino	no	
9mendocino_20110621_2	6212011	Morris Kaplan	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep coastal communities together
9mendocino_20110622_2	6222011	Larry Kellogg (duplicate)	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep coastal communities together
9mendocino_20110622_2	6222011	(duplicate)	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep coastal communities together
9mendocino_20110622_2	6222011	Stephen Scalmanini (duplicate)	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep coastal communities together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110621_2	Sonoma	Santa Rosa, Petaluma		no	yes	Shared water system	
8sonoma_20110621_2	Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Marin, Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Humbolt, Del Norte			no	yes		Shared wine production and tourism
8sonoma_20110622	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Shared transportation, water corridors	Shared economy
8sonoma_20110622	Sonoma	Healdsburg		no	yes	Shared environmental interests	Agriculture, wine production
8sonoma_20110622	Sonoma, Loki	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
9dnorte_20110622	Del Norte			no	yes		Agriculture
9humboldt_20110622_2				no	no		
9humboldt_20110622_2	Marin, Humboldt, Del Norte, Mendocino, San Francisco			no	yes	Financial similarity	
9mendocino_20110621_2	Mendocino			no	yes	Strong interest for ocean and shoreline protection, redwood parks	Freeway system, agriculture
9mendocino_20110621_2	Mendocino			no	no		
9mendocino_20110621_2	Mendocino			no	yes	Conservation and environmental protection	
9mendocino_20110622_2	Mendocino, Siskiyou			no	yes	Strong interest for ocean and shoreline protection, redwood parks	Freeway system, agriculture
9mendocino_20110622_2	Mendocino			no	yes	Common interests	
9mendocino_20110622_2	Mendocino			no	yes	Common interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110621_2			no				
8sonoma_20110621_2			no				
8sonoma_20110622			no				
8sonoma_20110622			no				
8sonoma_20110622			no				
9dnorte_20110622			no				
9humboldt_20110622_2			no				Thank you for listening
9humboldt_20110622_2			no				
9mendocino_20110621_2			no				
9mendocino_20110621_2			no			I support the North Coastal District lines	
9mendocino_20110621_2			no				
9mendocino_20110622_2			no				
9mendocino_20110622_2			no				
9mendocino_20110622_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110623	6232011	John Dickerson (duplicate)	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep Napa and Lake together; Keep Mendocino and Sonoma together
9sacramento_20110621_2	6212011	Warren V. Truitt, Jr.	no		Fair Oaks	Sacramento	yes	Keep Fair Oaks in Sacramento County
9siskiyou_20110621_3	6212011	John Menke	yes	Quartz Valley Red Angus	Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110622_2	6222011	Edward J. Pecis	yes	Special Agent, California Department of Justice		Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110622_2	6222011	Mark Baird	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110622_2	6222011	Stanley and Jeanette Loudon	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110624	6242011	Louise Gliatto	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou with Coastal communities
9sjoaquin_20110622	6222011	Chuck Wasmuth	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110622	6222011	Dennis Parks	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Make Lathrop, Stockton and Tracy a district
9tehama_20110622	6222011	Burt Bundy	no			Tehama, Yolo, Shasta	yes	Make Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Tehama, Butte, Plumas, Glenn as a Assembly District
9trinity_20110621_2	6212011	Diana Sheen	no			Trinity	yes	Do not include Trinity with coastal ppulation
9trinity_20110622	6222011	Diana Sheen	no			Trinity	yes	Do not include Trinity with coastal ppulation
9yuba_20110622	6222011	Cindy Miller	no			Yuba	yes	Do not include Trinity with coastal ppulation; keep with Chico

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110623	Mendocino, Lake, Napa, Sonoma	Santa Rosa, Marysville	Mountains separating Sacramento Valley and North Coast range	no	yes	Geography	Wine, jobs
9sacramento_20110621_2	Sacramento, Placer	Fair Oaks		no	yes	Similar issues	
9siskiyou_20110621_3	Siskiyou	Fort Jones		no	yes		water and agricultural use
9siskiyou_20110622_2	Siskiyou			no	yes	Public facilities, social interests, educational facilites	water and agricultural use
9siskiyou_20110622_2	Siskiyou			no	yes	Public facilities, social interests, educational facilites	water and agricultural use
9siskiyou_20110622_2	Siskiyou	Etna		no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110624	Siskiyou	Yreka		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110622	San Joaquin	Lodi, Stockton		no	yes		Agriculture
9sjoaquin_20110622	San Joaquin	Stockton, Tracy, Lathrop		no	yes		Tranportation system
9tehama_20110622	Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Tehama, Butte, Plumas, Glenn, Yolo, Shasta			no	yes		
9trinity_20110621_2	Trinity			no	yes	Political views	Land use
9trinity_20110622	Trinity	Arcata, Eureka, Marin, San Francisco, Sacramento		no	yes	Political views	
9yuba_20110622	Trinity, Chico			no	yes	Social interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110623			no				
9sacramento_20110621_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110621_3			no				
9siskiyou_20110622_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110622_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110622_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110624			no				
9sjoaquin_20110622			no				
9sjoaquin_20110622			no				
9tehama_20110622			no				
9trinity_20110621_2			no				
9trinity_20110622			no				
9yuba_20110622			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110621_2	6212011	Mary Ann Williams	no		Fair Oaks	Sacramento	yes	Keep Fair Oaks in Sacramento County
9siskiyou_20110621_3	6212011	Vonita Bishop	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110622_2	6222011	John O. Homer, D.C.	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110622_2	6222011	Phyllis Inghram	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
2sbernardino_20110624_1_after5pm	6252011	Janet Greenfield	no				yes	Do not split Redlands; Accept the district as redrawn by Inland Action and Inland Empire Economic Development
2sbernardino_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Virgina Paleno	no			San Bernadino	yes	Include Crestline with other mountain communities from Big Bear to Wrightwood and towns in between, and immediately surrounding mountain areas
2sbernardino_20110624_3_after5pm	6252011	Hank Fung	no				yes	Do not split San Bernadino, Riverside and LA, San Diego counties and put them in three BOE districts; Expand LA dist into Santa Barbara, remove Pomona Valley (Pomona, Ontario, Montclair) from ORSD BOE

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110621_2	Sacramento, Placer	Fair Oaks		no	yes	Similar issues	
9siskiyou_20110621_3	Siskiyou	Etna		no	yes	Public facilities, social interests, educational facilites	water and agricultural use
9siskiyou_20110622_2	Siskiyou	Fort Jones		no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110622_2	Siskiyou			no	yes		water and agricultural, logging, mining
2sbernardino_20110624_1_after5pm		Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_2_after5pm				no	yes	Mountain communitites share roadways, highways, recreation facilities, snow plows, problems of isolation, and share common interests; if grouped with larger communities outside mountain area, the will not be represented effectively	
2sbernardino_20110624_3_after5pm	San Bernadino, Riverside, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Barbara	Pomona, Ontario, Montclair		no	no		Imperial County, Blythe, Coachella Valley share farming and tax issues with other farming areas in the Eastern district

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110621_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110621_3			no				
9siskiyou_20110622_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110622_2			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_1_after5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_3_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110624_3_after5pm	6252011	Hank Fung, cont.	no				yes	...Do not put LA county or San Bernadino south of the mountains in eastern dist, but do include foothill areas Glendora, Claremont. Do not put GlendoraClaremont wSacramento; East dist could include Imperial county, Blythe, Coachella Valley.
2sbernardino_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Ann Olander	no		Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernadino	yes	Put federal land in San Gabriel Mtns with Rancho Cucamonga and Ontario dist; do not put part of these mtns with Inyo and Mono counties; use LA county line as west boundary, national forest line as north boundary, and I15 as west boundary
2sbernardino_20110624_5_after5pm	6242011	Susan Holden	no		Redlands	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split Redlands into 2 districts; do not put part of Redlands with mountain and high desert areas that are hundreds of miles away
2sbernardino_20110624_6_after5pm	6252011	Kathryn L. Bray	no		Highland	San Bernadino	yes	Keep Redlands, Highland, and mountaintop from Crestline to Snow Valley in one district; do not put Highland in Joe Bacas dist; keep in Jerry Lewiss district; do not put Highland with San Bernadino city
2sbernardino_20110624_7_after5pm	6242011	Kathy Reid	no		Redlands	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split Redlands among two districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110624_3_after5pm	Los Angeles, San Bernadino, Sacramento, Imperial	Glendora, Sacramento, Blythe		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110624_4_after5pm	Inyo, Mono, Los Angeles	Rancho Cucamonga, Ontario	I15	no	yes	Rancho Cucamonga has proximity connection to the mountains, and interest in preserving them	
2sbernardino_20110624_5_after5pm		Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_6_after5pm	San Bernadino	San Bernadino, Redlands, Highland		no	yes	Mountaintop communities are a COI	
2sbernardino_20110624_7_after5pm	San Bernadino	Redlands		no	yes	Redlands is an active, cohesive community, and is a COI	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110624_3_after5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_4_after5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_5_after5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_6_after5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_7_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110624_1_after5pm		Tony Lima	no		Artesia	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Cerritos and Artesia with Orange County; Put them with Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, and Bell Gardens in LA county (the Gateway Cities); supports Chinese American Citizens Alliance maps
4langeles_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Peter Rothenberg	yes	Westhills Homeowners Association, President		Los Angeles	yes	(SEE MAPS) Put entire Santa Monica Mtns Natl Rec (SMMNRA)Las Virgenes into WLADT Dist; do not put West Hills wSanta Clarita; Put Santa Clarita wnorth LA cnty, LancasterPalmdaleeastern Ventura; nest ADs into SD, wSanta Monica mtns and Bay.
4langeles_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	Juan Carlos Garcia	no		Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	Put Chino, Montclair, Pomona, Ontario, Fontana in same dist; do not include Covina, San Dimas, La Verne, Rancho Cucamonga, Chino Hills, Diamond Bar, Walnut, and Industry; use MALDEF SD maps for Pomonawest Inland Valley for Latino CVAP of 50 or greater

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110624_1_after5pm	Orange, Los Angeles	Cerritos, Artesia, Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, and Bell Gardens		no	yes	Cerritos and Artesia share transportation, housing and air quality issues with Gateway Cities in LA county, and got to neighboring LA cities for shopping and entertainment, they do not go to Orange county; they are in a COI with Gateway cities	
4langeles_20110624_2_after5pm	Los Angeles, Ventura	Santa Clarita, Lancaster, Palmdale		no	yes	SMMNRA is a COI, stretching from west to east; transportation corridors run eastwest; area has own water district; historical, cultural, socio-economic, environmental interests, and school district	
4langeles_20110624_3_after5pm		Chino, Montclair, Pomona, Ontario, Fontana, Covina, San Dimas, La Verne, Rancho Cucamonga, Chino Hills, Diamond Bar, Walnut, Industry		no	yes	These cities are a Latino ethnic COI; Latino net gain in Assembly level representation is needed because of increased proportion of Latino population	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110624_1_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_3_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Carolyn Ebert	yes	International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), member	Carson	Los Angeles	yes	Focus on residential populations, not port employee or port interests when drawing LA county district lines
4langeles_20110624_5_after5pm	6252011	Margaret Reavey	no				yes	Do not split San Pedro; do not put part of San Pedro with Palos Verdes
4langeles_20110624_6_after5pm	6242011	Greg Asher	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split San Pedro; keep it in the same SDADCD; move boundary east of the draft line, possibly to Figueroa Boulevard
4langeles_20110624_7_7_after5pm	6252011	Barbara Walker	no		Santa Clarity	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita; keep Newhall with Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110624_7_after5pm		Margaret Reavey, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110624_8_after5pm		Carolyn Ebert, duplicate	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110624_4_after5pm	Los Angeles			no	yes	Alignments of the ports in Los Angeles county is not as important as VRA compliance, balancing community interests; these goals are more important than aligning ports with not residents	
4langeles_20110624_5_after5pm		Los Angeles, Palos Verdes		no	yes	All of San Pedro is a COI; shares nothing in common with Palos Verdes which is a COI of its own small cities	
4langeles_20110624_6_after5pm		Los Angeles	Figueroa Boulevard	no	yes	San Pedro is a COI, strong sense of identity and history	
4langeles_20110624_7_7_after5pm		Santa Clarita		no	yes	Saugus, Valencia, Canyon Country, AND Newhall intentionally incorporated together as the city of Santa Clarita; share local gov, activities, businesss, shopping, and churches; geographically tied together by mountain range	
4langeles_20110624_7_after5pm				no	no		
4langeles_20110624_8_after5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110624_4_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_5_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_6_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_7_7_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_7_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_8_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110624_9_after5pm	6252011	Nancy Crater	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not eliminate West side of Los Angeles district
4langeles_20110624_10_after5pm	6252011	Roger Colwell	no				yes	Keep Newhall in same CD as City of Santa Clarita; do not split Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110624_11_after5pm	6252011	John and Sharon Masters	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Newhall with Santa Clarita CD; do not put Newhall with San Fernando Valley region
4langeles_20110624_12_after5pm		John and Sharon Masters, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110624_13_after5pm	6252011	Florence Nelson	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide South Pasadena into two districts; it should be with Pasadena and Western San Gabriel Valley; Arroyo Seco river divides South Pasadena from downtown LA and East Los Angeles;
5sbarbara_20110624_1_after5pm_Redacted	6252011	Maria Ruiz	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_2_after5pm_Redacted	6242011	Rosie Chandler	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Proposed AD and SD lines for Lompoc are the opposite of COI guidelines; do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_3_after5pm_Redacted	6242011	Erny Pinckert	no				yes	Do not split Lompoc Valley
5slo_20110624_after5pm	6242011	Thomas Geaslen	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo county as one voting unit

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110624_9_after5pm		Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_10_after5pm		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_11_after5pm		Santa Clarita		no	yes	Newhall is part of the Santa Clarita community; it is geographically separated from the San Fernando Valley	
4langeles_20110624_12_after5pm				no	no		
4langeles_20110624_13_after5pm		South Pasadena, Los Angeles, Pasadena	Arroyo Seco river	no	yes	South Pasadena shares interests, history and culture with Pasadena	
5sbarbara_20110624_1_after5pm_Redacted		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_2_after5pm_Redacted		Lompoc		no	yes	Crossing district lines would create increased election costs, need for additional ballot types, Lompoc cannot afford that	
5sbarbara_20110624_3_after5pm_Redacted		Lompoc		no	no		
5slo_20110624_after5pm	San Luis Obispo			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110624_9_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_10_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_11_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_12_after5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_13_after5pm			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_1_after5pm_Redacted			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_2_after5pm_Redacted			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_3_after5pm_Redacted			no				
5slo_20110624_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Ariana Milman	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Use 1st draft EASTVENT CD; use 1st draft SBVENT SD; Change AD map that would affect EVENT, SBWVT, SLOSB, LAVSF, SASCV, to keep Oxnard whole and wPort Hueneme, El Rio, Nyland Acres, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo; keep Thousand Oaks whole
5ventura_20110624_2_after5pm	6252011	Harry R. Copeland	no				yes	Do not include Ventura county wdistant parts of LA cnty, like Santa Catalina Island
7sclara_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Bea Mendez	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	(SEE MAPS) no verbal comment with maps
7sclara_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	Susan Valenta	yes	Gilroy Chamber of Commerce, PresidentC.E.O.	Gilroy	Santa Clara	yes	Do not use proposed Gilroy AD map; map splits Santa Clara county 4 times in SD and AD plan, from San Mateo, Contra Costa, and Monterey; Put Gilory with Santa Clara county neighbors, not with coast or central valley
7sclara_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Frank De Smidt	no		Milpitas	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara County togeter in one ADSDCD; do not put South Bay areas with Alameda county, Fremont, and Newark
7sclara_20110624_after5pm	6242011	Bea Mendez	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	(SEE MAPS) second set of maps; no verbal comments

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110624_1_after5pm	Ventura	Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo		no	no		
5ventura_20110624_2_after5pm	Ventura, Los Angeles			no	no		
7sclara_20110624_2_after5pm				no	no		
7sclara_20110624_3_after5pm	Santa Clara, San Mateo, Contra Costa, Monterey	Gilroy		no	yes	Gilory shares history, college system, water, road funding, health care programs, touris, and economic development with Santa Clara county	
7sclara_20110624_4_after5pm	Santa Clara, Alameda	Milpitas, San Jose, Fremont, Newark		no	no		
7sclara_20110624_after5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110624_1_after5pm			no				
5ventura_20110624_2_after5pm			no			Proposal gerrymanders Ventura cnty, disenfranchises Republican voters; head of Commission is a political opponent of the incumbent and campaigned against him in recent elections, should have recused himself re Ventura county	
7sclara_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
7sclara_20110624_3_after5pm			no				
7sclara_20110624_4_after5pm			no				
7sclara_20110624_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Harold Baran	no			Los Angeles	yes	
20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Sherry Glendenning	no			Siskiyou	yes	Opposes proposal for Scott Valley
20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	Colman deKay	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Use Chinese American Citizens Alliance maps from 617 hearing in Whittier
8sfrancisco_20110624_after5pm	6252011	M. Huiseman	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Lives in Potrero Hill, do not take out LGBTI candidates.
8smateo_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Rose Jacobs Gibson, Member	yes	San Mateo County Board of Supervisors	East Palo Alto	San Mateo	yes	San Mateo, Santa Clara county seat should have odd number, so San Carlos, Redwood City, Melo Park and East Palo Alto will have representation. Menlo Park should not be divided.
8smateo_20110624_2_after5pm	6252011	John Feldis	no				yes	Group Menlo Park with its neighbors. Lies between Atherton and Palo Alto.
9dnorte_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	James Cipolla	no			Del Norte	yes	Thank you for action with respect to Del Norte County
9dnorte_20110624_2_after5pm	6252011	Ken and Dianna Opiat	no			Del Norte	yes	Thank you for recognition of Del Norte County, important it be icluded with other coastal counties, like Humboldt

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110624_1_after5pm				no	no		
20110624_2_after5pm				no	no		
20110624_3_after5pm				no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110624_after5pm	San Francisco	San Francisco		no	yes	LGBTI communities and candidates	
8smateo_20110624_1_after5pm	San Mateo, Santa Clara	San Carlos, Redwood City, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto		no	yes	East Palo alto is more than 90 percent Latino.	
8smateo_20110624_2_after5pm		Menlo Park, Atherton, Palo Alto		no	no		
9dnorte_20110624_1_after5pm	Del Norte			no	no		
9dnorte_20110624_2_after5pm	Humboldt, Del Norte			no	yes	coastal, geography, rivers, fisheries, harbors, parks, tourism, Hwy, caltrans, culture, native american territories,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110624_1_after5pm			no				Protection of minorities was never mentioned in the ballot measure which created the CRC; your task is to eliminate gerrymandering and make districts more rational
20110624_2_after5pm			no				
20110624_3_after5pm		Should be 5 districts with majority Latino voters, not 3; this violates Section 2 of the federal VRA	no				
8sfrancisco_20110624_after5pm			no				Please do not censor me, we should have more LGBT candidates
8smateo_20110624_1_after5pm			no				Appreciates difficulties
8smateo_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110624_1_after5pm			no				Thank you for much needed action
9dnorte_20110624_2_after5pm	shared Commission district		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Annete Deglow, Presiden	yes	College Glen Neighborhood Association	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Sacramento should have own district. Has little in common with Rocklin and Loomis. Should not be split.
9sacramento_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Terrence Johnson, Executive Director	yes	The Stockton Boulevard Partnership	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Stockton Boulevard from Alhambra Blvd to 65th St Expwy should not be split. All should be connected to city of Sacramento
9siskiyou_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Glen Briggs	no			Siskiyou	yes	Objects changing boundaries to coastal district of Arcata, Eureka, Humboldt, Del Norte
9siskiyou_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Robert McClellan	no			Siskiyou	yes	Scott Valley and Happy Camp not part of coast, but mountains of Siskiyou.
9siskiyou_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	Doug Kaufner, Retired Battalion Chief	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Western Siskiyou County should be kept with Siskiyou County
9siskiyou_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	John Foster	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Scott Valley should be with Siskiyou, not Humboldt.
9siskiyou_20110624_5_after5pm	6242011	Nita Still	no				no	
9siskiyou_20110624_6_after5pm	6242011	Nita Still	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Siskiyou county must remain intact.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110624_1_after5pm	Sacramento	Sacramento, Rocklin, Loomis		no	no		
9sacramento_20110624_2_after5pm	Sacramento	Sacramento	Stockton Blvd, Alhambra Blvd, 65th st expwy	no	yes	neighborhoods, historic connection, schools	businesses
9siskiyou_20110624_1_after5pm	Siskiyou, Humboldt, Del Norte	Arcata, Eureka, Yreka		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_2_after5pm	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Happy Camp	mountains	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_3_after5pm	Siskiyou			no	yes	Siskiyou united by history, geography	Commerce
9siskiyou_20110624_4_after5pm	Siskiyou	Scott Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_5_after5pm				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_6_after5pm	Siskiyou	Yreka, Eureka	Salmon river, Klamath	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110624_1_after5pm			no			Sacramento has little in common with large rural areas	Thank you
9sacramento_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
9siskiyou_20110624_1_after5pm			no			5 hour drive from Arcata, Eureka. News, politics, activities and events originate within inland Siskiyou	
9siskiyou_20110624_2_after5pm			no			Not part of coast	
9siskiyou_20110624_3_after5pm			no				
9siskiyou_20110624_4_after5pm			no			seems to be a divide and conquer plan	
9siskiyou_20110624_5_after5pm			no				Population count of Native Americans is Siskiyou County is 1737 not 17037
9siskiyou_20110624_6_after5pm	do not split county		no			Great expense to split off part of county so indigenous people can fish at the coast, Legally the Klamath river can be their only source of fishing	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110624_7_after5pm	6242011	Robert J. Bigham	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to redistricting Fort Jones, Etna and Callahan into north coast district
9sjoaquin_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Jackie Bush	no			San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in Bay area, would change ability to vote in sacramento
9sjoaquin_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Kim Parigoris	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in Bay area, stay in San Joaquin.
9sjoaquin_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	Linda Jimenez	no		Tracy	San Joaquin	yes	Valley and Sierra should be separate. Tracy should be with Stockton, not bay area. Lathrop should be included in our district area. Remove Lockeford.
9sjoaquin_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Beverly Senior	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi, San Joaquin should not be in district with North Bay, but in a valley district
9sjoaquin_20110624_5_after5pm	6242011	Mark Vincent	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Against Moving Lodi to North Bay.
9sjoaquin_20110624_6_after5pm	6242011	Pam Aberle	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not redistrict lodi to East Bay district
9sjoaquin_20110624_7_after5pm	6242011	Deb	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not redistrict Lodi To Bay area
9sjoaquin_20110624_8_after5pm	6242011		no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Leave Lodi in San Joaquin County
9sjoaquin_20110624_9_after5pm	6242011	Philip J. Marcus	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be taken out of San Joaquin and grouped with Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and Woodland.
9sjoaquin_20110624_10_after5pm	6242011	Tom and Kim Driscoll	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and Woodland
9sjoaquin_20110624_11_after5pm	6242011	Robert Bush	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi out of San Joaquin.
9yolo_20110624_after5pm	6242011	Pamela F. Helm	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not redistrict Yolo county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110624_7_after5pm	Siskiyou	Fort Jones, Etna, Callahan		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_1_after5pm		Lodi, Sacramento		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_2_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	San Joaquin interests, shopping, work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_3_after5pm	San Joaquin	Tracy, Stockton, Lathrop, Lockeford	I 5, hwy 99,	no	yes	housing growth, hwys,	agriculture
9sjoaquin_20110624_4_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_5_after5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_6_after5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_7_after5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_8_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_9_after5pm	San Joaquin	Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, Woodland		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_10_after5pm	San Joaquin	Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and Woodland, Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_11_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9yolo_20110624_after5pm	Yolo			no	yes		economy

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110624_7_after5pm			no			No mutual relationship	impossible for local citizens to attend meetings
9sjoaquin_20110624_1_after5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_2_after5pm			no			No shared politics with Bay Area	
9sjoaquin_20110624_3_after5pm	geography		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_4_after5pm	farming		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_5_after5pm			no			would not represent us	
9sjoaquin_20110624_6_after5pm			no			interests are much different	
9sjoaquin_20110624_7_after5pm			no			would lose state political voice	
9sjoaquin_20110624_8_after5pm			no				What a shame
9sjoaquin_20110624_9_after5pm			no			Population difference, vote different, do not connect, representatives	No taxation without representation.
9sjoaquin_20110624_10_after5pm			no			nothing in common, distant	
9sjoaquin_20110624_11_after5pm			no				Thank you and have a nice day.
9yolo_20110624_after5pm	multi jurisdictional collaborations		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Joel McManus	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks and simi Valley should be connected to Santa Clarita instead of Malibu.
CSCFR_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Jean Desilets	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks and simi Valley should be connected to Santa Clarita instead of Malibu.
saigon_20110624_1_after5pm		Hien Dang	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon area together with Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley
saigon_20110624_2_after5pm		To Nga T Pham	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon area together with Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley
smmtns_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Frances Alet	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountain communities together, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.
smmtns_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Michael Karagosian	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountain communities together, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.
smmtns_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011		no				yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountain communities together, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110624_1_after5pm	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks and simi Valley , Santa Clarita, Malibu.		no	yes	keep inland valleys together, and better represented	
CSCFR_20110624_2_after5pm	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks and simi Valley , Santa Clarita, Malibu.		no	yes	keep inland valleys together, and better represented	
saigon_20110624_1_after5pm	Orange	Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	no		
saigon_20110624_2_after5pm	Orange	Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	no		
smmtns_20110624_1_after5pm	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.	Mountains	no	yes	collaboration, services, COG, Sherrifs station, fire stations, water district, school district, interest in preserving ecology and beauty	
smmtns_20110624_2_after5pm	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.	Mountains	no	yes	collaboration, services, COG, Sherrifs station, fire stations, water district, school district, interest in preserving ecology and beauty	
smmtns_20110624_3_after5pm	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.	Mountains	no	yes	collaboration, services, COG, Sherrifs station, fire stations, water district, school district, interest in preserving ecology and beauty	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110624_1_after5pm			no				Supports Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110624_2_after5pm			no				Supports Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
saigon_20110624_1_after5pm			no				
saigon_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
smmtns_20110624_1_after5pm			no				support maps by Las Vigenes Homeowners Federation
smmtns_20110624_2_after5pm			no				support maps by Las Vigenes Homeowners Federation
smmtns_20110624_3_after5pm			no				support maps by Las Vigenes Homeowners Federation

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
smmtns_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Jody Hahn	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountain communities together, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.
8alameda_20110624_1_after5pm	6252011	Himanshu Majmudar	no				yes	Keep Fremont with Tri Cities in Alameda county district
8alameda_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	John A. Polz	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Should not put Fremont in Santa Clara county.
8alameda_20110624_3_after5pm	6252011	Jaya Mirchandani	no			Alameda	yes	Should not split Fremont between two districts, it should be kept with Tri Cities and Southern Alameda county
8alameda_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Steven Richards	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Fremont should not be parceled out to San Jose district.
8ccosta_20110624_1_after5pm	6252011	Michael Parker	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Opposes division of Richmond.
8ccosta_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Susan Hirsch	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Brentwood should be in one district. Should not be split along San Vicente Ave.
8ccosta_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	Nancy Webb, CS CNIT Instructor	yes	City College of San Francisco	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Richmond should be in one district, more closely aligned with West Contra Costa County and Hercules, San Pablo
8napa_20110624_1_after5pm	6252011	Marjorie Burns	no			Napa	yes	Napa county should be in district with Sonoma county. Makes no sense with Yolo, which is more similar to Sacramento and Solano
8napa_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Jatinder Singh	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	American Canyon should stay in Napa county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
smmtns_20110624_4_after5pm	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu.	Mountains	no	yes	collaboration, services, COG, Sherrifs station, fire stations, water district, school district, interest in preserving ecology and beauty	
8alameda_20110624_1_after5pm	Alameda	Fremont, Tri Cities		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_2_after5pm	Santa Clara	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_3_after5pm	Alameda	Fremont, Tri Cities		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_4_after5pm	Alameda	Fremont, San Jose		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_1_after5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_2_after5pm	Contra Costa	Brentwood	San Vicente Ave	no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_3_after5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond, Hercules, San Pablo		no	yes	Richmond with West Conta Costa county, have same newspaper and interests	
8napa_20110624_1_after5pm	Napa, Sonoma, Yolo, Sacramento, Solano			no	yes	Napa and Sonoma renowned wine regions	vital to California economy
8napa_20110624_2_after5pm	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
smmtns_20110624_4_after5pm			no				support maps by Las Vigenes Homeowners Federation
8alameda_20110624_1_after5pm			no				Thank you
8alameda_20110624_2_after5pm			no			Fremont and Santa Clara have divergent viewpoints	I would be happy to volunteer my services
8alameda_20110624_3_after5pm			no			Unfair to progressive population	
8alameda_20110624_4_after5pm			no			Have own issues. Fremont is a large city.	
8ccosta_20110624_1_after5pm	Richmond should be unified because they are dealing with immense urban problems.		no				
8ccosta_20110624_2_after5pm	Brentwood functions as unit, VA, merchants.		no				Thank You
8ccosta_20110624_3_after5pm			no				Please Head Tom Butts analysis
8napa_20110624_1_after5pm			no				
8napa_20110624_2_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110622_2	6222011	Michelle Romero	yes	The Greenlining Institute	Berkeley	Alameda	yes	Number of letters urging commission to not divide San Bernardino county and Riverside.
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Jeanette Hayes	yes	Time For Change Foundation		San Bernardino	yes	San Bernardino should not be divided
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Concerned Citizen	no			San Bernardino	yes	All San Bernarndino should have one representative
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Sherry Ervin	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not split San Bernardino, the lines are not fair
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Annie M. Johnson	no		Fontana	San Bernardino	yes	Keep San Bernardino solely. Keep Fontana separate from Realto
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Juanita Burnett	yes	Time For Change Foundation	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide San Bernardino. Do not separate Redlands
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Dana Robertson	yes	Time For Change Foundation	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	yes	Do not Divide San Bernardino.
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Celia Jasso	yes	Time For A Change		San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide San Bernardino and keep Redlands
2riverside_20110622_2	6172011	Stacy Duncanson	yes	Time For Change Foundation		San Bernardino	yes	Redlands should be included with San Bernardino
2riverside_20110622_3	6222011		no				no	
2riverside_20110622_4	6222011		no				no	
2riverside_20110622_5	6222011	Dr. Bill	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Thanks for adding Desert Hot Springs to Riverside
2riverside_20110622_6	6222011	Bette Meyers, President CEO	yes	Valley Creditors Service	Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Thank you for lines drawn in Riverside
2riverside_20110622_7	6222011	Carolyn Daniels	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Keep the entire Valley in one District, confusing to be represented by San Diego
2riverside_20110622_8	6222011	Peter R. McWilliams	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not include Indio with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardino	Riverside		no	yes		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardino			no	no		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardino			no	no		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardino			no	no		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardinon	Fontana, Realto		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardino			no	no		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardinon	Redlands		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_2	San Bernardino	Redlands, San Bernardino		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_3				no	no		
2riverside_20110622_4				no	no		
2riverside_20110622_5	Riverside	Desert Hot Springs		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_6	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110622_7		San Diego		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_8	Imperial	Indio		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_2			no				
2riverside_20110622_3			no				Comments will be posted as soon as practicable
2riverside_20110622_4			no				Comments will be posted as soon as practicable
2riverside_20110622_5			no				
2riverside_20110622_6			no				Went to school here in the desert.
2riverside_20110622_7			no				
2riverside_20110622_8			no			No reason to break and lump with rural Imprerial	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110622_9	6222011	Terrence W. Halloran	no		Banning	Riverside	yes	Banning and Beaumont should be in same district with Coachella Valley and San Jacinto. Should not be with San Bernardino
2riverside_20110622_10	6222011	Sheryl Hamlin	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley together, Palm Springs
2riverside_20110622_11	6222011	John W. Kopp	no		Eastvale	Riverside	yes	Do not nest 80 assembly districts into 40 state senatorial districts, keep geographical contiguity.
2riverside_20110622_12	6222011	Charlene Withers	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Keep Desert Cities intact. Do not district Indio, Coachella, Mecca with Imperial County
2riverside_20110622_13	6222011	Anne Taylor	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Desert Hot Springs should be with Coachella Valley.
2riverside_20110622_14	6222011		no				no	
2sbernardino_20110622_1	6222011	Bruce Satzger	no			San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110622_2	6222011	Jeremy Milliorn	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110622_3	6222011	Cynthia Taylor	no			San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110622_4	6222011	Rachel Reed	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110622_5	6222011	Allen Edgar	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110622_6	6222011	Hong	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110622_9	San Bernardino	Banning, Beaumont		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_10		Coachella Valley, Palm Springs, Salton Sea		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_11				no	yes		
2riverside_20110622_12	Imperial	Indio, Coachella, Mecca		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_13		Desert Hot Springs		no	no		
2riverside_20110622_14				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_1				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_2				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_3				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_4				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_5				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_6				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110622_9			no				
2riverside_20110622_10	Yacht Club, low crime, tourism		no				
2riverside_20110622_11			no				
2riverside_20110622_12			no				
2riverside_20110622_13			no				
2riverside_20110622_14			no				thank you for taking the time to share your views
2sbernardino_20110622_1			no				Please support inland action maps
2sbernardino_20110622_2			no				Support Inland Actions proposed maps for San Bernardino, Riverside counties
2sbernardino_20110622_3			no				Support Inland Actions proposed maps for San Bernardino, Riverside counties
2sbernardino_20110622_4			no				Support Inland Actions proposed maps for San Bernardino, Riverside counties
2sbernardino_20110622_5			no				Support Inland Acton maps for San Bernardino
2sbernardino_20110622_6			no				Support Inland Acton maps for San Bernardino

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110622_7	6222011	John F. Prentice	no				yes	Fair representation for Redland, Fontana, Upland, Chino Hills, Rancho Cucamonga
2sbernardino_20110622_8	6222011	Thomas Brickley	no		Inland Empire	San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110622_9	6222011	Steve von Rajes, President CEO	yes	California Housing Foundation	Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	San Bernardino, Riverside.
2sbernardino_20110622_10	6222011	John Hoffman, President	yes	Jack Hoffman, Associates, Inc		San Bernardino	yes	Keep mountain communities in the same district
2sbernardino_20110622_11	6222011	Mark Bulot	no			San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110622_12	6222011	Matthew Martin	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110622_13	6222011	Jack Dangermon	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110622_14	6222011	Steve von Rajcs	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110622_15	6222011	Treva Webster	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands. Is not community with Mono Lake or Bishop
2sbernardino_20110622_16	6222011	Robert W. Heinze	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Supports Inland Action map especially as it relates to Redlands
2sbernardino_20110622_17	6222011	Greg Rodriguez	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Include Imperial County with Coachella Valley.
2sbernardino_20110622_18	6222011	Ken Terry	no		Yucaipa	San Bernardino	yes	Keep district the same
3orange_20110622_1	6222011	Julie Simer	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana Point intact and within Orange County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110622_7		Rancho Cucamonga, Chino Hills, Upland, Fontana, Redland		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_8				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_9	San Bernardino, Riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_10	San Bernardino			no	yes	Special needs and conditions	
2sbernardino_20110622_11				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_12	San Bernardino, Riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_13				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_14				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_15		Redlands, Mono Lake, Bishop		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_16	San Bernardino, Riverside			no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110622_17	Imperial, San Bernardino	Coachella Valley		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110622_18				no	no		
3orange_20110622_1	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110622_7			no				Supports Inland Action maps
2sbernardino_20110622_8			no				Supports Inland Action
2sbernardino_20110622_9			no				Support Inland Actions maps
2sbernardino_20110622_10			no				
2sbernardino_20110622_11			no			Recent draft is no better than the gerrymandered divisions prepared by the legislature	
2sbernardino_20110622_12			no				Support Inland Actions maps
2sbernardino_20110622_13			no				Support Inland Action maps for SB, riverside
2sbernardino_20110622_14			no				Support Inland Action maps
2sbernardino_20110622_15			no				
2sbernardino_20110622_16	common interests		no				
2sbernardino_20110622_17			no				
2sbernardino_20110622_18			no				
3orange_20110622_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110622_2	6222011	Anita Meister-Boyd	no			Orange	yes	Fix inconsistencies with congress, assembly and senate districts for La Habra, Los Alamitos, La Palma, Artesia, Cerritos, Yorba Linda, Diamond Bar, San Juan Capistrano
3orange_20110622_3	6222011	Dolores Frisby	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Do not put Los Alamitos into Long Beach, belongs in Orange County next to Cypress and Garden Grove
3orange_20110622_4	6222011	Barbara Bennett	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Los Alamitos and Rossmoor need to be represented in Orange County.
3orange_20110622_5	6222011	Joe Carchio, Mayor	yes	City of Huntington Beach	Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Keep Huntington Beach with Orange, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Westminster
4langeles_20110622_1	6222011	Robbert Moskowitz	no		Santa Monica	Orange	yes	Two Santa Monica assembly districts should be nested within and denote the boundaries for Santa Monica Montains Bay West Side district
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Jill Lederer, President CEO, Jan Smith, Director of Governmental Affairs	yes	Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce			yes	Thousand Oaks should remain part of Ventura County, not LA county.Santa Clarita has no Common Ground. Also city should not be split up
4langeles_20110622_3	6222011	Charell W. Charlie	no		Pico Rivera	Los Angeles	yes	Pico Rivera should be in same district as Whittier, Downey, Montebello, La Mirada, Norwalk, and Santa Fe Springs
4langeles_20110622_4	6222011	Roy Emberland	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Thousand Oaks should be unified. Remove Santa Clarita from map. Place Santa Clarita Valley with Antelope Valley. Replace Santa Clarita Valley with Santa Monica Bay area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110622_2	Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego	La Habra, Los Alamitos, La Palma, Artesia, Cerritos, Yorba Linda, Diamond Bar, San Juan Capistrano	LA River	no	no		
3orange_20110622_3	Orange	Los Alamitos, Long Beach, Cypress, Garden Grove		no	no		
3orange_20110622_4	Orange	Los Alamitos		no	yes	court and probation services	
3orange_20110622_5	Orange	Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Westminster, Huntington Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_1	Los Angeles	Santa Monica	Mountains	no	yes	cultural interest and educational endeavors	socio-economic matters,
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles, Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita	West of Lynn Road and north of Avenida de los Arboles	no	yes	social	economic
4langeles_20110622_3	Los Angeles	Whittier, Downey, Montebello, La Mirada, Norwalk, and Santa Fe Springs		no	yes	Latino community	
4langeles_20110622_4	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica, Antelope Valley	Pacific Coast Highways, Freeways 101 and 405	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110622_2			no				
3orange_20110622_3			no				sinc 1948
3orange_20110622_4			no				
3orange_20110622_5	water district, police, fire, public works, information services, events		no				
4langeles_20110622_1	mutual relations, environmental, transportation contiguous, municipal lines,		no				
4langeles_20110622_2	service providers, programs, police, fire		no				
4langeles_20110622_3			no				
4langeles_20110622_4	geographical integrity		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_5	6222011	Peter Anton	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Monica assembly districts within district denoted as Santa Monica Mountains, Bay-West Side
4langeles_20110622_5	6222011	Frank Harper	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Monica assembly districts within district denoted as Santa Monica Mountains, Bay-West Side
4langeles_20110622_5	6222011	Ronald M. Sharrin	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Monica assembly districts within district denoted as Santa Monica Mountains, Bay-West Side
4langeles_20110622_5	6222011	Catherine Robin Rudnikoff	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Monica assembly districts within district denoted as Santa Monica Mountains, Bay-West Side
4langeles_20110622_5	6222011	R.C. Brody	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Monica assembly districts within district denoted as Santa Monica Mountains, Bay-West Side
4langeles_20110622_7	6222011	Mary Ann Lutz, Mayor	yes	City of Monrovia	Monrovia	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Monrovia whole. Reduce size of district. Keep Monrovia with Pasadena
4langeles_20110622_8	6222011	Brad Folb, President	no		Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hollywood whole and in one district
4langeles_20110622_9	6222011	Sand Canyon Community Homeowners Association	yes	Sand Canyon Community Homeowners Association	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110622_10	6222011	Frieda Wang	no				yes	Would like Harbor City, Lennox, and West Carson stay with Beach Cities
4langeles_20110622_11	6222011	Brian Saunders	no				yes	Do not split Santa clarita, add Newhall to Antelope valley, Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110622_12	6222011	Mary D Hall	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita as one district. Do not take away Newhall, Canyon Country, Placerita Canyon
4langeles_20110622_13	6222011	Linda and David Tennies	no		Chino Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Chino and Chino Hills should be united.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_5	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_5	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_5	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_5	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_5	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_7	Los Angeles	Monrovia, Pasadena		no	yes	shared minority communities	
4langeles_20110622_8	Los Angeles	Hollywood		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_9	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	boundary should be mountaintop, not Placerita Canyon Road	no	yes	school district	
4langeles_20110622_10		Harbor City, Lennox, West Carson, Beach cities		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_11		Santa Clarita, Newhall, Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_12		Santa Clarita, Newhall, Canyon Country, Placerita Canyon		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_13	Los Angeles	Chino, Chino Hills		no	yes	school district, fire district, water district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_5			no				
4langeles_20110622_5			no				
4langeles_20110622_5			no				
4langeles_20110622_5			no				
4langeles_20110622_5			no				
4langeles_20110622_7	emergency services, transportation		no				thank you for time and consideration
4langeles_20110622_8			no				
4langeles_20110622_9			no				
4langeles_20110622_10			no				
4langeles_20110622_11			no				
4langeles_20110622_12			no				
4langeles_20110622_13	participate events together		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_14	6222011	Brian Folb	no		Toluca Lake	Los Angeles	yes	thank you for keeping Toluca Intact, with Hollywood in SD 22
4langeles_20110622_15	6222011	Richard Kern	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lawndale and Hawthorne in same district Southbay 36 Cd. Eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110622_16	6222011	Joe Klocko	no				yes	Include entire Santa Clarita Valley in one district.
4langeles_20110622_17	6222011	Ellen C. Garrett	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not include Topanga with Santa Clarita. Topanga has always identified with Santa Monica, West Los Angeles
4langeles_20110622_18	6222011	Paul Glicker	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not include Topanga with Santa Clarita. Topanga has always identified with Santa Monica, West Los Angeles
4langeles_20110622_19	6222011	Elaine Hanson	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Topanga from West side Santa Monica and join with Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110622_20	6222011	Sue M. Forbes	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not pair Topanga with Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110622_21	6222011	Judy Allegra	no				yes	Do not split Santa clarita, add Newhall to Antelope valley, Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110622_22	6222011	Sue Schmitt	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Monica assembly districts within district denoted as Santa Monica Mountains, Bay-West Side
4langeles_20110622_23	6222011	Veronica Nourafchan	no		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Include Lawndale and Hawthorne in 36th CD, Eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110622_24	6222011	Edward Hosken	no		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Palos Verdes should not be a part of Santa Monica and Venice
4langeles_20110622_25	6222011	Jean Coleman	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, Include Newhall into Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley
4langeles_20110622_26	6222011	Kathy Klocko	no				yes	Include entire Santa Clarita Valley within one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_14	Los Angeles	Toluca Lake, Hollywood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_15	Los Angeles	Lawndale, Hawthorne, Venice, Santa Monica		no	yes	Southbay, work, recreate	aerospace industries
4langeles_20110622_16	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_17	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica, Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_18	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita, Los Angeles		no	yes	environmental concerns	
4langeles_20110622_19	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_20	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_21		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_22		Santa Monica, Topanga		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_23	Los Angeles	Lawndale, Hawthorne, Santa Monica, Venice		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_24	Los Angeles	Palos Verdes, Santa Monica, Ventura		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_25	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_26		Santa Clarita		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_14			no				
4langeles_20110622_15			no				
4langeles_20110622_16			no				
4langeles_20110622_17			no			far apart in geography, concerns, population and community spirit	
4langeles_20110622_18			no			totally different social and political ecology	
4langeles_20110622_19			no			Good hour away	
4langeles_20110622_20			no			geographically and politically apart	
4langeles_20110622_21			no				
4langeles_20110622_22			no				
4langeles_20110622_23	aerospace, recreate, shop, work,		no			little in common with Venice	
4langeles_20110622_24			no				
4langeles_20110622_25			no				
4langeles_20110622_26			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_27	6222011	Julie Henry	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall and Sand Canyon and Placerita Canyon into Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110622_28	6222011	Claudia Hasenhuttl	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Do not connect Santa Monica with Santa Clarita. Unite it with neighboring westside COIs
4langeles_20110622_29	6222011	Victor S. LoCicero	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Include Lawndale and Hawthorne in 36th CD, Eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110622_30	6222011	Deborah Moorehead	no				yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, you should nest it with Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110622_31	6222011	Alyssa Alderman	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add newhall to Antelope valley
4langeles_20110622_32	6222011	Mildred Hubert	no				yes	Leave Santa Clarita Valley whole.
4langeles_20110622_33	6222011	Glen Dake	no		Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Put Hollywood, Silver Lake, and North Hollywood together.
4langeles_20110622_34	6222011	Alyssa Alderman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Nest Santa Clarita with Ventura county, not Malibu.
4langeles_20110622_35	6222011	Evelyn Taibi-Richards	no				yes	Keep all of Santa Clarita in same district.
4langeles_20110622_36	6222011	Reginald E. Fear	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110622_37	6222011	Deborah Moorehead	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall to antelope Valley
4langeles_20110622_38	6222011	John Stratton	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_27		Santa Clarita, Newhall, Sand Canyon, Placerita Canyon		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_28		Santa Clarita, Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_29		Lawndale, Hawthorne, Venice Santa monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_30	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_31		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_32		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_33	Los Angeles	Hollywood, Silver Lake, North Hollywood		no	yes		entertainment industry
4langeles_20110622_34	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_35		Santa clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_36		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_37		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_38				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_27			no				
4langeles_20110622_28	environment, land use, parks, emergency preparedness and response		no				
4langeles_20110622_29	aerospace, recreate, shop, work,		no				
4langeles_20110622_30	like communities		no				
4langeles_20110622_31			no				
4langeles_20110622_32			no				especially in the senate
4langeles_20110622_33			no				
4langeles_20110622_34	keep inland suburban valleys connected		no				
4langeles_20110622_35			no				
4langeles_20110622_36			no				
4langeles_20110622_37			no				
4langeles_20110622_38			no				Good Job, if the pols are upset you have done a good job

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_39	6222011	Patricia A. Starr	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lawndale and Hawthorne in same district Southbay 36 Cd. Eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110622_40	6222011	Edward Gladbach	no				yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County, not Malibu
4langeles_20110622_41	6222011	Christina Polino	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark in Ventura, not Los angeles.
4langeles_20110622_42	6222011	Edward G. Jerry Gladbach	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split santa Clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Santa Clarita Valley district
4langeles_20110622_43	6222011	Cindy Hazard	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110622_44	6222011	Laura Duffy	no		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lawndale and Hawthorne in same district Southbay 36 Cd. Eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110622_45	6222011	Roland Ilsen	no		Torrance Polos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay, Torrance, Palos Verdes contiguous.
4langeles_20110622_46	6222011	Fred Seeley	no				yes	Do not split santa clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110622_47	6222011	Charlene Voss	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
4langeles_20110622_48	6222011	Sahaja Douglass	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not attach Topanga to Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110622_49	6222011	Mike Waterhouse	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Opposes redistricting measure. Do not add spurious piece of the Valley
4langeles_20110622_50	6222011	Berta Gonzalez Harper (duplicate)	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Newhall and Agua Dulce are part of SCV and should be included in district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_39	Los Angeles	Lawndale, Hawthorne, Venice, Santa Monica		no	no	Southbay, work, recreate	aerospace industries
4langeles_20110622_40	Ventura, Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_41	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark	mountains	no	yes	quality of life	
4langeles_20110622_42		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_43		Santa clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_44	Los Angeles	Lawndale, Hawthorne, Venice, Santa Monica		no	yes	Southbay, work, recreate	aerospace industries
4langeles_20110622_45	Los Angeles	Torrance, Palos Verdes		no	yes	transportation	
4langeles_20110622_46		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_47		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_48		Topanga, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_49		Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_50	Los Angeles	Newhall, Agua Dulce, Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_39			no				
4langeles_20110622_40			no			keep inland valleys connected	
4langeles_20110622_41	roads, improvements, schools, representatives		no				
4langeles_20110622_42			no				
4langeles_20110622_43			no			separate from San Fernando Valley	Dont be the pin to pop our dreams for the future of our city.
4langeles_20110622_44			no				
4langeles_20110622_45	law enforcement, educational facilities,		no			not with Santa Monica,	
4langeles_20110622_46			no				
4langeles_20110622_47			no				
4langeles_20110622_48	politically active and concerned with environment, parks, issues		no				
4langeles_20110622_49			no				
4langeles_20110622_50	hospital, schools, college, trails, open space districs, sherrifs dept, community college		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_51	6222011	Abby Diamond	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Tujunga should be in same district as Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Crescenta, La Canada, Burbank, Glendale.
4langeles_20110622_52	6222011	Gail Adams	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, Duarte, San Marino, Arcadia, South Pasadena should be together.
4langeles_20110622_53	6222011	Landoll Adam	no			Los Angeles	yes	Tujunga and Sunland sould be in same area.
4langeles_20110622_54	6222011	Tomi Lyn Bowling	no				yes	Foothill Communities should share connection to San Gabriel Mountains
4langeles_20110622_55	6222011	Florence Hanan	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110622_56	6222011	Madeline M.	no			Rancho Palos Verdes	yes	Include Lawndale and Hawthorne in 36th CD, Eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110622_57	6222011	Carol Cohen	no				yes	Hollyglen and Del Aire neighborhoods of Hawthorne west of 405 should be included in districts including Palos Verdes and Beach Cities, El Segundo
4langeles_20110622_58	6222011	Connie Ratner	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Topanga in its current district with Pacific Palisades, Calabasas, and Malibu
4langeles_20110622_59	6222011	Aaron Kitzman	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not cut Thousand Oaks in half, do not place into LA county.
4langeles_20110622_60	6222011	John	no		El Monte	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate El Monte. Shares citizens with Baldwin Park, La Puente, Irwindale, Monrovia
4langeles_20110622_62	6222011		no				no	
4langeles_20110622_63	6222011	Ivonne Correa	no				yes	Keep South East Cities in one community

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_51	Los Angeles	Tujunga, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Crescenta, La Canada, Burbank and Glendale	I20	no	yes	traffic	
4langeles_20110622_52	Los angeles	Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, Duarte, San Marino, Arcadia, South Pasadena	san gabriel mountains	no	yes	shopping, entertainment	
4langeles_20110622_53		Tujunga, Sunland	Foothill Blvd	no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_54		Foothills	San Gabriel Mountains	no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_55		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_56	Los Angeles	Lawndale, Hawthorne		no	no	Southbay, work, recreate	
4langeles_20110622_57	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, El Segundo, Palos Verdes, Beach Cities	405 freeway	no	yes	demographically	
4langeles_20110622_58	Los Angeles	Topanga, Pacific Palisades, Calabasas, Malibbu	Highway 27	no	yes	shopping	businesses
4langeles_20110622_59	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_60		Baldwin Park, La Puente, Irwindale, Monrovia		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_62				no	no		
4langeles_20110622_63		South East Cities		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_51	equestrian properties, open space, work, shop		no				
4langeles_20110622_52	education, transportation, emergency services		no				
4langeles_20110622_53	organization, common concerns, mountains		no				
4langeles_20110622_54	contiguous connection		no				
4langeles_20110622_55			no				
4langeles_20110622_56	aerospace, recreate, shop, work,		no				
4langeles_20110622_57	school district, economically		no				
4langeles_20110622_58	schools, political associations		no				
4langeles_20110622_59			no				
4langeles_20110622_60			no			nothing in common with Rosemead, Temple City, Monterey Park	
4langeles_20110622_62			no				Thank you for sharing your views with Commission
4langeles_20110622_63			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_64	6222011	Larry Blugrind	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Chino Hills in San Bernardino, not Los Angeles
4langeles_20110622_65	6222011	Alvon Blair, III	no				yes	Put Chino and Chino Hills in same district
4langeles_20110622_66	6222011	Albert Abrams, President	yes	Board of Neighborhood Commissioners	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Reseda and Northridge should be kept whole in West Valley Congressional District. Unify Studio City and Sherman Oaks. Valley Glen, Van Nuys and North Hollywood should be Unified
4langeles_20110622_67	6222011	David McKinnon	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Include Lawndale and Hawthorne in 36th CD, Eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110622_68	6222011	Olivia J. Valentine	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be in 36th CD with Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, El Seguna
5ventura_20110622_1_2	6222011	M. Carmen Ramirez, Council Member	yes	City of Oxnard	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	Do not split Oxnard, include with Port Hueneme, Ventura, Santa Clara Valley, and keep Oxnard in Ventura County
5ventura_20110622_1_18	6222011	Sharon McCann	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Doing serious harm to Simi Valley and Moorpark by taking out of Ventura and putting with Los Angeles
5ventura_20110622_2_2	6222011	Justin Paroski	no		Santa Paula	Ventura	yes	Do not include Santa Paula, Fillmore and Piru in same district as Santa Barbara.
5ventura_20110622_2_18	6222011	Carynn McCann	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not redistrict Simi Valley and Moorpark out of Ventura and into Los Angeles

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_64	San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Chino Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_65	Orange, Los Angeles	Chino, Chino Hills		no	yes	Asian and Hispanic population	
4langeles_20110622_66	Los Angeles	Northridge, Reseda, Valley Glen, Van Nuys, North Hollywood Studio City, Sherman Oaks		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_67		Lawndale, Hawthorne, Venice Santa monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_68	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa, El Segundo	405, 110	no	yes		
5ventura_20110622_1_2	Ventura	Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Ventura, Santa Clara Valley		no	yes	Hispanic population	
5ventura_20110622_1_18	Ventura, LA	Simi Valley, Moorpark	mountains	no	yes		
5ventura_20110622_2_2		Santa Paula, Fillmore, Piru		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_2_18	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_64			no			Would favor democrats at the expense of republicans	
4langeles_20110622_65	recreation, shopping, state park, work, transportation	To include Chino Hills with Orange and LA county is not complying with FVRA	no				
4langeles_20110622_66		like-valley communities	no				
4langeles_20110622_67	aerospace, recreate, shop, work,		no				
4langeles_20110622_68	aerospace industry, FAA, hotels, arterials		no				
5ventura_20110622_1_2	Superfund sites, naval battalion, farm workers, low level of educational attainment, housing crisis, foreclosure crisis		no				
5ventura_20110622_1_18	natural COI, mountains, roads, quality of life		no				
5ventura_20110622_2_2			no			Lower to middle class agricultural with heavy immigrant population, unlike SBs upper middle class to wealthy, tourism	needs are different
5ventura_20110622_2_18			no			Far removed geographically and terrain	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110622_3_18	6222011	Johnny Garcia Vasquez, State Legislative Liason	no		Oxnard	Ventura	yes	Keep Oxnard whole in one assembly district
5ventura_20110622_4_18	6222011	Vivian Zinn	no			Ventura	yes	Nest Santa Clarita with Ventura County, not Malibu
5ventura_20110622_5_18	6222011	Vivian Zinn	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley
5ventura_20110622_6_18	6222011	Roy Talley	no				yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark needs to stay with Ventura County, not Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110622_7_18	6222011	Robert Hassebrock	no		Ventura	Ventura	yes	Do not combine Ventura with Santa Barbara, Ventura county should not be broken up.
5ventura_20110622_8_18	6222011	Mr and Mrs James Paulson (duplicate)	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Do not split Oxnard in half, keep in Ventura
5ventura_20110622_9_18	6222011	Mark Ferguson	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not include Thousand Oaks in Los Angeles County
5ventura_20110622_10_18	6222011	Terry Glaser	no				yes	Do not redistrict us into LA county, Ventura county is our home
5ventura_20110622_11_18	6232011	Renee Frumkin	no		Simi Valley Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark should be in Ventura, not Los Angeles
5ventura_20110622_12_18	6222011	Shannon Bowman	no				yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark should remain Ventura County
5ventura_20110622_13_18	6222011	Rick Maas	no				yes	Do not include Simi Valley and Moorpark in Los Angeles county district
5ventura_20110622_14_18	6222011	Ted Schmid	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley into LA countn
5ventura_20110622_15_18	6222011	Evan Connor	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not take Simi Valley and Moorpark out of Ventura and Place with LA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110622_3_18	Ventura	Oxnard		no	yes		
5ventura_20110622_4_18	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes		
5ventura_20110622_5_18		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_6_18	Ventura	simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_7_18	Ventura, Santa Barbara	Ventura		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_8_18	Ventura	Oxnard		no	yes	Majority Latino population under represented	
5ventura_20110622_9_18	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_10_18	Los Angeles, Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110622_11_18	Los Angeles, Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes	family	
5ventura_20110622_12_18	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_13_18	Los Angeles	Simi Valley Moorpark		no	yes		
5ventura_20110622_14_18	Los Angeles	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_15_18	Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110622_3_18	Oxnard and Ventura colleges should be in same district, students		no				
5ventura_20110622_4_18	keep inland valleys together		no				
5ventura_20110622_5_18			no				
5ventura_20110622_6_18			no				
5ventura_20110622_7_18			no				
5ventura_20110622_8_18			no				
5ventura_20110622_9_18			no			Interest are quite different	
5ventura_20110622_10_18			no				
5ventura_20110622_11_18			no			takes would go up	
5ventura_20110622_12_18			no				
5ventura_20110622_13_18	quaity of life		no			different dynamics	
5ventura_20110622_14_18			no			budget shortfalls, and no representation	
5ventura_20110622_15_18	taxes, mountains, schools, quality of life		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110622_16_18	6222011	Carol Serrano	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not Break simi Valley and Moorpark to be combined with LA Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110622_18_18	6222011		no				no	
5ventura_20110622_19	6222011	Vern Orth	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not Include Simi Valley and Moorpark with Los Angeles. Ventura
6fresno_20110622_1	6222011	Cedric Reese	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	King City, Hollister, Santa Clara, are not part of Central Valley
6fresno_20110622_2	6222011	Carol Streit	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	Shaver lake should be placed in Fresno, not Sacramento. Sanger should be in Fresno
6merced_20110622_1_16	6222011	Andrea Clark	no		Central Valley		yes	Do not group Central Valley with coastal counties or San Jose
6merced_20110622_2_16	6222011	Dawn Brown	no		Central Valley	Merced	yes	Extend Merced County to South, keep Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Tulare and Kern Counties together.
6merced_20110622_3_16	6222011	Dorothy Kielty	no			Merced	yes	Keep Merced away from Monterey and Santa Clara
6merced_20110622_4_16	6222011	Andree Soares	no				yes	Do not incorporate coastal community into Valley Region 6
6merced_20110622_5_16	6222011	Linn Carlson	no				yes	The Valley has no interest with coastal counties
6merced_20110622_6_16	6222011	Tommy Flores	no		Merced	Merced	yes	Place Turlock in different district from Merced, Stanislaus.
6merced_20110622_7_16	6222011	Henry Xiong	no			Merced	yes	Merced has no COI with coastal counties
6merced_20110622_8_16	6222011	John M. Derby, Publisher	no			Merced	yes	Do not move Merced district to Santa Cruz, San Jose
6merced_20110622_9_16	6222011	Tony Bowling	no		Sunland	Merced	yes	Do not look like LA city with San Pedro existing man miles shouth

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110622_16_18	Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110622_18_18				no	no		
5ventura_20110622_19	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes		
6fresno_20110622_1		King City, Hollister, Santa Clara		no	yes		
6fresno_20110622_2	Sacramento, Fresno	Shaver Lake, Fresno, Sanger		no	yes		
6merced_20110622_1_16	San Jose	central Valley		no	no		
6merced_20110622_2_16	Merced, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Tulare, Kern			no	yes	rural communinty, education, vocational	
6merced_20110622_3_16	Merced, Monterey	Santa Clara		no	yes		
6merced_20110622_4_16				no	no		
6merced_20110622_5_16				no	no		
6merced_20110622_6_16	Stanislaus, Merced	Turlock, Merced	Highway 99	no	no		
6merced_20110622_7_16	Merced			no	no		
6merced_20110622_8_16	Merced	Santa Cruz, San Jose		no	no		
6merced_20110622_9_16		Los Angeles, San Pedro		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110622_16_18			no				
5ventura_20110622_18_18			no				Oxnard Thousand Oaks unity Map
5ventura_20110622_19	schools, people, business		no				cesspool
6fresno_20110622_1	reside, work, visit		no			fail the test	
6fresno_20110622_2	distance to sacramento		no				
6merced_20110622_1_16			no				
6merced_20110622_2_16			no				
6merced_20110622_3_16	unemployment, dropout rates, agriculture, water		no				
6merced_20110622_4_16			no				
6merced_20110622_5_16			no				
6merced_20110622_6_16			no			Funds for special educational programs for our son. Do not pair with areas that do not share challenges	
6merced_20110622_7_16			no				
6merced_20110622_8_16			no			not in best interests for representative government	
6merced_20110622_9_16			no			should be close to circle or rectangle	Were they drunk at the time

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6merced_20110622_10_16	6222011	Michael E. Gates	no				no	
6merced_20110622_11_16	6222011	Bob Anderson	yes	Sherwood Oaks Homeowners Association		Los Angeles	yes	Move southern boundary of West San Fernando Valley Calavasas from Ventura Boulevard To Mullholland Drive
6merced_20110622_12_16	6222011	Dan Hultgren	no				yes	Nothing in common with Santa Clara or San Benito County
6merced_20110622_13_16			no				no	
6merced_20110622_14_16	6222011	Robert J. Apodaca	no				no	
6merced_20110622_15_16	6222011	Michael Gates	no				yes	Reconsider moving boundary of WESTG west near 405 freeway, and at Goldenwest and Edinger.
6merced_20110622_16_16	6222011	Sue Martin	no				no	
6mono_20110622_1	6152011	Susan Sanders	no		Mammoth Lakes	Mono	yes	Wants Trans Sierra Assembly district to represent mountain communities of Placer, el Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolomne, Mariposa, Mono and Alpine
6stanislaus_20110622_1_2	6222011	Rosemary Fernandes	no		Escalon	San Joaquin	yes	Thank you for keeping Sierra and Valley in different districts
6stanislaus_20110622_2_2	6222011	Connie Slusser	no		Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Turlock should be with Northern Modesto, not Southern Modesto, Ceres
6toulumne_20110622_1_3	6222011	Tillman Sherman	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6merced_20110622_10_16				no	no		
6merced_20110622_11_16	Los Angeles	Calabasas, Sherman Oaks	Ventura Blvd, Mullholand Drive	no	no		
6merced_20110622_12_16	Santa Clara, San Benito			no	no		
6merced_20110622_13_16				no	no		
6merced_20110622_14_16				no	no		
6merced_20110622_15_16			405, Goldenwest, Edinger	no	yes		
6merced_20110622_16_16				no	no		
6mono_20110622_1	Placer, El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, Mono, Alpine		Route 80, route 49	no	yes	mountains, lifestyle,	businesses
6stanislaus_20110622_1_2				no	yes		agriculture and dairies
6stanislaus_20110622_2_2		Turlock, Modesto, Ceres	Highway 99	no	no		
6toulumne_20110622_1_3				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6merced_20110622_10_16			no				Do not take Alan Mansoor out of his home district of SNANA
6merced_20110622_11_16			no				attached maps
6merced_20110622_12_16			no			issues they face unrelated to unemployment, agriculture, water needs in area	No no no
6merced_20110622_13_16			no				renumbering chart
6merced_20110622_14_16			no				attached chart will bbe of help in numbering
6merced_20110622_15_16	gemographics, population		no				
6merced_20110622_16_16			no				Wish they would do something about able bodies welfare leeches and freebies given to welfare and illegals.
6mono_20110622_1	livelihood, passions, tourism		no				
6stanislaus_20110622_1_2			no			recreation and tourism	
6stanislaus_20110622_2_2			no			different income, needs, housing, tourism v. agriculture	
6toulumne_20110622_1_3			no				Concurs with Mr. Torchias comments on 621

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6toulumne_20110622_2_3	6222011	Chris Caldwell, Multiline Accounts Executive	yes	Glen S. Caldwell Insurance Services	Sonora	Toulumne	yes	Sonora should be with Tuolumne county
6toulumne_20110622_3_3	6222011	John and Karen Bargmann	no		Sonora	Toulumne	yes	Appreciates seperation of foothill areas from valley counties
6tulare_20110622_1	6222011		no				yes	majority Hispanic population in Tulare County
7sclara_20110622_1	6222011	Barbara Biehl	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Put San Jose with San Jose not Monterey
8alameda_20110622_1_11	6222011	Carol J. Kennedy	no				yes	Do not want to be part of Oakland or Hayward
8alameda_20110622_2_11	6222011	Michael Greenslade	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Do not split San Leandro, do not put with Oakland and Hayward.
8alameda_20110622_3_11	6222011	Chris Crow	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Do not separate San Leandro from its Eden area roots
8alameda_20110622_4_11	6222011	Patricia Silva	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Do not split San Leandro, do not put with Oakland and Hayward.
8alameda_20110622_5_11	6222011	Elissa Kartman	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Do not put San Leandro in with Oakland
8alameda_20110622_6_11	6222011	Cynthia Jaynens	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Do not put San Leandro with Oakland and Berkeley.
8alameda_20110622_7_11	6222011	Paul	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Keep Pleasanton whole
8alameda_20110622_8_11	6222011	Vik Ghai	no				yes	Keep Fremont with Southern Alameda, do not split between districts
8alameda_20110622_9_11	6222011	Cynthia Clark	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro whole, not with Oakland and Berkeley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6toulumne_20110622_2_3	Tuolumne	Sonora	Highway 49	no	yes		
6toulumne_20110622_3_3				no	yes		
6tulare_20110622_1	Tulare			no	no		
7sclara_20110622_1	Monterey	San Jose		no	yes	live in area, school , library, work	
8alameda_20110622_1_11		Oakland, Hayward		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_2_11	Alameda	San Leandro, Oakland, Hayward		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_3_11		San Leandro		no	yes		
8alameda_20110622_4_11		San Leandro, Oakland, Hayward		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_5_11		San Leandro, Oakland		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_6_11		San Leandro, Oakland, Berkeley		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_7_11		Pleasanton		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_8_11	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_9_11		San Leandro, Oakland, Berkeley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6toulumne_20110622_2_3	timber, water, minerals, representation		no				
6toulumne_20110622_3_3	water concerns, funding for fire fighting, education, unemployment		no				
6tulare_20110622_1			no				why does Rep Nunes still fail to address issues
7sclara_20110622_1			no				
8alameda_20110622_1_11			no			property values	
8alameda_20110622_2_11			no			representation	
8alameda_20110622_3_11	Eden Area Health District, shared utilities		no				
8alameda_20110622_4_11			no				
8alameda_20110622_5_11			no				
8alameda_20110622_6_11			no			lose power in congress, and ties to local communities will be compromised	
8alameda_20110622_7_11			no				
8alameda_20110622_8_11			no				
8alameda_20110622_9_11			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110622_10_11	6222011	Stefan Mueller	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro whole, do not split between districts
8alameda_20110622_11_11	6222011	Anu Natarajan, Council Member	yes	Fremont City	Fremont	Alameda	yes	Put Tri-Cities back in Alameda county. Unite Richmond with Contra costa
8alameda_20110622_12	6222011	Aref Aziz, Chair	yes	Keep Fremon in Alameda County Coalition	Fremont	Alameda	yes	keep Fremont in Alameda, put Richmond in Contra Costa
8ccosta_20110622_1_2	6222011	Greg Feere	yes	Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council		Contra Costa	yes	Contra Costa needs to be kept whole
8ccosta_20110622_2_2	6222011	Duane C. Chapman	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not move Richmond from its district
8ccosta_20110622_3	6222011	Linda Best, President and CEO	yes	Contra Costa Council		Contra Costa	yes	Make contra costa an odd numbered district
8marin_20110622_1_5	6222011	Patricia and Lewis Zuelow	no				yes	Either make Marin County one district or combine it with Sonoma
8marin_20110622_2_5	6222011	Sondra S. Wuthnow	no				yes	All of marin should be kept together with all of Sonoma. North coast countnies have different agricultural and economic situation
8marin_20110622_3_5	6222011	Chris W	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	Have all of Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte and Lake County in same district. Include western siskiyou
8marin_20110622_4_5	6222011	Chris Brown (duplicate)	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Marin has nothing in common with San Francisco
8napa_20110622_1_2	6222011	Nan Vaaler	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110622_2_2	6222011	John Stephens	no				yes	A job well done for District 8

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110622_10_11		San Leandro		no	yes		
8alameda_20110622_11_11	Alameda, Contra Costa	Richmond, Tri Cities		no	no		
8alameda_20110622_12	Contra Costa, Alameda	Fremont, Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110622_1_2	Contra Costa			no	no		
8ccosta_20110622_2_2		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110622_3	Contra costa			no	no		
8marin_20110622_1_5	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110622_2_5	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes		
8marin_20110622_3_5	Marin, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, Siskiyou		Jan-80	no	no		
8marin_20110622_4_5	Marin, San Francisco	San Francisco	Golden Gate Bridge	no	no		
8napa_20110622_1_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes		
8napa_20110622_2_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110622_10_11	small city and dividing it will weaken our voice		no				
8alameda_20110622_11_11			no				attached maps
8alameda_20110622_12	emphasis on innovation		no				attached maps
8ccosta_20110622_1_2			no				Give Contra Costa an odd number
8ccosta_20110622_2_2			no				
8ccosta_20110622_3			no				
8marin_20110622_1_5			no				
8marin_20110622_2_5	dependent upon economies, agriculture, dense population		no				
8marin_20110622_3_5			no				
8marin_20110622_4_5			no				
8napa_20110622_1_2	library system		no				
8napa_20110622_2_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110622_1_3	6222011	Gary Wysocky, Councilman	yes	Santa Rosa City	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa has COI with North Coast, not Central Valley
8sonoma_20110622_2_3	6222011	Kimberly Kunkel	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Santa Rosa needs to stay with Sonoma county, not Lodi
8sonoma_20110622_3_3	6222011	Barbara Cates	no		Healdsburg	Sonoma	yes	Santa rosa needs to be with Sonoma, not Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo
9mendocino_20110622_1_4	6222011	Larry Kellogg	no				yes	Coastal communities need to be kept together. Including Siskiyou
9mendocino_20110622_2_4	6222011	Morris Kaplan	no				yes	Costal counties should have own representatives
9mendocino_20110622_3_4	6222011	John Dickerson	no			Mendocino County	yes	Keep lake, napa counties and Santa rose away from Sacramento. Line between NapaLake and SonomaMendocino makes no sense
9mendocino_20110622_4_4	6212011	Larry Hanson	no				yes	Coastal Communities should be kept together
9mendocino_20110622_5	6212011	Larry Kellog	no				yes	Coastal Communities should be kept together
9mendocino_20110622_6	6222011	Stephen Salmanini	no			Mendocino	yes	Mendocino should be with other coastal commuities north of SF
9norte_20110622_1_2	6222011	Rob Miller, President	yes	Del Norte County Farm Bureau		Del Norte	yes	Keep Del Norte in district represented by Doug LaMalfa
9norte_20110622_2_2	6222011	Linda Crockett	no			Del Norte	yes	redraw lines for Del Norte West to East

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110622_1_3		Santa Rosa		no	yes	transportation, water	commercial center
8sonoma_20110622_2_3	Sonoma	Santa rosa, Lodi		no	no		
8sonoma_20110622_3_3	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
9mendocino_20110622_1_4	Siskiyou		101 corridor	no	yes		harbors,
9mendocino_20110622_2_4				no	yes		
9mendocino_20110622_3_4	Napa, Lake, Sonoma, Mendocino	Santa Rosa	Steep mountain Ridge, the wall	no	yes		wine industry, job commuters
9mendocino_20110622_4_4				no	yes		
9mendocino_20110622_5				no	yes		
9mendocino_20110622_6	Mendocino	San Francisco		no	no		
9norte_20110622_1_2	Del Norte			no	yes		
9norte_20110622_2_2	Del Norte			no	yes	Del Norte is rural and agricultural with Conservative interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110622_1_3	air quality		no				
8sonoma_20110622_2_3			no				
8sonoma_20110622_3_3	russian river, preservation, wine, gardening, smart rail		no			valley is big agricultural, conservative rural	
9mendocino_20110622_1_4	ocean and shoreline protection, redwood parks, 101		no				
9mendocino_20110622_2_4	conservation, environmental protection		no				
9mendocino_20110622_3_4			no				
9mendocino_20110622_4_4	rivers, ocean and shoreline protection, redwood parks, 101 corridor, coastal climate		no				
9mendocino_20110622_5	rivers, ocean and shoreline protection, redwood parks, 101 corridor, coastal climate		no				
9mendocino_20110622_6			no				
9norte_20110622_1_2	agricultural background, leans right		no				
9norte_20110622_2_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110622_1_5	6222011	Edward J. Pecis, Special Agent in Charge	yes	California Dept. of Justice		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county.
9siskiyou_20110622_2_5	6222011	Phyllis Inghram	no				yes	Objects to redistricting
9siskiyou_20110622_3_5	6222011	John O. Homer, D.C.	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110622_4_5	6222011	Stanley and Jeanette Loudon	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou county whole.
9siskiyou_20110622_5_5	6222011	Mark Baird	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou county whole
9sjoaquin_20110622_1_2	6222011	Chuck Wasmuth	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not carve Lodi out of San Joaquin. Lodi and Stockton are close
9sjoaquin_20110622_2_2	6222011	Dennis Parks	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Put Lathrop with Stockton and Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110622_3	6222011	Robert J. Mitchell	no			San Joaquin	yes	Do not put San Joaquin valley in Coastal area
9tehama_20110622_1	6222011	Burt Bundy	no				yes	Do not put Shasta and Tehama counties Yuba district.
9yuba_20110622 _1	6222011	Carl Schid	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Consolidate Yolo in one or at most two districts.
9yuba_20110622_2	6222011	Cindy Miller	no			Yuba	yes	Do not put Yuba with coastal counties, keep with Chico
general_20110622_1	6222011	Bob Gutierrez	yes	Latino Policy Forum			no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110622_1_5	Siskiyou			no	yes	School districts,	living standards, public transportation
9siskiyou_20110622_2_5				no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110622_3_5	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110622_4_5	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110622_5_5	Siskiyou			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110622_1_2	San Joaquin	Lodi, Stockton		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110622_2_2	San Joaquin	Lathrop, Stockton, Tracy	1-205, 1-5, Highway 99	no	yes	communities are the same	
9sjoaquin_20110622_3	San Joaquin			no	no		
9tehama_20110622_1	Shasta, Tehama, Yuba			no	no		
9yuba_20110622 _1	Yolo		Hwy 113	no	yes		
9yuba_20110622_2	Yuba	Chino		no	no		
general_20110622_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110622_1_5	media of communication		no				
9siskiyou_20110622_2_5	agriculture, mining and logging, water		no				
9siskiyou_20110622_3_5			no				
9siskiyou_20110622_4_5			no				
9siskiyou_20110622_5_5			no			eight hour round trip drive, nothing in common with coastal environmentalist elite	
9sjoaquin_20110622_1_2	proximity, business, agriculture		no				
9sjoaquin_20110622_2_2	valley town		no				
9sjoaquin_20110622_3			no			way of life totally different	
9tehama_20110622_1			no				
9yuba_20110622 _1	shopping, river, 113, water, agriculture, quality of life		no				
9yuba_20110622_2			no				
general_20110622_1			no				the deviation is 0 given two assembly proposed districts were joined together to form the senate seat

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110622_2	6222011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
general_20110622_3	6222011	Michael Gates	no				yes	Move WESTG boundary westward
1imperial_20110622_1	6222011	Karen Knowles	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not include Indio with Imperial Valley
1imperial_20110622_2	6222011	Miguel Figueroa, Executive Director	yes	Calexico New River Committee		Imperial	yes	Keep Imperial and Coachella Valleys as one COI.
1imperial_20110622_3	6222011	Karla	no			Imperial	yes	Put Imperial in with Riverside, not San Diego
1imperial_20110622_4	6222011	Randall Morton	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Exclude Imperial county and San Diego county from Coachella Valley.
1imperial_20110622_5	6222011	Coulter Stewart	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Include Imperial County with Riverside county as one COI
1imperial_20110622_6	6222011	Jan Diego Uribe	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and Riverside should be connected.
1imperial_20110622_7_7	6222011	John F. Manion	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Include Imperial County wiwth Eastern Riverside County
1sdiego_20110622	6222011	James Udan	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Do not divide San Diego County.
2riverside_20110622_1	6222011		no				no	
5sbarbara_20110622_10	6222011	Melinda Johansson	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara County whole. Move the 33rd north to Monterey County and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_11	6222011	Edwin Weston	no				yes	Do not split City of Lompoc down the middle. City needs total representation.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110622_2				no	no		
general_20110622_3			405 freeway	no	yes		
1imperial_20110622_1	Imperial	Riverside		no	no		
1imperial_20110622_2	Imperial, Coachella			no	yes		natural resources, enterprise zones, shared service territory, agriculture, canals,
1imperial_20110622_3	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego	Imperial Valley		no	no		
1imperial_20110622_4	Imperial, San Diego	Coachella Valley		no	no		
1imperial_20110622_5	Imperial Riverside			no	yes	Hispanic population	agriculture, renewable energy
1imperial_20110622_6	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes	Farm workers	Agriculture, schools
1imperial_20110622_7_7	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes	Hispanic population	agriculture, energy resources
1sdiego_20110622	San Diego	Chula Vista	I 805	no	yes	Filipino population	
2riverside_20110622_1				no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_10	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura.			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_11	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110622_2			no				should not be behind closed doors
general_20110622_3	capture college aged voters, and similarly situated people		no				
1imperial_20110622_1			no			no common interests	
1imperial_20110622_2	cultural ties		no				
1imperial_20110622_3			no			more in common with Riverside than San Diego	
1imperial_20110622_4			no			resort and retirement community, not agriculture	
1imperial_20110622_5			no				
1imperial_20110622_6			no				
1imperial_20110622_7_7			no				
1sdiego_20110622	political, community		no				
2riverside_20110622_1			no				Comments will be posted as soon as practicable
5sbarbara_20110622_10			yes	Montere y	move the 33rd north to Monterey County.		
5sbarbara_20110622_11			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_12	6222011	Lin Graf	no		Carpinteria	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara County whole. Recommend moving the 33rd north to Moneterey County, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_13	6222011	Brian N. Kopeikin	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide County of Santa Barbara in half.
5sbarbara_20110622_14	6222011	Dennis Headrick	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split city of Lompoc in half. Keep it whole.
5sbarbara_20110622_15	6222011	Jim Hurt	no		Goleta	Santa Barbara	yes	Support one Assembly district in Santa Barbara County, and two in Ventura County. The 33rd SLO district should go north along the Coast in Monterey County.
5sbarbara_20110622_16	6222011	Terry Hammons	no				yes	Oppose splitting city of Lompoc. Keep one representative for the city.
5sbarbara_20110622_17	6222011	Eric Christianson	no		Solvang	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara County whole and as one district.
5sbarbara_20110622_18	6222011	James R. Langley	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as one district.
5sbarbara_20110622_19	6222011	Helga Schmidt	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara County whole, move the 33rd SLO district north to Monterey County, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_20	6222011	Jeannette E. Watson	no				yes	Make one assembly district in Santa Barbara County, and two in Ventura County. Also, 33rd SLO district should go north along coast in Monterey County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_12	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_13	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_14	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_15	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_16	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_17	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_18	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_19	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey	Santa Barbara		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_20	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Moneterey			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_12			yes	Monterey	move the 33rd north to Monterey County.		
5sbarbara_20110622_13			no			split will put on a new court case. This initiative was made to end political manipulation.	
5sbarbara_20110622_14			no				Hard enough to keep track of one representative. If split, attempt to stop gerrymandering will fail.
5sbarbara_20110622_15			yes	Monterey	33rd SLO district should go north along the coast in Monterey County.		
5sbarbara_20110622_16			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_17			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_18			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_19			yes	Monterey	Move the 33rd SLO district north to Monterey County.		
5sbarbara_20110622_20			yes	Monterey	33rd SLO district could go north along the coast in Monterey County.		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_21	6222011	Robert Manning	no				yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110622_22	6222011	Dr. and Mrs. John Sawyer	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Splitting of Lompoc makes no sense. Keep it together.
5sbarbara_20110622_23	6222011	Nicholas Cooper	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110622_24	6222011	Ken Ostini	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	DO not split Lompoc in State and Senate districts.
5sbarbara_20110622_25	6222011	Shirley Eyre	no		Solvang	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara County whole, move the 33rd north to Moneterey county, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_26	6222011	Robert Manning	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110622_27	6222011	Roberta MacKenzie	no				yes	One assembly district in Santa Barbara County, two in Ventura County. 33rd SLO district should go north along the coast in Monterey County.
5sbarbara_20110622_28	6222011	Tricia Dixon	no		Goleta	Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_29	6222011	Randall Fox	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Santa Barbara in two. City of Lompoc should not be split. Solution is to move 33rd district so it goes along coast in Monterey County.
5sbarbara_20110622_30	6222011	Susan Perry	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_21	Santa Barbara	Lompoc, Mission Hills, Vandenberg Village.		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110622_22	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_23	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_24	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_25	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura	Solvang		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_26	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_27	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_28	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura	Goleta		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_29	Santa Barbara, Monterey	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_30	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_21	Lompoc, Mission Hills, Vanderberg Village are a COI.		no				
5sbarbara_20110622_22			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_23			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_24			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_25			yes	Montere y	The 33rd SLO district should go north along the coast in Monterey Valley.		
5sbarbara_20110622_26			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_27			yes	Montere y	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_28			yes	Montere y	33rd district should be Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_29			yes	Montere y	move 33rd district so it goes north along Monterey County Coast		
5sbarbara_20110622_30			yes	Montere y	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_31	6222011	Ed and Anne Goulart	no		Carpinteria	Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_32	6222011	Debbie Isbell	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_33	6222011	Robert D Gleason	no				yes	Do not cut Santa Barbara County in half. District 33 should be moved up north.
5sbarbara_20110622_34	6222011	Elaine Bashford	no				yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_35	6222011	Mr. and Mrs. James K. Kunkle	no		Santa Ynez	Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_36	6222011	Jim Perry	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_37	6222011	Pat Wardlaw	no				yes	Santa Barbara County stays whole. 33rd district should be Monterey County, make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_38	6222011	John Deacon	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Santa Barbara County into two separate districts.
5sbarbara_20110622_39	6222011	Frank Marino	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara County whole.
5sbarbara_20110622_40	6222011	Jeff Havlik	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Santa Barbara County
5sbarbara_20110622_41	6222011	Bill Freudenstein	no				yes	Please keep Santa Barbara County whole, and Ventura County in two parts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_31	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura	Carpinteria		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_32	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_33	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_34	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_35	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_36	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_37	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_38	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_39	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_40	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_41	Santa Barbara,Ventura			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_31			yes	Monterey	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_32			yes	Monterey	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_33			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_34			yes	Monterey	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_35			yes	Monterey	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_36			yes	Monterey	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_37			yes	Monterey	The 33rd SLO district go north along the coast in Monterey County		
5sbarbara_20110622_38			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_39			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_40			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_41			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_42	6222011	Gina Perry	no		Montecito	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara whole, move the 33rd district north to Monterey County and make two assembly districts in Ventura County
5sbarbara_20110622_43	6222011	Douglas J. Mackenzie	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara whole, move the 33rd district north to Monterey County and make two assembly districts in Ventura County
5sbarbara_20110622_1	6222011	Carol Benham	no				yes	Opposition to split of Lompoc for state assembly and senate.Should be grouped with Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks, it is a COI.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Bon Lingl	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Opposition to splitting Lompoc into two districts for state assembly and senate.
5sbarbara_20110622_3	6222011	Kathy Heringer	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide the Santa Ynez Valley.It is a COI and needs to be represented as a whole.Split will disenfranchise area.
5sbarbara_20110622_4	6222011	Peter Kruse	no				yes	Keep Santa Barbara as one district. Recommend two districts for Ventura county, and the new 33rd district extending northward into Monterey County.
5sbarbara_20110622_5	6222011	Mary Weston	no				yes	Do not split City of Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110622_6	6222011	Gregory Gandrud	no		Carpinteria	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Santa Barbara County in half. It should be together and well represented as a whole.
5sbarbara_20110622_7	6222011	Lisa White	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Protest of splitting of Lompoc for state and federal representation.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_42	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_43	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_1	Santa Barbara,	Lompoc, Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks.		no	yes	shop, dine	
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110622_3	Santa Barbara			no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110622_4	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_5	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_6	Santa Barbara	Carpinteria		no	yes		Fair, balanced representation
5sbarbara_20110622_7	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_42			yes	Monterey	Move the 33rd district north to Monterey County.		
5sbarbara_20110622_43			yes	Monterey	Move the 33rd district north to Monterey County.		
5sbarbara_20110622_1	routine visits to these areas around Lompoc		no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Lompoc is one community, needs equal representation for community		no				
5sbarbara_20110622_3	disenfranchment will happen if split.		no				
5sbarbara_20110622_4			yes	Monterey	new 33rd district extending northward into Monterey County.		
5sbarbara_20110622_5			no			Lompoc should have equal representation, election costs would be higher if it was split in two.	
5sbarbara_20110622_6	keep communities whole in Santa Barbara.		no				
5sbarbara_20110622_7	Should not be split and disenfranchised.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_8	6222011	Justin LeCavalier	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Splitting of Lompoc is a bad thing.
5sbarbara_20110622_9	6242011	Mary Ferris	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in two.
1imperial_20110624_1_before 5pm	6242011	Everardo Cervantes	no			Imperial	yes	Keep Imperial and Coachella Valleys as one contiguous COI; do not include Eastern San Diego with Imperial county; these requests not reflected in the 610 maps; put Imperial with eastern Riverside county
1imperial_20110624_2_before 5pm	6242011	Antonio Ortega	no			Imperial	yes	Southeast desert should be one region; put Imperial with Riverside, not with San Diego; 40th SD should look more like the AD (80th) in the area
1imperial_20110624_3_before 5pm	6232011	Christopher Malmberg	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Residents of Coachella Valley do not want to be in a district with Imperial County; approves of the proposed map
1imperial_20110624_4_before 5pm	6242011	Rebecca Terrazas-Baxter	no			Imperial	yes	Do not put Imperial with eastern San Diego; put it with Eastern Riverside; Imperial has more in common with Coachella, Indio, Mecca, Thermal and Blythe; Do not put Imperial with La Quinjta, Indian Wells, and Palm Desert

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_8	Santa Barbara	Lompoc,		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110622_9	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
1imperial_20110624_1_before 5pm	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	yes	Imperial and eastern Riverside share vast natural resources, environmental concerns, culture	Imperial and Eastern Riverside counties share economies
1imperial_20110624_2_before 5pm	Imperial, San Deigo, Riverside			no	yes	Imperial priorities different from San Diego re border issues and federal funding; Imperial shares environmental concerns, transportation; median incomes, unemployment rate, education levels, ethnic makeup wRiverside	Imperial and Riverside share surge in development and and building up of renewable energy generation
1imperial_20110624_3_before 5pm	Imperial			no	no		
1imperial_20110624_4_before 5pm	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego	Coachella, Indio, Blythe, La Quinta, Indian Wells, Palm Desert		no	yes	Imperial and eastern Riverside share culture, Salton Sea restoration efforts, environmental issues, limited higher education institutions	Imperial and Eastern Riverside share natural resources, renewable energy hub

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_8	Deserve one voice to community.		no				Lompoc is not a prison. People here work outside of it.
5sbarbara_20110622_9			no				So glad you are making an attempt to take politics and gerrmandering out of redistricting.
1imperial_20110624_1_before 5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_2_before 5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_3_before 5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_4_before 5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110624_5_before 5pm	6242011	Ruth Debra and Sherry Fulton	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Put Palm Springs in same district as Imperial county
1imperial_20110624_6_before 5pm	6292011		no				yes	Put Riverside, Coachella Valley wImperial county; include San Gorgonio PassSan Jacinto valley; Do NOT put wSan Bernandino; make other AD wWestern Coachella Valley, BeaumontBanningSan Jacinto Valley; put both in one SD
1imperial_20110624_7_before 5pm	6242011	Rebecca Terrazas-Baxter, duplicate	no				no	
1imperial_20110624_8_before 5pm	6242011	Sharon Miller	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Put Palm Desert with Imperial County
1imperial_20110624_9_before 5pm	6242011	John Hernandez	no			Imperial	yes	Imperial county is a COI with Coachella ValleyRiverside county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110624_5_before 5pm	Imperial; Riverside	Palm Springs		no	yes	Imperial is just south of Coachella Valley, shares climate, agriculture, tourism	
1imperial_20110624_6_before 5pm	Riverside, Imperial, San Bernadino	Beaumont, Banning		no	yes	Banning, Beaumont should not be in SBBAN SD, have nothing in common wSan Bernadino; eastern Riverside and Imperial share shopping and social services, rural, retired community, different from youngurbad san bernadino area	Eastern Riverside and Imperial share geo-thermal resources, renewable energy
1imperial_20110624_7_before 5pm				no	no		
1imperial_20110624_8_before 5pm	Imperial	Palm Desert		no	no		
1imperial_20110624_9_before 5pm	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes	ImperialRiverside share Latino cmmty, cost of living, housing, Salton Sea cleanup issues, water sources, alternative energy interests, mtn range, medical facilities, environmental justice issues, tribal lands, low educational achievementschool issues	ImperialRiverside share mirgrant stream for agricultural harvests, border transportation corridor, state prisons

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110624_5_before 5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_6_before 5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_7_before 5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_8_before 5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_9_before 5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm	6242011	Alex Behzadi	no				yes	put Imperial wRiverside not San Diego; separate urban suburban in San Diego (Coronado, Chula Vista); do not put North LA cities w PomonaGlendale; put Rancho Palos VerdesLong Beach in own dist; not Torrance wLong Beach
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm	6242011	Alex Behzadi, continued	no				yes	put Ventura wwest Santa Barb.San Luis ObispoMalibu; put inland VenturaSanta Barb w LA, Kern; Put rural KernKingsFresno areas together, not wurban BakerfieldFresno areas; San Joaquin cnty in own dist, or wrural areas
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm	6242011	Alex Behzadi, continued	no				yes	separate suburban area from urban coastal areas in Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara; separate SolanoMarin from north coast Sonoma to Del Norte; keep inland nor cal same
1imperial_20110624_11_before5pm	6242011	Monica Terrazas	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Put Imperial wCoachella valleyEastern Riverside, not Eastern San Diego
1sdiego_20110624_12_17	6242011	John Ingalls	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego, Los Angeles,	Coronado, Chula Vista, Pomona, Glendale, Rancho Palos Verdes, Long Beach, Torrence		no	yes	Draw COI lines based on economic groups (wealthaffluence) not racialethnic groups	
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm	Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Los Angeles, Kern, Kings, Fresno, San Joaquin	Malibu, Bakersfield, Fresno		no	yes	Rural communities in FresnoKernKings have similar interests, different from urban FresnoBakersfield communities; San Joaquin is ruralagricultural, should not be put with SF exurbs	rural agricultural communities have different interests than urban areas
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, Solano, Marin, Sonoma, Del Norte			no	yes	Bay area suburbs are different COI from Bay Area coastal urban centers	
1imperial_20110624_11_before5pm	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	yes	ImperialRiverside share culture, Salton Sea restoration, environmental health issues, limited access to higher education, CAMexico border should have two fed reps, not one	ImperialRiverside share natural resources, renewable energy generation, irrigation water utility, agricultural based economy
1sdiego_20110624_12_17				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_10_before5pm			no				
1imperial_20110624_11_before5pm			no			Concern that numerous written and in-person requests for this outcome are not being incorporated into the plans.	
1sdiego_20110624_12_17			no				Comment refers to PDF maps, not shown in forwarded comment; no text comment

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110624_13_17	6242011	Mark Leo	no				yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_14_17	6242011	Kimberly Hoang	no				yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_15_17	6242011	Isidro Ortiz	yes	San Diego State Univ., Dept of Chicana and Chicano Studies, Professor		San Diego	yes	Approves of keeping Lemon Grove, Southeastern San Diego, and the college area, Spring Valley, and Bonita together in ADSDCDs; like LMSAND map in present form
1sdiego_20110624_16_17	6242011	Jongdae Lee	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_17_17	6242011	Rachel Meyer	no			San Diego	yes	Likes changes to map complying with comments from 513 hearing in San Marcos re Ramona similar backcountry communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110624_13_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_14_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_15_17	San Diego	Lemon Grove		no	no		
1sdiego_20110624_16_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_17_17				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110624_13_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_14_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_15_17			no				Thank you for your serivce, the process is challenging.
1sdiego_20110624_16_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_17_17			no				In general Arent we all Americans first? Districts based on race do not enhance melting pot.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110624_1		Elaine and Stephen Grand	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Do not put Coachella Valley with Imperial County, keep it wRiverside
2riverside_20110624_2	6232011	Harriet Arias	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not change Coachella Valley district, fine as it is; Do not add Imperial to Coachella Valley district
2riverside_20110624_3	6242011	Nichole Robles	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Republicans commenting to split Coachella Valley and Imperial are writing to maximize Republican party power, not maintain legitimate COIs (by Republican commenter); Put Coachella Valley with Imperial; do not put Imperial with San Diego
2riverside_20110624_4	6242011	Glenn A. Miller	yes	Indio City Council, Mayor Pro Tem	Indio	Riverside	yes	Use preliminary maps for Coachella Valley in Eastern Riverside; keep Coachella Valley cities united; Do not join Indio, Coachella, Mecca and Thermal with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110624_1	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110624_2	Imperial			no	yes	Coachella Valley has unique interests, including tourism	
2riverside_20110624_3	Imperial			no	yes	Coachella Valley Imperial share economic, social, and demographic ties, transportation corridors, Imperial Irrigation District, Salton Sea issues; Imperial is 75 Latino, has little in common with San Diego (birthplace of the Minutemen)	
2riverside_20110624_4	Riverside, Imperial	Indio, Coachella		no	yes	CoachellaIndio is suburban contiguous bedroom community, different from Imperial rural farmland; testimony to join Imperial to Coachella valley is partisan Democrat party effort	Coachella Valley based on tourism, while Imperial based on agriculture

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110624_1			no				
2riverside_20110624_2			no				
2riverside_20110624_3			no				
2riverside_20110624_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110624_5	6242011	Rachel Sherrell	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Create AD wall of Imperial cnty, Palo Verde Valley (Blythe, Palo Verde, Ripley) east Coachella Valley from Palm Desert east; 2nd AD wRancho MirageCathedral CityThousand PalmsPalm SpringsBanningBeaumont to NW county line; make 1 SD, 3 entire CDs
2riverside_20110624_6	6242011	Jeremy Mape	no				yes	Use Inland Actions maps for San Bernadino and Riverside counties
2riverside_20110624_7	6242011	Michelle Hathaway	no				yes	Do not divide Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110624_9	6242011	Friends of Manuel Perez for Assembly	yes	Friends of Manuel Perez for Assembly	Indio	Riverside	yes	Create AD wall of Imperial cnty, Palo Verde Valley (Blythe, Palo Verde, Ripley) east Coachella Valley from Palm Desert east; 2nd AD wRancho MirageCathedral CityThousand PalmsPalm SpringsBanningBeaumont to NW county line; make 1 SD, 3 entire CDs
2riverside_20110624_10	6242011	Rick Weingard	no				yes	Put Imperial County with Coachella Valley, not with San Diego

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110624_5	Imperial, Riverside	Blythe, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Banning, Beaumont		no	yes	ImperialRiverside boundary is manmade; climate, economies, demographics are identical; shares Irrigation Dist; share Salton Sea and conservation issues and air quality issues; Riverside is 50 Latino wsome African American and Asian communities	ImperialEast Coachella Valley has population that migrates there for winters, economy based on agriculture, hospitality, retail, and health care ; Northwestern AD economy based on conventions, retirement, health, NOT agriculture
2riverside_20110624_6	San Bernadino, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110624_7				no	no		
2riverside_20110624_9	Imperial, Riverside	Blythe, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Banning, Beaumont		no	yes	ImperialRiverside boundary is manmade; climate, economies, demographics are identical; shares Irrigation Dist; share Salton Sea and conservation issues and air quality issues; Riverside is 50 Latino wsome African American and Asian communities	ImperialEast Coachella Valley has population that migrates there for winters, economy based on agriculture, hospitality, retail, and health care ; Northwestern AD economy based on conventions, retirement, health, NOT agriculture
2riverside_20110624_10	Imperial, San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110624_5	Riverside has different interests than coastal communities		no			Do not put needs of San Diego, Orange or LA counties before the needs of RiversideImperial; these counties should not be an afterthought.	
2riverside_20110624_6			no				
2riverside_20110624_7			no				Thank you for listening to residents of Riverside and Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110624_9	Riverside has different interests than coastal communities		no			Do not put needs of San Diego, Orange or LA counties before the needs of RiversideImperial; these counties should not be an afterthought	
2riverside_20110624_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110624_11	6242011	Claudia I. Suarez	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley with Banning and Beaumont, not with Imperial; put Imperial with San Diego; use proposed map 1
2riverside_20110624_12	6242011	Henri V. De Roule	no				yes	Put San Gorgonio Pass with Coachella ValleySan JacintoHemetPalm Springs, not with Inland EmpireSan Bernadino; keep BanningBeaumont SD in Riverside county, not in San Bernadino; likes CD, AD and SD should follow it
2riverside_20110624_13	6242011	Joan Smith and Family	no			Riverside	yes	Likes 610 maps for Coachella Valley ADSDCDs; keep Coachella Valley together, and with Riverside; do not split East Coachella to go wImperial; put Imperial with San Diego
7sclara_201106254_1_6	6242011	Frank Biehl	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Do not split up East San Jose community; do not put San Jose suburbsfoothills with rural AD that includes Mt. HamiltonKing City (SCLARAWMONT)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110624_11	Imperial, San Diego	Banning		no	yes		Coachella Valley has unique tourism, desert resorts, and professional workforce; Imperial Valley is agricultural
2riverside_20110624_12	San Bernadino, Riverside	San Jacinto, Hemet, Palm Springs, Banning		no	yes	San Gorgonio Pass is a rural community, has nothing in common with NW San Bernadino	
2riverside_20110624_13	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	yes	Coachella Valley is compact, shares transportation wPalm Springs Airport, HWY 111; HWY 8 connects Imperal to San Diego	Coachella Valley industries are resortstourism, while Imperial is agricultural
7sclara_201106254_1_6		San Jose, King City		no	yes	Area around San Jose, including foothills, has more in common wSan Jose than rural areas; resident there considers himself part of the East San Jose community; current lines divide Latino community, do not divide please	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110624_11			no				
2riverside_20110624_12			no				
2riverside_20110624_13			no				
7sclara_201106254_1_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110624_8	6242011	Christina Garcia	no		Coachella	Riverside	yes	Create AD wall of Imperial cnty, Palo Verde Valley (Blythe, Palo Verde, Ripley) east Coachella Valley from Palm Desert east; 2nd AD wRancho MirageCathedral CityThousand PalmsPalm SpringsBanningBeaumont to NW county line; make 1 SD, 3 entire CDs
5ventura_20110624_2_12	6242011	Phyllis Jones	no			Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley and Moorpark with LA county
5ventura_20110624_3_12	6242011	Patricia Havens	no			Ventura	yes	Refers to summary attachment sent to other address; comment not available in this email
5ventura_20110624_4_12	6242011	Barbara Macri-Ortiz	yes	Mexican American Bar Association of Ventura County (MABA), member	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	Use the OxnardThousand Oaks unity map; Oxnard is one close-knit community; do not divide SBWVENT and EASTVENT ADs along Ventura Road, cuts through heard of COI

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110624_8	Imperial, Riverside	Blythe, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Banning, Beaumont		no	yes	ImperialRiverside boundary is manmade; climate, economies, demographics are identical; shares Irrigation Dist; share Salton Sea and conservation issues and air quality issues; Riverside is 50 Latino wsome African American and Asian communities	ImperialEast Coachella Valley has population that migrates there for winters, economy based on agriculture, hospitality, retail, and health care; Northwestern AD economy based on conventions, retirement, health, NOT agriculture
5ventura_20110624_2_12	Los Angeles	Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110624_3_12				no	no		
5ventura_20110624_4_12	Ventura	Oxnard, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Oxnard is close knit COI, strong family ties and common history of farmworkers and immigrant families, shared ethnic makeup, school dists	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110624_8	Riverside has different interests than coastal communities		no			Do not put needs of San Diego, Orange or LA counties before the needs of RiversideImperial; these counties should not be an afterthought	
5ventura_20110624_2_12			no				
5ventura_20110624_3_12			no				
5ventura_20110624_4_12			no				Attended Oxnard College hearing on 622 to address CRC on behalf of MABA, but hearing ended before her was called; working class Oxnard residents came late because they had to come after work, and were not heard

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110624_5_12	6242011	Richard Rowell	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark with Ventura, do not put them with LA countySanta Clarita district
5ventura_20110624_6_12	6242011	Richard Rowell, duplicate	no				no	
5ventura_20110624_7_12	6242011	Laurie Maas	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley with Ventura, not with Los Angeles county
5ventura_20110624_8_12	6242011	Susan Goldberg	no				yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark with Ventura, do not put them in a district with LA countySanta Clarita
5ventura_20110624_9_12	6242011	Nick Zepeda	no				yes	Do not put Ventura, Santa Paula, Fillmore, and Piru with Santa Barbara

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110624_5_12	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Mountains separate Simi ValleyMoorpark from LA county; Simi ValleyMoorpark taxes go to Ventura for roads, schools, improvements; small number of voters in Ventural county would be overshoadowed by LA county votes	
5ventura_20110624_6_12				no	no		
5ventura_20110624_7_12	Ventura, Los Angeles			no	yes	Simi Valley pays taxes to Ventura county	
5ventura_20110624_8_12	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Mountains separate Simi ValleyMoorpark from LA county; Simi ValleyMoorpark taxes go to Ventura for roads, schools, improvements; small number of voters in Ventural county would be overshoadowed by LA county votes	
5ventura_20110624_9_12	Santa Barbara, Ventura	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Santa Paula, Fillmore		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110624_5_12			no				
5ventura_20110624_6_12			no				
5ventura_20110624_7_12			no				
5ventura_20110624_8_12			no				
5ventura_20110624_9_12			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110624_10_12	6242011	Jill Collins	no				yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark with Ventura, do not put them in a district with LA countySanta Clarita
5ventura_20110624_11_12	6242011	Paul Pietro	no			Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley with LA county, keep it with Ventura
5ventura_20110624_12_12		Patricia Havens	no			Ventura	yes	Use Santa SusanaSimi Hills Mountains as a geographic boundary; do not put Simi Valley and Moorpark with LA County, keep with Ventura
6kern_20110624_1_5	6242011	Richard Cayia Rowe	no				yes	Put Kern rvr valley wBakersfield; put Shafter Corcoran in one AD; move 16k residents in Kern River Valley to Kern AD (32); move 16k residents in Shafter from Kings AD (30) to Kern AD (32); move 16k Corcoran residents from Kern (32) to Kings (30) AD
6kern_20110624_2_5	6242011	Richard Cayia Rowe, duplicate	no				yes	SEE MAPS, not included in duplicate text comment above

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110624_10_12	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Mountains separate Simi ValleyMoorpark from LA county; Simi ValleyMoorpark taxes go to Ventura for roads, schools, improvements; small number of voters in Ventural county would be overshoadowed by LA county votes	
5ventura_20110624_11_12	Los Angeles, Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110624_12_12	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark	Santa SusanaSimi Hills Mountains	no	yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark have been geographically associated with Ventura, not LA, since Native American boundaries, as well as under Spanish Colonial control	
6kern_20110624_1_5	Kern, Kings	Shafter, Corcoran		no	yes	Residents of Kern River Valley travel regularly to Bakersfield for shopping, medical, government services; would have better access to reps there	
6kern_20110624_2_5				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110624_10_12			no				
5ventura_20110624_11_12			no				The redistricting is moving almost everything in favor of the Democratic party, this is not right
5ventura_20110624_12_12			no				
6kern_20110624_1_5			no			All districts mentioned have republican incumbents	
6kern_20110624_2_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110624_3_5	6242011	Kernville Chamber of Commerce	yes	Kernville Chamber of Commerce		Kern	yes	Do not put Kern River Valley in AD 34 (Visalia); keep in AD 32 (Bakersfield)
6kern_20110624_4_5	6242011	Cheryl Borthick	yes	Kernville Chamber of Commerce, President		Kern	yes	Do not put Kern River Valley in district with Visalia; keep with Bakersfield
6kern_20110624_5_5	6242011	Cheryl Borthick, duplicate	no				no	
6merced_20110624_1_2	6242011	Steve Teranishi	no				yes	Do not put all of Merced county wSanta Clara, San Benito, and Monterey counties; Los Banos has connection to those counties, but the rest of Merced does not; put Merced with Central Valley counties Stanislaus, Madera and Fresno
6merced_20110624_2_2	6242011	Mary Grace Kaljian	no		Los Banos	Merced	yes	Agrees wproposed AD for Los Banos; disagrees wpropsed SD; do not put parts of StanislausMerced with San Benito and Monterey; put MercedStanislaus wModesto SD or MaderaFresno

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110624_3_5	Kern	Visalia, Bakersfield		no	yes	Kern River Valley is closer to Bakersfield, Visalia is too far; Kern River Valley residents frequent Bakersfield for shopping, medical and government services; incumbent understands local issues such as road closures and Lake Isabella dam problems	
6kern_20110624_4_5	Kern	Visalia, Bakersfield		no	yes	Kern River Valley has no transportation route to Visalia during winter, as roads are closed due to snow; would be isolated from reps if they were in Visalia	
6kern_20110624_5_5				no	no		
6merced_20110624_1_2	Merced, Santa Clara, San Benito, Monterey, Stanislaus, Madera, Fresno	Los Banos		no	yes	Merced residents share conservative background and mindset	
6merced_20110624_2_2	Stanislaus, Merced, San Benito, Monterey, Madera, Fresno	Los Banos		no	yes	MercedStanislaus is a farming, valley community; ethnically similar to other valley districts; MontereySan Benito population is older, more affluent	San Benito and Monterey are more industrialbusiness oriented, valley areas are agricultural;

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110624_3_5			no				
6kern_20110624_4_5			no				
6kern_20110624_5_5			no				
6merced_20110624_1_2			no				
6merced_20110624_2_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6stanislaus_20110624_1_2	6232011	Luis I. Molina	yes	City of Patterson, Mayor	Patterson	Stanislaus	yes	Put Stanislaus communities Patterson, Ceres, Newman, Gustine, Crows Landing, Westley, Grayson with Modesto; keep these communities in same district
6stanislaus_20110624_2_2	6242011	Ryan Swehla	no				yes	Does not like proposed changes to 12th SD; put weird leg of Foothills dist in 12th dist; Do not put valley areas wMonterey or San Jose
7scruz_20110624_1_3	6242011	Craig Marianne Cabot	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not take Scott Valley out of current dist; do not combine Scott Valley wcoastal dist
7scruz_20110624_2_3	6242011	Patricia Henderson	no				yes	Do not put Scotts Valley or other ares of northern Santa Cruz county in the Santa Clara county district; keep northern santa cruz county with santa cruz and central coast
7scruz_20110624_3_3	6242011	Jon Dewis	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Scott Valley wcoastal districts; NOTE SCOTT VALLEY IS IN SISKIYOU, SCOTTS VALLEY IS AN INCORPORATED CITY IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY; SOME COMMENTS FOR SCOTT VALLEY ARE MISFILED UNDER SANTA CRUZ

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6stanislaus_20110624_1_2	Stanislaus	Patterson, Ceres, Newman, Gustine		no	yes	West side of Stanislaus communities share Latino ethnicity, culture, news, social services, health resourcesprograms, sports leagues, agriculture work, churches, highways and shopping, and share all this with Modesto	
6stanislaus_20110624_2_2	Monterey	San Jose		no	no		
7scruz_20110624_1_3				no	no		
7scruz_20110624_2_3	Santa Cruz, Santa Clara	Scotts Valley, Santa Cruz		no	yes	Scotts Valley shares interests with Santa Cruz, not silicon valley	
7scruz_20110624_3_3				no	yes	Scott Valley does not share culture or interests with coastal districts, poor roads from Scott Valley to Eureka would cause hardship for residents to reach reps	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6stanislaus_20110624_1_2			no			Proposed area is too large, would be impossible for a representative to effectively serve all constituents	Thanks to the CRC
6stanislaus_20110624_2_2			no				
7scruz_20110624_1_3			no				
7scruz_20110624_2_3			no				
7scruz_20110624_3_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110624_1_17	6242011	Yen Tu	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_2_17	6242011	John Ingalls	no			San Diego	yes	Add San Diego area west of I-85 to CRNOSAND CSAND; Put unincorporated area east of Solana Beach, Del Mar, San Diego (aka historic Rancho Santa Fe Fairbanks Ranch) back in RANCHOBMM NESAN; Unite La Jolla university community divided in draft by I-5
1sdiego_20110624_3_17	6242011	Laura Cyphert	yes	Lakeside Community Planning Group, member; East County Community Action Coalition, board member		San Diego	yes	Dislikes 1st draft ADSD maps; do not split Lakeside (SEE MAP OF LAKESIDE BOUNDARIES); put all of Lakeside with NESAND, not with IMSAND AD, and with NESAND, not ISAND SD; do not put Lakeside wImperial county; also applies to Alpine (treat like Lakeside)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110624_1_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_2_17	San Diego	Solana Beach, Del Mar, San Diego	I-85, I-5	no	yes	Solana Beach and Rancho Santa Fe have different schoolfire dists, sewer service; UCSD community should be united	Rancho Santa Fe is a rural historical area, has different economy and coastal urban areas like city of San Diego
1sdiego_20110624_3_17	San Diego, Imperial			no	yes	Lakeside is a cohesive COI, do not split; Lakeside and Alpine have more in common with northern San Diego; have conflicting interests wImperial county re renewable energy generation, environmental issues	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110624_1_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_2_17			no			These changes would eliminate the lollipop shape of the CRNOSAND and CSAND districts; sticking wealthy, rural Rancho Santa Fe onto San Diego risks appearance of gerrymandering	
1sdiego_20110624_3_17			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110624_4_17	6242011	George Gastil	yes	Lemon Grove City Council, council member	Lemon Grove	San Diego	yes	Likes 610 maps; keeps Lemon Grove with La Mesa; OK with splitting East County into 2 Ads; Lemon Grove has links to city of SD; keep Lemon Grove wSpring Valley La Mesa, do not put it with rural Lakeside Alpine or affluent suburbs surrouding El Cajon
1sdiego_20110624_5_17	6242011	Bob Ham	yes	County of Imperial, Director of Intergovernmental Relations		Imperial	yes	Attached hearing comment of Jack Terrazas, Chair of Imperial Co BOS put Imperial wCoachella ValleyRiverside (Indio, Mecca, Thermal, Blythe), not wLa Quinta, Indian Wells, Palm Springs; if joined wSan Diego, must be wSouth San Diego (SEE MAPS)
1sdiego_20110624_6_17	6242011	Rohanee Casillan	no				yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110624_4_17		Lemon Grove, La Mesa, San Diego, El Cajon		no	yes	Lemon Grove is multicultural and not very wealthy, does not share interests wwealthy suburbs or rural areas like LakesideAlpine; Lemon Grove and La Mesa share schools and community college district	
1sdiego_20110624_5_17	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside	Indio, Blythe, La Quinta, Indian Wells, Palm Springs		no	yes	Imperial and Coachella Valley share interests in Salton Sea, agricultural indusstry, air qualitycommon air basin, desert regions, renewable energy; share culture and socio-economic levels; Imperial does not share interests wmountains of eastern SD	Imperial and Coachella Valley share Imperial Irrigation Dist, which is also one of the major employers in the area
1sdiego_20110624_6_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110624_4_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_5_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_6_17			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110624_7_17	6242011	David Chan	no				yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_8_17	6242011	Kimberly M. Hisa	no				yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_9_17	6242011	Megan Zapanta	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_10_17	6242011	Sirivanh (Sandy) Spackman	yes	Lao American Coalition, President			yes	Supports following speakers from 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91. Use CAPAFR maps
1sdiego_20110624_11_17	6242011	Yen Tu, duplicate	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110624_7_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_8_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_9_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_10_17				no	yes	Do not split up Asian Pacific Islander communities in San Diego county; this COI shares socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110624_11_17				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110624_7_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_8_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_9_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_10_17			no				
1sdiego_20110624_11_17			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110625_6_Redacted	6252011	Karen Chong	no				yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County.Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a senate seat.This divides the inland and coastal populations.
6kern_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Richard Crockett	no			Kern	yes	Ridgecrest should be connected to Bakersfield. Connected by hwy. 178. Not opposed to kicking out Bakersfield, but do not include Visalia.
6kern_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Richard Cayia Rowe	no		Woffard Heights	Kern	yes	Oppose moving Kern River Valley from Assembly district 32 to district 34.COI with Bakersfield area.Do not cut cities of Shafter and Corcoran between two districts.
6kern_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Irene Rizzardini	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest in Kern County.We work well with Bakersfield,
8alameda_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Rosemary Corbin	no				yes	Do not lump most of Richmond in same district as Oakland.This will hurt Richmond, because the two areas will compete for representation.
8alameda_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Kristin Goldthorpe	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one congressional district, being Alameda.
8alameda_20110625_3_Redacted	6252011	Roberto Grau	no		Alameda	Alameda	yes	Do not Join Fremont with City of Pleasonton.Do not merge North Bay districts with San Francisco Districts.Any Assembly district in Marin should expand north on hwy. 101, not far east to Benicia.Oppose CIJEE plan to split San Jose.Oppose CIJEE plan to put

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110625_6_Redacted	Ventura, Malibu,	Santa Clarita, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes	Historically Connected, populations	
6kern_20110625_1_Redacted	Kern	Ridecrest,Bakersfield, Visalia.	hwy 178 defines community.	no	no		
6kern_20110625_1_Redacted	Kern	Shafter, Corcoran, Bakersfield,Visalia,Tehachapi.		no	yes	Shopping,physical closeness, medical, government issues.	
6kern_20110625_2_Redacted	Kern	Bakersfield, Ridgecrest		no	no		
8alameda_20110625_1_Redacted	Alameda	Oakland, Richmond.		no	no		
8alameda_20110625_2_Redacted	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110625_3_Redacted	Alameda, Marin	San Leandro,Milpitas, Richmond, El Cerrito,Livermore,Berkeley,Oakland,San Jose,Benicia,Pleasanton,		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110625_6_Redacted			no				
6kern_20110625_1_Redacted			no				
6kern_20110625_1_Redacted	we are a COI with this county.		no				
6kern_20110625_2_Redacted			no				
8alameda_20110625_1_Redacted			no				
8alameda_20110625_2_Redacted			no				
8alameda_20110625_3_Redacted			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110625_3_Redacted	6252011	Roberto Grau	no		Alameda	Alameda	yes	Palo Alto with city of Santa Cruz.Oppose plan to put Lamorinda and Pleasant Hill into district with Berkeley.Oppose plan to link Union City with with San Ramon and Livermore.Keep BerkeleyOakland Hills as natural barrier between communities.
8alameda_20110625_4_Redacted	6252011	Roberto Grau	no		Alameda	Alameda	no	
8alameda_20110625_5_Redacted	6252011	Ran Bush	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond into two districts.
8ccosta_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Jerry Power	no				yes	Do not divide Richmonds congressional district in half.
8ccosta_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Chia Hamilton	no				yes	Do not divide Richmond
8ccosta_20110625_3_Redacted	6252011	Jeannette Kortz	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond.It would not be good for our city.
8ccosta_20110625_4_Redacted	6252011	David Vasnaik	no				yes	Keep city of Richmond in one district.
8ccosta_20110625_5_Redacted	6252011	Anne Marie Van Amson	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide City of Richmond into multiple districts.
8ccosta_20110625_6_Redacted	6252011	Dodi Fromson	no		Brentwood	Contra Costa	yes	Do not cut our area in half
8ccosta_20110625_7_Redacted	6252011	Michael J. Meagher	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in Contra Costa County and do not split it in half.Do not put it in same district as Berkeley or Oakland.
8ccosta_20110625_8_Redacted	6252011	Anonymous	no				yes	If you split Richmond,work to lower murder rate will be reversed. Richmond has nothing in common with Berkeley or Oakland. These cities will ruin Richmond.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110625_3_Redacted	Alameda, Marin	San Leandro,Milpitas, Richmond, El Cerrito,Livermore,Berkeley,Oakland,San Jose,Benicia,Pleasanton,	Hwy 101, BerkeleyOakland Hills, I 880,	no	no		
8alameda_20110625_4_Redacted				no	no		
8alameda_20110625_5_Redacted				no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_1_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_2_Redacted	Conta Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_3_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_4_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_5_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_6_Redacted	Contra Costa	Brentwood		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_7_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond, Oakland, Berkeley		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_8_Redacted	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond, Oakland, Berkeley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110625_3_Redacted			no				
8alameda_20110625_4_Redacted			no				Gerrymandering is taking place.please do not do it, think about it, do not be impartial to the outcomes, and do not work with political bias.
8alameda_20110625_5_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_1_Redacted			no				Support councilman Tom Butt in protest of dividing Richmond.
8ccosta_20110625_2_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_3_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_4_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_5_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_6_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_7_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_8_Redacted			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110625_9_Redacted	6252011	Maxine Henagan	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond as one community.
8ccosta_20110625_10_Redacted	6252011	Juan P Reardon	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in one district.
8ccosta_20110625_11_Redacted	6252011	Sydney Metrick	no				yes	Proposed division of Richmond will not serve the city well.
8ccosta_20110625_12_Redacted	6252011	Jacob Lubliner	no				yes	El Cerrito should not be attached to inland Contra Costa district, centered in Walnut Creek.El Cerrito is a San Francisco bay community. Issues are closer to those of Oakland and Richmond.
8ccosta_20110625_13_Redacted	6252011	Terry Baird	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in one district.
8ccosta_20110625_14_Redacted	6252011	Daniel Moriarty	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole, in one district.
8ccosta_20110625_15_Redacted	6252011	June Mountcastle	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole, in one district.
8ccosta_20110625_16_Redacted	6252011	Charles Smith	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond into two congressional districts.
8ccosta_20110625_17_Redacted	6252011	Andrea Biren	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole and with Contra Costa, not with OaklandBerkeley.Do not put Richmond west of I 80 in a district with Oakland.
8ccosta_20110625_18_Redacted	6252011	Eugene Fleming	no				yes	Do not split Richmond in half. Richmond is a COI. Needs to be together.Nothing in common with Berkeley,Oakland,Alameda, Emeryville

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110625_9_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_10_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_11_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_12_Redacted	Contra Costa,	El Cerrito, Oakland, Richmond, San Francisco		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_13_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_14_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_15_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_16_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_17_Redacted	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond,Berkeley,Oakland	I 80	yes	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_18_Redacted	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond, Berkeley, Alameda, Emeryville		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110625_9_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_10_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_11_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_12_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_13_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_14_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_15_Redacted	Richmond as a whole is working towards its own goals.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_16_Redacted	This community works hard together towards improvement. There is a sense of pride in the city.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_17_Redacted	Richmond works with Contra Costa and has similar interests, not with OaklandAlameda County.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_18_Redacted	Richmond is more of a COI in itself that with Alameda County.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110625_19_Redacted	6252011	Gretchen Blais	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Leave all of Richmond in one district.
8ccosta_20110625_20_Redacted	6252011	Leslie O Hara	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Reconsider dividing city of Richmond.
8ccosta_20110625_21_Redacted	6252011	Jim Hite	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond.
8ccosta_20110625_22_Redacted	6252011	Rebecca E. Robinson	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in one district.
8ccosta_20110625_23_Redacted	6252011	Tani Suzanne Martinat	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond.
8ccosta_20110625_24_Redacted	6252011	Eugene F. Fleming	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Opposed to splitting Richmond into two districts.
8ccosta_20110625_25_Redacted	6252011	Rocky Leplin	no				yes	Do not split Richmond into different districts.
8ccosta_20110625_26_Redacted	6252011	Joan Bartulovich	no				yes	Please keep Richmond one district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110625_19_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_20_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_21_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_22_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_23_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_24_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110625_25_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110625_26_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110625_19_Redacted	Richmond has worked hard to generate some sense of community and being in one district helps keep that goal alive.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_20_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_21_Redacted	Richmond has worked against poverty and violence and splitting city will make it harder to continue doing so. We are a COI working together against common struggles.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_22_Redacted	We have a large, disconnected school district. Its important to keep us in one district so we can work on unifying it.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_23_Redacted	Richmond has made lots of progress as a community. Splitting would ruin it.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_24_Redacted	Richmond in itself is more of a COI than combined with surrounding areas.		no				
8ccosta_20110625_25_Redacted			no				
8ccosta_20110625_26_Redacted			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110625_27_Redacted	6252011	Jeannette Mohoney	no			Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond.Do not group it with BerkeleyOakland.
5sbarbara_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Kathy Badrak	no				yes	Keep city of Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Bart Bader	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split city of Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110625_3_Redacted	6252011	Bart Bader	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split city of Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110625_4_Redacted	6252011	Jeannette L. Wynne	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	It is destructive to split city of Lompoc as proposed.
5ventura_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Mickey Jones	no		Simi Valley	Ventura County	yes	Do not place Simi Valley and Moorpark with Los Angeles County. Keep us with Ventura County.We are seperated by mountains from L.A.
5ventura_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Jayne Staley	no		Bell Canyon	Ventura	yes	Keep Bell Canyon in Ventura Canyon. Do not re assign us to any other county.
5ventura_20110625_3_Redacted	6252011	Beverly Cullum	no				yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark in Ventura County. Do not place in Los Angeles CountySanta Clarita district.
5ventura_20110625_4_Redacted	6252011	Don and Beverly Zeller	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not remove Simi Valley and Moorpark from Ventura County and place in Los Angeles County.
5ventura_20110625_5_Redacted	6252011	Nancy K. Kilbolurn	no				yes	Do not split some parts of cities in Ventura County and place them within Los Angeles County.
2sbernardino_20110624_7_before5pm	6242011	Shirley Harry	no				yes	Dividing Redlands make no sense. Should not extend into Kern county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110625_27_Redacted	Contra Costa	Richmond, Oakland, Berkeley		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110625_1_Redacted	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110625_2_Redacted	Santa Barbara			no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110625_3_Redacted	Santa Barbara			no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110625_4_Redacted	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5ventura_20110625_1_Redacted	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark.	Mountains seperating us from Los Angeles	no	yes	Roads, Improvements, Schools, quality of life.	
5ventura_20110625_2_Redacted	Ventura,	Bell Canyon, Moorpark, Fillmore, Santa Paula		no	yes	Taxes, physical seperation,	
5ventura_20110625_3_Redacted	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes	Roads, improvements, schools, quality of life.	
5ventura_20110625_4_Redacted	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes		
5ventura_20110625_5_Redacted	Ventura, Los Angeles			no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110624_7_before5pm	Kern	Redlands		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110625_27_Redacted			no				
5sbarbara_20110625_1_Redacted			no				
5sbarbara_20110625_2_Redacted	If you split Lompoc, our small community will lose its voice.		no				
5sbarbara_20110625_3_Redacted	If this city is split, we will become transparent, we are already hard to hear.		no				
5sbarbara_20110625_4_Redacted			no				
5ventura_20110625_1_Redacted	Our taxes go to Ventura county, we are a COI together.		no				
5ventura_20110625_2_Redacted			no				
5ventura_20110625_3_Redacted	Nothing in common with Los Angeles, Keep us in Ventura		no				
5ventura_20110625_4_Redacted	Nothing in common with Los Angeles County. We are a COI with Moorpark and surrounding Ventura cities.		no				
5ventura_20110625_5_Redacted	Cities of Ventura have different concerns than those in Los Angeles County.		no				This proposal hurts minorities.
2sbernardino_20110624_7_before5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110624_8_before5pm	6242011	Dale Wintergerst	no				yes	Do not split Redlands in two, do not divide Crestline from Lake arrowhead. Do not combine Redlands with High Desert.
2sbernardino_20110624_9_before5pm	6242011	Dan Scott	no			San Bernardino	yes	Reconsider plan to redraw lines
2sbernardino_20110624_10_before5pm	6242011	Susie Hofmann	no			San Bernardino	yes	Chino and Chino Hills should be in the same district
2sbernardino_20110624_11_before5pm	6242011	Christine French	no			San Bernardino	yes	Should not split redlands.
2sbernardino_20110624_12_before5pm	6242011	Marc Steinorth	no			San Bernardino	yes	Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Chino Hills and Redlands should not be split. They and Upland should not be redistricted from San Bernardino to Los Angeles county
2sbernardino_20110624_13_before5pm	6242011	Janet Korfmacher	no				yes	Should not split Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110624_14_before5pm	6242011	Pete Blackstead	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Should not split Redlands in half
2sbernardino_20110624_15_before5pm	6242011	Adrian Asencio	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not cut Redlands in half
2sbernardino_20110624_16_before5pm	6242011	Rodney Spooner	yes	Redlands Tea Party Patriots	Riverside	Riverside	yes	Should not Split redlands. ONTPOM should incorporate Chino Hills and Upland, SBRIA should add Fontana. East San Bernardino, Riverside county seat could include Highland, Lorna Linda, San Bernardino East of I 215, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley
2sbernardino_20110624_17_before5pm	6242011	John G. Egan, Principal Engineer	yes	Engineering Resources of Southern California, Inc	Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Redlands, include Loma Linda, Highland, Yucaipa, East san Bernardino

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110624_8_before5pm		Redlands, Crestline, High Desert		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110624_9_before5pm				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_10_before5pm		Chino, Chino Hills		no	yes	Fire district, water district, school district	
2sbernardino_20110624_11_before5pm	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110624_12_before5pm	San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Redlands, Rancho Cucamonga, Chino Hills, Upland		no	yes		Dividing is detrimental to success and growth.
2sbernardino_20110624_13_before5pm	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_14_before5pm	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110624_15_before5pm	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110624_16_before5pm	San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands, Chino Hills, Upland Fontana, Highland, Lorna Linda, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley, San Bernadino	I 215 freeway	no	yes		Work together
2sbernardino_20110624_17_before5pm	Riverside	Redlands, Loma Linnda, Highland, Yucaipa, East San Bernardino		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110624_8_before5pm	lose conservative voice		no				
2sbernardino_20110624_9_before5pm			no				not in best interest of the people
2sbernardino_20110624_10_before5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_11_before5pm	district should reflect urban, suburban character of city		no				Thank you for your consideration
2sbernardino_20110624_12_before5pm			no			Do not have commonalities with LA	Thank you
2sbernardino_20110624_13_before5pm			no				Supports inland actions map
2sbernardino_20110624_14_before5pm	To represent all the voters		no				
2sbernardino_20110624_15_before5pm	to be fair to voters		no				
2sbernardino_20110624_16_before5pm	to acheieve effective representation		no			current lines are partisan	
2sbernardino_20110624_17_before5pm			no			Nothing in common with eastern Sierra area	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110624_2	6242011	Bruce L. Beal	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Dana point should remain grouped with Orange county.
3orange_20110624_3	6222011	Jean Tietgen, President	yes	Orange County Association of REALTORS		Orange	yes	Do not divide Dana point or place within other county that does not include other Orange cities
3orange_20110624_4	6242011	Marlene Beal	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Dana point as a whole should be with Orange county cities
3orange_20110624_5	6242011	Ingrid McGuire, Board of Directors	yes	South Coast Water District	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not Divide Dana Point, region 9 of State Water Quality Control Board.
3orange_20110624_6	6242011	John Molino	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Huntington Beach has little in common with Irvine. Demographics of Newport beach are diferent. Connected by 405 fwy
3orange_20110624_7	6242011	Joseph Cho, Ph.D, City Councilmember	yes	City of Cerritos	Cerritos	Orange	yes	Include Cerritos and Garden Grove in same Orange county Assembly District. Do not include Cerritos annd Artestia with Garden Grove and Westminster
3orange_20110624_8	6242011	Susan T. Kroffe	no			Orange	yes	Do not redistrict Los Alamitos and Rossmoor to Long Beach, keep in Orange County
3orange_20110624_9	6242011	Ann Coil	no		Santa Ana	Orange	yes	San Juan Capristano and San Clemente should be in Orange. Los Alamitos, Yorba Linda should be in Orange. Artesia and Cerritos should be placed in L.A. county.
3orange_20110624_10	6242011	Loretta A Molino	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Huntington beach has no commonality with Irvine, unite Central Orange county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110624_2	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	common issues, ocean water quality, transportation, regional land use planning	working relationships, affordable housing
3orange_20110624_3	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	disaster preparedness, medical response, fire protection	job creation, housing business retention
3orange_20110624_4	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	ocean water quality, regional transportation, land use planing	affordable housing, working relationships
3orange_20110624_5	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Same water district	
3orange_20110624_6	Orange	Huntington Beach, Irvine, Newport Beach	405 fwy	no	yes	beach, shopping	school district funding
3orange_20110624_7	Orange	Cerritos, Garden Grove, Westminster		no	yes	Many Asians	
3orange_20110624_8	Orange	Long Beach, Los Alamitos, Rossmor		no	no		
3orange_20110624_9	L.A., Orange	San Juan Capristrano, San Clemente, Los Alamitos,		no	yes		
3orange_20110624_10	Orange	Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Little Saigon		no	yes	malls, shopping, dining, doctors, dentists, Water, schools	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110624_2			no				respectfully submitted
3orange_20110624_3	State assembly and district issues		no				
3orange_20110624_4			no				
3orange_20110624_5			no				
3orange_20110624_6			no				Appreciates commissions hard work
3orange_20110624_7			no			Different Asian groups in terms of Ethnicity, religion and culture	
3orange_20110624_8			no				
3orange_20110624_9	Fair representation		no				Please do your job.
3orange_20110624_10			no			Irvine opposed the airport.	Supports map contributed by Shawn Dewane

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110624_11	6242011	Kate Klimow, VP Government and Community Affairs	yes	Orange County Business Council	Irvine	Orange	yes	La Palma and La Habra should be in Orange, not L.A. County. Los Alamitos should be in Orange like Stanton, Cypress, Garden Grove. Orange and Dana point should not be cut in two
3orange_20110624_12	6242011	Zonya and Roy Townsend	no				yes	Fullerton has strong bond with North Anaheim and Placentia. Keep lines as they are.
3orange_20110624_13	6242011	Sharon L. Weissman	no		Norwalk	Orange	yes	Keep gateway cities together. No reason to split Cerritos and Artesia and place them in Orange County
4langeles_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	Marie Cruz	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita. Add Newhall to Antelope Valley Santa Clarity Valley district
4langeles_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Terry Rubin	no		Valencia	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, Add Newhall and Valencia
4langeles_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Gregory S. Whitney	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Newhall in Santa Clarita district.
4langeles_20110624_4_before5pm	6242011	Luis Alvarado	no		Pico Rivera	Los Angeles	yes	Dislodge portion of Bell Gardens, make Downey whole. Pico Rivera, Whittier, Downey belong together
4langeles_20110624_5_before5pm	6242011	Morris Griffen	no				no	
4langeles_20110624_6_before5pm	6242011	Sam Crowe	no		Ontario	San Bernardino	yes	Pomona should remain with Ontario, Montclair. Supporrts Map
4langeles_20110624_7_before5pm	6242011	James V. Upton	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita. Add Newhall to Antelope Valley Santa Clarity Valley district
4langeles_20110624_8_before5pm	6242011	David Warburton	no				yes	Please make Santa Clarity Valley districts more competative.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110624_11	Orange, L.A.	La Habra, La Palma, Los Alamitos, Staton, Cypress, Garden Grove, Orange, Dana Point		no	yes	strong sense of identity.	burden on municipalities.
3orange_20110624_12	Orange	Fullerton, North Anaheim, Placentia		no	no		
3orange_20110624_13	L.A., Orange	Cerritos, Artesia		no	yes	shopping, transportation, air quality	housing
4langeles_20110624_1_before5pm	Los Angeles.	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_2_before5pm	Los Angeles	Newhall, Valencia		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_3_before5pm	Los Angeles	Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Newhall is where Santa Clarita began, heritage, history, library, schools	
4langeles_20110624_4_before5pm	Los Angeles	Bell Gardens, Downey, Pico Rivera, Whittier		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_5_before5pm				no	no		
4langeles_20110624_6_before5pm		Pomona, Ontario, Montclair		no	yes	Sister cities, in touch with each other.	
4langeles_20110624_7_before5pm		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_8_before5pm		Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110624_11			no				Appreciate the difficult task
3orange_20110624_12			no				
3orange_20110624_13			no				
4langeles_20110624_1_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_2_before5pm			no			huge mountain dividing the areas	
4langeles_20110624_3_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_4_before5pm			no				God Speed
4langeles_20110624_5_before5pm			no				Please send me changes of districts in L. Richardsons area
4langeles_20110624_6_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_7_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_8_before5pm			no				current office holders will breeze to re election. Staunch Democrat

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110624_9_before5pm	6242011	Bonnie Skolnik	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena and Altadena should be in same district.
4langeles_20110624_10_before5pm	6242011	Francis J. Cunningham II	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita Valley. Include Newhall with Antelope Valley Santa Clarita valley
4langeles_20110624_11_before5pm	6242011	Howard Welinsky	yes		Toluca Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Toluca lake is in city of LA and belongs in the Southern Part of the East San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110624_12_before5pm	6242011	Leigh C. Cornell, Manager	yes	Pomona Valley Hospital	Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	Pomona should be kept with Chino, Ontario, Montclair
4langeles_20110624_13_before5pm	6242011	James V. Upton	no				yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County instead of malibu, Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110624_14_before5pm	6242011	Marvin H. Andrade	yes	Carecen		Los Angeles	yes	Pico union and Westlake should not be with Beverly Hills, Pacific Palisades
4langeles_20110624_15_before5pm	6242011	M.H. Levison	no				yes	Do not redistrict Santa Clarita, keep properties within zipcodes intact
4langeles_20110624_16_before5pm	6242011	William L. Reynolds	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley intact. Leave Newhall.
4langeles_20110624_17_before5pm	6242011	Brandon Murphy	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Brentwood, Keep Brentwood Glen included
4langeles_20110624_18_before5pm	6242011	Jim B. Clarke	no		Culver City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep port of Los Angeles and San Pedro together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110624_9_before5pm	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Altadena		no	yes	historical ties, public tranportation, school district, activism	
4langeles_20110624_10_before5pm	Los Angeles	Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_11_before5pm	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Toluca Lake		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_12_before5pm	Los Angeles	Pomona, Chino, Ontario, Montclair		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_13_before5pm	Los Angeles, Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes	historically connected in senate seat	
4langeles_20110624_14_before5pm	Los Angeles	Pico Union, Westlake, Beverly Hills, Pacific Palisades		no	yes	Latino communities,	growth
4langeles_20110624_15_before5pm		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110624_16_before5pm	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	yes		
4langeles_20110624_17_before5pm	Los Angeles	Brentwood, Brentwood Glen		no	yes		
4langeles_20110624_18_before5pm	Los Angeles	Port of Los Angeles, San Pedro		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110624_9_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_10_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_11_before5pm			no			We seem to be a last minute add on or filler	
4langeles_20110624_12_before5pm	Medical Center		no				Thank you
4langeles_20110624_13_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_14_before5pm		maps should be in accordance with VRA	no			affluent, far away	
4langeles_20110624_15_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_16_before5pm	much more commonality than any other		no				
4langeles_20110624_17_before5pm	common issues and concerns		no				
4langeles_20110624_18_before5pm	economic connection, headquarter of Port is in San Pedro, environmental protection, water quality		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110624_19_before5pm	6242011	Susan Benfatto	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Sunland Tujunga belongs with Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
4langeles_20110624_20_before5pm	6242011	Greg Asher	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pedro together, or move boundary east to Figuero Blvd
4langeles_20110624_21_before5pm	6242011	Dick Jeffrey	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Clarita at Lyons Ave.
4langeles_20110624_22_before5pm	6242011	Noelle Guzman	yes	Reseda Neighborhood Council	Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Resenda unified as part of San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110624_23_before5pm	6242011	Robert Lia	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountain Region together, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu,
4langeles_20110624_24_before5pm	6242011	Alma D. Martinez, Commissioner	yes	Los Angeles County Boundary Commission	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Federal lands from I 14 west to I 5 east should be in same district as foothill and watershed cities to South.
4langeles_20110624_25_before5pm	6242011	Joy Wilson	no				yes	Keep Newhall, Valencia as one in Santa Clarita Valley. Valencia has different needs.
4langeles_20110624_26_before5pm	6242011	Mary Bucci Bush	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not Split Padsadena and Altadena between LA and San Bernardino county
4langeles_20110624_27_before5pm	6242011	Joy Wilson	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita as one, Newhall and Valencia.
4langeles_20110624_28_before5pm	6242011	Carol K. Chen, Mayor	yes	City of Cerritos	Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Cerritos with other Los Angeles County cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110624_19_before5pm	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank	210, 5, Lake View Terrace, GlenOaks Blvd	no	yes	lifestyle, trails, rural area, lifestyles	
4langeles_20110624_20_before5pm	Los Angeles	San Pedro	Figueroa Blvd	no	yes	unified community	
4langeles_20110624_21_before5pm	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	Lyons Ave	no	yes	law enforcement, water rights, representation,	
4langeles_20110624_22_before5pm	Los Angeles	Reseda	Sherman way	no	yes	volunteering, community improvements, beautifications	economic impact
4langeles_20110624_23_before5pm	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu,		no	yes	Fire Safe Alliance, COG, Las Virgines Water District, school district, ecology	
4langeles_20110624_24_before5pm	Los Angeles		I 14, I 15, 210 freeway	no	yes	common recreational area and public land	
4langeles_20110624_25_before5pm		Valencia, Santa Clarita		no	yes	schools, community events and organization	
4langeles_20110624_26_before5pm	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Pasadenta, Altadena		no	yes	churches, school district, generational families	business, educational institutions
4langeles_20110624_27_before5pm	Los Angeles	Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	yes	library, new parking, restaurants, theaters	Revitilization, development
4langeles_20110624_28_before5pm	Los Angeles	Cerritos		no	yes	Schools, associations, water, school district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110624_19_before5pm			no			Difference between communities often in conflict	Come and take a looks
4langeles_20110624_20_before5pm			no				Thank you for attention to this grave injustice
4langeles_20110624_21_before5pm			no				I thank you in advance
4langeles_20110624_22_before5pm	Reseda is integral part of W San Fernando Valley		no				
4langeles_20110624_23_before5pm			no				With best regards
4langeles_20110624_24_before5pm	geographic, economic, recreational connection to mountain range		no				
4langeles_20110624_25_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_26_before5pm	long tradition of single representative		no				
4langeles_20110624_27_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_28_before5pm			no			No connections to any cities in Orange county for water	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110624_29_before5pm	6222011	Linda Alexander, President	yes	Central San Pedro Neighborhood Council	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	San Pedro should be in Los angeles county
4langeles_20110624_30_before5pm	6232011	Jane Burlingame Smith, President	yes	Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split San Pedro, Include with Port of Los angeles in Los Angeles county district
5slo_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	Jacqueline	no				yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Eileen Codling	no				yes	keep san Luis Obispo district whole
5slo_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Russell J and Denise E Surber	no		Paso Robles	San Luis Obispo	yes	Do not split San Luius Obispo County.
6tuolumne_20110624_before5pm	6242011	Paolo Maffei, Retired Supervisor	yes	District 2		Tuolumne	yes	Foothill counties do not have more in common with Central Valley areas
8alameda_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	Luck Rukchart	no			Alameda	yes	Put Fremont, Newark, Union City back into Alameda county, separate Eastern Alameda County, put with San Jose. Unite Richmond with Contra Costa County.
8alameda_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Ruth Duncan	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont in one district
8alameda_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Wendy Lu	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Does not make sense to split Fremont
8alameda_20110624_4_before5pm	6242011	Vyjayanthimala Susarla	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Do not split Fremont
8alameda_20110624_5_before5pm	6242011	Sukanya Dasarathy	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Does not want Fremont to be split
8alameda_20110624_6_before5pm	6242011	Karin Fetherston	no		Piedmont	Alameda	yes	Piedmont should be grouped with West Contra Costa

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110624_29_before5pm	Los Angeles	San Pedro		no	yes		
4langeles_20110624_30_before5pm	Los Angeles	San Pedro, Port of Los Angeles		no	yes		
5slo_20110624_1_before5pm	San Luis Obispo			no	no		
5slo_20110624_2_before5pm	San Luis Obispro			no	no		
5slo_20110624_3_before5pm	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara			no	no		
6tuolumne_20110624_before5pm	Tuolomnen			no	yes	common nature of foothill counties	
8alameda_20110624_1_before5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda, San Jose	Fremont, Newark, Union Cities, Richmond		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_2_before5pm		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_3_before5pm	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_4_before5pm	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_5_before5pm	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_6_before5pm	Alameda, West Contra Costa	Piedmont		no	yes	Disparity of richest and poorest	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110624_29_before5pm			no				
4langeles_20110624_30_before5pm	Port of Los Angeles and its impact on San pedros neighborhoods		no				thank you
5slo_20110624_1_before5pm			no				
5slo_20110624_2_before5pm			no				
5slo_20110624_3_before5pm	poor county has been subject of such gerrymandering		no				
6tuolumne_20110624_before5pm			no				
8alameda_20110624_1_before5pm			no				Attached map
8alameda_20110624_2_before5pm			no				
8alameda_20110624_3_before5pm			no				
8alameda_20110624_4_before5pm			no				
8alameda_20110624_5_before5pm			no				
8alameda_20110624_6_before5pm			no				Good work and thank you

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110624_7_before5pm	6242011	Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor	yes	Pleasanton	Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Pleasanton district should remain odd numbered. Do not disenfranchise residents of Contra Costa and Alameda
8alameda_20110624_8_before5pm	6242011	Pompa Malakar	no				yes	Do not split Fremont.
8ccosta_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	Tom Butts	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Richmond should not be split, should be included in COI with Contra costa, not Alameda.
8ccosta_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Gayle McLaughlin, Mayor	yes	City of Richmond	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide richmond.
8ccosta_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Jean Knox	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not assign Richmond to district 10 with Berkeley and Oakland. Put with west Contra Costa
8ccosta_20110624_4_before5pm	6242011	Carol J. Manahan	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond, keep with Contra Costa, not Alameda
8ccosta_20110624_5_before5pm	6242011	Robert Lane	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Richmond should not be divided into two separate districts
8ccosta_20110624_6_before5pm	6242011	Susan Elwell	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Richmond should not be split, should be included in COI with Contra costa, not Alameda.
8ccosta_20110624_7_before5pm	6242011	Mary Nejedly Piepho, Couny Supervisor, District III	yes	Contra Costa County		Contra Costa	yes	Assign odd number to Contra Costa county
8ccosta_20110624_8_before5pm	6242011	Kendal E. Andersen	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep North and East Neighborhoods of Richmond together.
8ccosta_20110624_9_before5pm	6242011	Jennifer Kirkland	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110624_7_before5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Pleasonton		no	no		
8alameda_20110624_8_before5pm	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_1_before5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond	San Pablo Ave, I 80	no	yes	waterfront, social, health, criminal justice	
8ccosta_20110624_2_before5pm	Contra Cotsa	Richmond		no	yes	community ties run deep	
8ccosta_20110624_3_before5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond, Berkeley, Oakland		no	yes	historic individuality and interests	
8ccosta_20110624_4_before5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond	I 80, San Pablo Ave	no	yes	Social, health, criminal justice	
8ccosta_20110624_5_before5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_6_before5pm	Conta Costa, Alameda	Richmond	San Pablo Ave, I 80	no	yes	waterfront, social, health, criminal justice	
8ccosta_20110624_7_before5pm	Contra Costa			no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_8_before5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond	San Pablo Ave, Macdonald Ave, 23rd st	yes	yes	schools, police department, library, city hall, community center, churches, transport	
8ccosta_20110624_9_before5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes	crime, poverty, racism	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110624_7_before5pm			no				Making even will delay senator election from 2012 to 2014
8alameda_20110624_8_before5pm	will not be good for citizens or city		no				
8ccosta_20110624_1_before5pm	minorities	Removing Richmond from Contra Costa would violate VRA	no				See atttached map
8ccosta_20110624_2_before5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_3_before5pm	diluting congressional input will worsen representation		no				
8ccosta_20110624_4_before5pm	one representative, different political sphere		no				
8ccosta_20110624_5_before5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_6_before5pm	minorities	Removing Richmond from Contra Costa would violate VRA	no				
8ccosta_20110624_7_before5pm			no				Need odd numbered district so that residents are not disenfranchised
8ccosta_20110624_8_before5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_9_before5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110624_10_before 5pm	6242011	Camile Zulpo	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmonds district up.
8ccosta_20110624_11_before 5pm	6242011	Christine Caldwell	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split up Richmond.
8ccosta_20110624_12_before 5pm	6242011	Jennifer Quallick	no		San Ramon	Contra Costa	yes	Assign an odd number to Contra Costa, Alameda district
8ccosta_20110624_13_before 5pm	6242011	Brook Demmerle	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not cut Richmond in half.
8ccosta_20110624_14_before 5pm	6242011	John A. Peterson	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	Makes sense to bind Livermore Valey in Alameda to Danville along Highway 680. Include Antioch in Contra Costa district.
8ccosta_20110624_15_before 5pm	6242011	J. Kit Eakle	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not group Richmond with Berkeley and Oakland, Alameda County. Richmond has association with El Sobrante, Crockett, Walnut Creek, etc.
8ccosta_20110624_16_before 5pm	6242011	Ellenn Sasaki	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond.
8ccosta_20110624_17_before 5pm	6242011	Nancy Baer	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide our city in half.
8ccosta_20110624_18_before 5pm	6242011	Tani Suzanne Martinat	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Richmond will not be well served by splitting it between different congressional districts.
8ccosta_20110624_19_before 5pm	6242011	David Moore	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Hopes Richmond will not be split into two districts
8ccosta_20110624_20_before 5pm	6242011	Peggy Geary	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Opposed to redistricting plan.
8ccosta_20110624_21_before 5pm	6242011	Cindy Valentine	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond
8ccosta_20110624_22_before 5pm	6242011	Col Dupontn	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Cutting Richmond in half is nuts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110624_10_before 5pm		Richmond		no	yes	many problems, crime rate going down	
8ccosta_20110624_11_before 5pm		Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110624_12_before 5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda			no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_13_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_14_before 5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Antioch, Livermore, Danville	580 highway	no	yes	Berkeley hills, west of hills	
8ccosta_20110624_15_before 5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond, Oakland, Berkeley, El Sobrante, Crockett, Walnut Creek		no	yes	urban center of Contra Costa	
8ccosta_20110624_16_before 5pm		Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110624_17_before 5pm		Richmond		no	yes	On the rise	
8ccosta_20110624_18_before 5pm		Richmond		no	yes	Richmond is on a good path towards growth	
8ccosta_20110624_19_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_20_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_21_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_22_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110624_10_before 5pm	George Miller		no				
8ccosta_20110624_11_before 5pm	George Miller		no				
8ccosta_20110624_12_before 5pm			no				Assign district odd number
8ccosta_20110624_13_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_14_before 5pm			no				Labeling of maps on webbsite is not distinctive
8ccosta_20110624_15_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_16_before 5pm	George miller as one elected official who knows issues		no				
8ccosta_20110624_17_before 5pm	just ONE Richmond		no				
8ccosta_20110624_18_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_19_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_20_before 5pm			no			happy with George Miller	
8ccosta_20110624_21_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_22_before 5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110624_23_before 5pm	6242011	Ella B. Robberson	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	It is a stretch to lump Richmond in with Alameda county. In competition with Oakland. Richmond more properly alligned with El Cerrito.
8ccosta_20110624_24_before 5pm	6242011	Jon Stiles	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not redistrict Richmond. Richmond should be with Contra Costa, not Alameda.
8ccosta_20110624_25_before 5pm	6242011	Anthony W. Gillispie	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do nont split city in half.
8ccosta_20110624_26_before 5pm	6242011	Marilyn Langlois	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond together. Put Richmond in district with Berkeley and Oakland
8ccosta_20110624_27_before 5pm	6242011	Susan Libby	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not lump Richmond with Berkeley
8ccosta_20110624_28_before 5pm	6242011	Mary Lee Cole, Ph. D	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond and combine with 9th district.
8ccosta_20110624_29_before 5pm	6242011	Larry Hatfield	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Dividing Richmond makes no sense
8ccosta_20110624_30_before 5pm	6242011	Karen Basting, President	yes	The Hampton Group	Alamo	Contra Costa	yes	Assign Odd number to districts of Contra Costa and Alameda
8ccosta_20110624_31_before 5pm	6242011	Lesli Zephyr	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not group Richmond with Oakland.
8ccosta_20110624_32_before 5pm	6242011	Tomi Van de Brooke	yes	Governing Board, Contra Costa Community District		Contra Costa	yes	Must assign ann odd number to senate district
8ccosta_20110624_33_before 5pm	6242011	Al Miller	no		El Cerrito	Contra Costa	yes	Do El Cerrito and Kensington both remain in same districts?
8ccosta_20110624_34_before 5pm	6242011	James Villegas, Former Library Commissioner,	yes	City of Oakley	Oakley	Contra Coasta	yes	Should not separate Oakley from Eastern Contra Costa County, including Pittsburg, Bay Point, Antioch, Brentwood, Knightsen, Bethel Island, Byron, and Discovery Bay

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110624_23_before 5pm	Alameda	Richmond, Oakland		no	yes	Urban problems, safety issues	
8ccosta_20110624_24_before 5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond		no	yes	historical, health, judicial, minorities	
8ccosta_20110624_25_before 5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_26_before 5pm	Alameda	Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_27_before 5pm		Richmond, Berkeley		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_28_before 5pm	Alameda, Contra Costa	Richmond	San Pablo Ave, I 80	no	yes	Social, health, judicial, minorities	
8ccosta_20110624_29_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_30_before 5pm	Alameda, Contra Costa			no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_31_before 5pm		Richmond, Oakland		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_32_before 5pm				no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_33_before 5pm		El Cerrito, Kensington		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_34_before 5pm	Contra Costa	Pittsburg, Bay Point, Antioch, Brentwood, Knightsen, Bethel Island, Byron, and Discovery Bay, Oakley		no	yes	neighbors, representation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110624_23_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_24_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_25_before 5pm			no			Could pit half of citizens interest against one another	
8ccosta_20110624_26_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_27_before 5pm			no				Own needs
8ccosta_20110624_28_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_29_before 5pm			no			George Miller has done a good job	
8ccosta_20110624_30_before 5pm			no				Need odd numbered district
8ccosta_20110624_31_before 5pm			no			Violence, gangs, high unemployment	Congressman Miller knows the issues
8ccosta_20110624_32_before 5pm			no			Otherwise will leave millions of people disenfranchised	
8ccosta_20110624_33_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_34_before 5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110624_35_before 5pm	6242011	Kerry Moriarty	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond
8ccosta_20110624_36_before 5pm	6242011	Miriam Joscelyn	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Richmond should not be divided between two districts
8ccosta_20110624_37_before 5pm	6242011	Charlie Richard Jr, President	yes	Painters Local 367		Contra Costa	yes	Assign Contra Costa district an odd number.
8ccosta_20110624_38_before 5pm	6242011	John Strohmeier, Multimedia Advertising Consultant	yes	Bay Area News Group	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond in half. Do not want to be neglected stepchild of Oakland or Walnut Creek
8ccosta_20110624_39_before 5pm	6242011	Sharon Coffer	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond and do not attach to Alameda County.
8ccosta_20110624_40_before 5pm	6242011	Gary M. Levin, President	no	Levin Richmond Terminal Corporation	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	City of Richmond should not be split in half and joined with Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, Alameda in Alameda county. Should stay in Contra Costa.
8ccosta_20110624_41_before 5pm	6242011	Amy Ukena	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not pair Richmond with Hercules, Black Hawk, Berkeley, Albany, etc.
8ccosta_20110624_42_before 5pm	6242011	Nina Smith	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond. Agree Richmond has more in common with Alameda county thatn East Contra Costa, and would not object if it could happen without the split.
8napa_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	William Bennett	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa county. Distinct from Vallejo and Solano County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110624_35_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_36_before 5pm		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_37_before 5pm	Contra Costa			no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_38_before 5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond, Oakland, Walnut Creek		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_39_before 5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond	I 80, San Pablo Ave	no	yes	historical and geographical ties bind Richmond to Contra Costa county, social, health, Judicial, minorities	
8ccosta_20110624_40_before 5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, Alameda		no	yes	Richmond whole unique qualities, representatives experience	trade, marine terminal, competition for Lawrence Berkeley National Labs
8ccosta_20110624_41_before 5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond, Black Hawk, Berkeley, Albany, Hercules		no	no		
8ccosta_20110624_42_before 5pm	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond		no	no		
8napa_20110624_1_before5pm	Solano, Napa	American Canyon, Vallejo	Highway 29	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110624_35_before 5pm			no			Causes harm to community	supports comments sent by Tom Butt
8ccosta_20110624_36_before 5pm			no				
8ccosta_20110624_37_before 5pm			no				Need representation from a senator elected by people of the district.
8ccosta_20110624_38_before 5pm	Richmond needs to operate as a unified political unit to sustain progress. One representative at each level.		no				
8ccosta_20110624_39_before 5pm		removing block from Richmond would disenfranchise minorities and violate the VRA	no				
8ccosta_20110624_40_before 5pm			no			Would split supervisorial representation	
8ccosta_20110624_41_before 5pm			no			Would destroy Richmond.	Supports Tom Butts suggestions
8ccosta_20110624_42_before 5pm			no			Split would split off poorer section from middle class section.	
8napa_20110624_1_before5pm			no			Highway 29, projects would have to involve six legislators.	Do not burden our town with this onerous task

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Deborah M. Castles, VP	yes	McGrath Properties, Inc.	Oakland	Alameda	yes	Include American Canyon in Napa County. Citizens relate to Napa valley, not Vallejo
8napa_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Susan Archer, President	yes	North Bay Association of Realators		Napa	yes	Include American Canyon with the remainder of Napa county.
8napa_20110624_4_before5pm	6242011	Teresa Aubert, Owner	yes	Aubert wines		Napa	yes	Do not redraw district lines.
8napa_20110624_5_before5pm	6242011	Cheryl Jackson-Peet	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	American Cayon should be aligned with Napa, not Vallejo.
8sfrancisco_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Cheryl Traverse	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Assign San Francisco senate seat an Odd number. Do not divide LGBT community between East side and West side.
8solano_20110624_before5pm	6242011	Sandra Kirkpatrick	no		Benicia	Solano	yes	Benicia should be with Martinez, Pleasant Hill and Concord, not Fairfield or vacaville. Both face Carquinez Strait
9dnorte_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Lee Beising	no			Del Norte	yes	Thank you for grouping Coastal Del Norte County with other coastal counties
9dnorte_20110624_4_before5pm	6242011	Scott Kimball	no			Del Norte	yes	Keep Del Norte County grouped with coastal region, Crescent City
9dnorte_20110624_5_before5pm	6242011	Gordon Bonser	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Thank you for keeping Crescent City with coastal county
9humboldt_20110624_before5pm	6242011	Rudy Ramp	no		Arcata	Humboldt	yes	In favor of North Coast districts as proposed
9mendocino_20110624_before5pm	6242011	Pam Brown, MFT	no			Mendocino	yes	Supports North coast redistricting
9sacramento_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	Gordon V. Scott	no				yes	Cannot see reason for splitting eastern suburbs of Sacramento from rest of urban Sacramento and including with Foothills.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110624_2_before5pm	Napa	American Canyon, Vallejo		no	yes	infrastructure, traffic	affordable housing, wine industry, economic success
8napa_20110624_3_before5pm	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	residential growth, identity and linkage to Napa	
8napa_20110624_4_before5pm				no	no		
8napa_20110624_5_before5pm	Napa	Vallejo, American Canyon		no	yes	vineyards, warehousing, great schools, housing road improvements, open spaces	Vineyards, businesses
8sfrancisco_20110624_2_before5pm	San Francisco	San Francisco	West Side, East Side, Diamond Heights, Twin Peaks, Upper Haight, Cole Valley	yes	yes	LGBT community	
8solano_20110624_before5pm	Solano.	Benicia, Vacaville, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Concord, Fairfield	Carquinez strait.	no	yes	Strait, bridge, nonprofits, small town identity, commuter corridor	
9dnorte_20110624_3_before5pm	Del Norte			no	yes	coastal rain forest county	
9dnorte_20110624_4_before5pm	Del Norte	Crescent City		no	yes	Coastal, historic, natural ties	active commercial fishing fleet
9dnorte_20110624_5_before5pm	Del Norte	Crescent City		no	yes	coastal issues	
9humboldt_20110624_before5pm	Humboldt			no	no		
9mendocino_20110624_before5pm	Mendocino			no	no		
9sacramento_20110624_1_before5pm	Sacramento	Sacramento		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110624_2_before5pm			no				Thank you for your consideration
8napa_20110624_3_before5pm			no				
8napa_20110624_4_before5pm			no				
8napa_20110624_5_before5pm			no				
8sfrancisco_20110624_2_before5pm			no				
8solano_20110624_before5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110624_3_before5pm			no				thank you for your wisdom
9dnorte_20110624_4_before5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110624_5_before5pm			no				
9humboldt_20110624_before5pm			no				
9mendocino_20110624_before5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110624_1_before5pm			no			issues facing dense suburban area are different from rural, farm based economic area	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Joseph Hensler	no		Fair Oaks	Sacramento	yes	Do not add chunk of Eastern Sacramento to Placer. Restore Fair Oaks, Folsom, Orangevale, Gold River, Citrus Heights to Sacramento
9sacramento_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Gordon R. Olson, President	yes	Elmhurst Neighborhood Association	Elmhurst	Sacramento	yes	Do not separate Elmhurst from rest of the City by including it in district with Roseville, El Dorado Hills, Loomis.
9sacramento_20110624_4_before5pm	6242011	Joseph Sison	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Keep Sacramento intact in one district
9siskiyou_20110624_8_before5pm	6242011	Peggy Heide	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split county of Siskiyou. Keep Scott Valley, Shasta Valley, Butte Valley, Tulelake, Alturas, Yreka together.
9siskiyou_20110624_9_before5pm	6242011	Jennifer Hurlimann	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou county.
9siskiyou_20110624_10_before5pm	6242011	Stanley G. Meager	no		Seiad Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Do not take Scott Valley and Happy Camp out of Siskiyou county, do not divide
9siskiyou_20110624_11_before5pm	6242011	Jim Cook, Supervisor	yes	Siskiyou County		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county.
9siskiyou_20110624_12_before5pm	6242011	Tina Frost	no			Siskiyou	yes	do not split Siskiyou county.
9siskiyou_20110624_13_before5pm	6242011	Harry L. Lake	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou county. The most fair demarcation is the drainage divide between Scott River Watershed and Trinity River Watershed
9siskiyou_20110624_14_before5pm	6242011	Theodora Dowling	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict my hometown
9siskiyou_20110624_15_before5pm	6242011	Andrew Hurlimann	no		Callahan	Siskiyou	yes	Please leave Siskiyou county intact, do not put with coastal regions, Eureka is 5 hours away

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110624_2_before5pm	Sacramento, Placer	Fair Oaks, Folsom, Orangevale, Gold River, Citrus Heights		no	no		
9sacramento_20110624_3_before5pm	Sacramento	Sacramento, Roseville, El Dorado Hills, Loomis		no	yes	State University and UC Davis should remain in City District	
9sacramento_20110624_4_before5pm	Sacramento	Sacramento		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_8_before5pm	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Shasta Valley, Butte Valley, Tulelake, Alturas, Yreka		no	yes	joined by families	Agriculture
9siskiyou_20110624_9_before5pm	Siskiyou			no	yes		agriculturalists
9siskiyou_20110624_10_before5pm	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Happy Camp		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_11_before5pm	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110624_12_before5pm	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110624_13_before5pm	Siskiyou		Scott River Watershed, Trinity River Watershed	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_14_before5pm	Siskiyou	Etna		no	yes		farming, ranching, timber
9siskiyou_20110624_15_before5pm	Siskiyou	Eureka		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110624_2_before5pm	historically representatives have been from the area in question		no				
9sacramento_20110624_3_before5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110624_4_before5pm			no				
9siskiyou_20110624_8_before5pm			no				
9siskiyou_20110624_9_before5pm			no				
9siskiyou_20110624_10_before5pm			no			Do not share common interest and culture with those not in district	
9siskiyou_20110624_11_before5pm	Social and economic, western area would be severely seperated geographically		no				attached proposed maps
9siskiyou_20110624_12_before5pm			no			do not share common interests with coastal region, 5 hour drive	
9siskiyou_20110624_13_before5pm			no			Not significant Native population	
9siskiyou_20110624_14_before5pm	representation		no				
9siskiyou_20110624_15_before5pm			no			Different interests, views, needs, culture	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110624_16_before5pm	6242011	Louise Gliatto	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split western Siskiyou off and do not join with Coastal communities.
9siskiyou_20110624_17_before5pm	6242011	Stanley G. Meager	no		Seiad Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Big difference between Yreka, Eureka.
9siskiyou_20110624_18_before5pm	6242011	Ellis Jones	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou to coastal areas.
9siskiyou_20110624_19_before5pm	6242011	Mark Baird	no			siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou county.
9siskiyou_20110624_20_before5pm	6242011	Leo T Bergeron	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county in half.
9siskiyou_20110624_21_before5pm	6242011	Jim Cook, Chair	yes	Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county into separate districts.
9sjoaquin_20110624_29_before5pm	6242011	Chris Frei	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be included in san Joaquin county
9sjoaquin_20110624_30_before5pm	6242011	Frank Ruiz	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not redistrict Lodi to bay area
9sjoaquin_20110624_31_before5pm	6242011	Kerry Suess, President	yes	Lodi Association of Realtors	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi out of San Joaquin and group with Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisjun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and woodland. Group with Stockton, Mantecta and Modesto
9sjoaquin_20110624_32_before5pm	6242011	Bob Johnson	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not group Lodi with Santa Rosa, keep with Stockton and San Joaquin

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110624_16_before5pm	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_17_before5pm	Siskiyou	Yreka, Eureka		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_18_before5pm	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_19_before5pm	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_20_before5pm	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110624_21_before5pm	siskiyou			no	yes	living standards, public transport, newspaper	economic interests, rural agricultural area
9sjoaquin_20110624_29_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110624_30_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_31_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, Woodland, Stockton, Manteca, Modesto		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_32_before5pm	San Joaquin	Stockton, Lodi, Santa Rosa	Highway 99	no	yes	school district in stockton, highway 99	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110624_16_before5pm			no			Native population is only 4 percent	
9siskiyou_20110624_17_before5pm			no			5 hours away, dangerous, winding roads	
9siskiyou_20110624_18_before5pm			no			coastal areas have little economic, social, or land use policies consistent with ethics of inland residents	
9siskiyou_20110624_19_before5pm			no			Native population not significant, Eureka and Redding are too far to drive	
9siskiyou_20110624_20_before5pm			no			Long drive, intermountain district are doers not users.	Will speed up process for formation of the state of Jefferson
9siskiyou_20110624_21_before5pm	schools will incur increas of election expenses, will separate population		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_29_before5pm	water rights, farmers, best interests		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_30_before5pm			no			bay area does not share concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_31_before5pm			no			Lodi will never have a representative	
9sjoaquin_20110624_32_before5pm			no			growers have little in common with those in Napa, St Helena	It truly makes sense

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_33_before5pm	6242011		no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi out of San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_34_before5pm	6242011	Dennis Sattler	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Grouping Lodi with north bay makes no sense, keep with localities
9sjoaquin_20110624_35_before5pm	6242011	Michelle Mills	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin. Yola, Napa and Marin are too far away.
9sjoaquin_20110624_36_before5pm	6242011	Joy Freeman	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin county.
9sjoaquin_20110624_37_before5pm	6242011	Joseph Salzman	no		Lockeford	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lockeford in San Joaquin county.
9sjoaquin_20110624_38_before5pm	6242011	Michelle Olea	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_39_before5pm	6242011	Edward Van Diemen, President and Amy Blagg, Executive Director	yes	Lodi District Grape Growers Association	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with Victor, Lockeford, Clements, Acampo in San Joaquin. Do not put with Vacaville, Dixon, Woodland in Solano, Santa Rosa, Sebastapol
9sjoaquin_20110624_40_before5pm	6242011	Kathy Cassebarth, Business Owner	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi and San Joaquin County in a single senate district. Take Tracy instead.
9sjoaquin_20110624_41_before5pm	6242011	Raymond Crow	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi and San Joaquin County in a single senate district. Take Tracy instead.
9sjoaquin_20110624_42_before5pm	6242011	Daryl R. Petrick, CPA	yes	Certified Public Accountants	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not group Lodi with Vallejo and santa Rosa. Keep San Joaquin homogenous.
9sjoaquin_20110624_43_before5pm	6242011	Calvin Ogren ad Denise Rinaldi	yes	Ogrens Auction Services	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi from San Joaquin and put with Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, etc.
9sjoaquin_20110624_44_before5pm	6242011	Steve Kludt	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_33_before5pm	san Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_34_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_35_before5pm	San Joaquin, Yola, Napa, Marin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_36_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	farmers, close knit, wine, produce, water rights	
9sjoaquin_20110624_37_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lockeford		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110624_38_before5pm	san Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_39_before5pm	San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi, Victor, Lockeford, Clements, Acampo, Vacaville, Dixon, Woodland, Santa Rosa, Sebastapol		no	yes	Agriculture, interests, political voice, grapes	
9sjoaquin_20110624_40_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Tracy		no	yes	interests, political voice, commuters	
9sjoaquin_20110624_41_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Tracy		no	yes	nterests, political voice, commuters	
9sjoaquin_20110624_42_before5pm	san Joaquin	Lodi, Vallejo, Santa Rosa		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_43_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield		no	yes	conservative	
9sjoaquin_20110624_44_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_33_before5pm			no			will lose state political voice	
9sjoaquin_20110624_34_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_35_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_36_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_37_before5pm	need to be represented together		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_38_before5pm			no			They want our water.	
9sjoaquin_20110624_39_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_40_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_41_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_42_before5pm			no				Thank you
9sjoaquin_20110624_43_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_44_before5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_46_before5pm	6242011	Doug Dinjian, CIC	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be included in San Joaquin district.
9sjoaquin_20110624_47_before5pm	6242011	Connie S. Rill	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi is not aligned with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano. More in common with southern county, including stockton
9sjoaquin_20110624_48_before5pm	6242011	Joel and Betty Wilson	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not redistrict Lodi
9sjoaquin_20110624_49_before5pm	6242011	Brenda Jackson	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not remove Lodi from San Joaquin map.
9sjoaquin_20110624_50_before5pm	6242011	John Johnson, Vice President	yes	Cat Rental Store	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi does not belong with Vallejo, Benicia, Santa Rosa, Fairfield, Etc. Belongs with San Joaquin, not Contra Costa.
9sjoaquin_20110624_51_before5pm	6242011	Madelyn Ripken Kolber	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with valley, not North bay
9sjoaquin_20110624_52_before5pm	6242011	Tito Samaniego, Financial Analyst	yes	Lodi Memorial Hospital	Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Stockton together. Include Tracy and Manteca with stockton, not antioch and Contra Costa.
9sjoaquin_20110624_53_before5pm	6242011	Ed Miller	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Group Lodi with Stockton. Add Galt. Group Lodi with San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_54_before5pm	6242011	J. Mark Hamilton	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi has nothing in common with Santa rosa, keep with San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_55_before5pm	6242011	Jolynn McDonald	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Place Lodi with Stockton, Tracy, Galt, foothills
9sjoaquin_20110624_56_before5pm	6242011	Gary M. Linder, Ph D.	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with San Joaquin

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_46_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	Transportation, Education, Water, public safetey, community involvement, representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_47_before5pm	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin	Lodi, Stockton		no	yes	school district, unemployment	
9sjoaquin_20110624_48_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_49_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_50_before5pm	san Joaquin, Contra Costa	Lodi, Vallejo, Benicia, Santa Rosa, Fairfield,		no	yes	different voters, small town issues, works in valley, shops in valley, schools	
9sjoaquin_20110624_51_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_52_before5pm	San Joaquin, Contra Costa	Stockton, Tracy, Manteca, Antioch, Lodi		no	yes	hospitals, community	
9sjoaquin_20110624_53_before5pm	San Joaquin	Stockton, Lodi, Galt		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_54_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110624_55_before5pm		Lodi, Stockton, Tracy, Galt		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_56_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_46_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_47_before5pm			no			not alligned with east bay, etc	
9sjoaquin_20110624_48_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_49_before5pm			no			have right to local representation, not bay area rep	
9sjoaquin_20110624_50_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_51_before5pm			no			North bay has other interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_52_before5pm			no			Bay area has very different community	
9sjoaquin_20110624_53_before5pm			no			Grapes in common but nothing else	
9sjoaquin_20110624_54_before5pm	Live and work in San Joaquin valley		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_55_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_56_before5pm			no			will limit ability for fair representation	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_57_before5pm	6242011	Pat Patrick, President CEO	yes	Lodi Chamber of Commerce	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi does not have interest with Bay or Contra Costa
9sjoaquin_20110624_58_before5pm	6242011	Brendt Pemberton	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Maps will not work for Lodi
9sjoaquin_20110624_59_before5pm	6242011	Mike Erickson, Sr Loan Officer	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Not viable to include Lodi with Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and Woodland. Leave with San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_60_before5pm	6242011	Pat Maddox	yes	Western Printing and Graphics	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi is not Bay area or East Contra Costa, but San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_61_before5pm	6242011	Aaron Beitler	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_62_before5pm	6242011	Paul Inman	yes	The Search Group Partners, Inc	Lodi	San Joaquin	no	
9sjoaquin_20110624_63_before5pm	6242011	Ron Kreutner, VP and CEO (duplicate)	yes	Lodi Memorial Hospital	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi with North Bay Cities. Keep with San Joaquin Valley cities. Lodi is coupled with Stockton, Manteca, Galt, Elk Grove, Rio Vista, Lockeford, Valley Springs
9sjoaquin_20110624_64_before5pm	6242011	Karen Griggs	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Stockton has nothing in common with Antioch keep San Joaquin County intact. Keep Lodi and Stockton together.
9sjoaquin_20110624_65_before5pm	6242011	Aaron Beitler	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with San Joaquin, not North Bay
9sjoaquin_20110624_67_before5pm	6242011	Gary M. Lindner, Ph. D	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with San Joaquin

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_57_before5pm	Contra Costa	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_58_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_59_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and Woodland		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_60_before5pm	Contra Costa, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_61_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	agriculture, independent spirit, history, character	agriculture
9sjoaquin_20110624_62_before5pm				no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_63_before5pm	San Joaquin	Stockton, Manteca, Galt, Elk Grove, Rio Vista, Lockeford, Valley Springs, Lodi		no	yes	hospitals, similar	
9sjoaquin_20110624_64_before5pm	San Joaquin	Stockton, Lodi, Antioch		no	yes	water	agriculture, retail businesses,
9sjoaquin_20110624_65_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	ethos with roots in agriculture and independent spirit	
9sjoaquin_20110624_67_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_57_before5pm			no			nothing in common	
9sjoaquin_20110624_58_before5pm			no			lose state political voice and representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_59_before5pm			no			different values, political voice	
9sjoaquin_20110624_60_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_61_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_62_before5pm			no				Stop trying to put the FIX in. California has become a joke equalled only by New York.
9sjoaquin_20110624_63_before5pm			no			Keep bay area and valley separate	
9sjoaquin_20110624_64_before5pm	schools		no			stockton and antioch have no ties educational or commercial	
9sjoaquin_20110624_65_before5pm			no			Do not want political voices diluted bby population base that does not understand their history	
9sjoaquin_20110624_67_before5pm			no			Revision will limit ability for fair representation	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_68_before5pm	6242011	Tito Samaniego, Financial Analyst	yes	Lodi Memorial Hospital	Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Stockton together. Include Tracy and Manteca with stockton, not antioch and Contra Costa.
9sjoaquin_20110624_69_before5pm	6242011	Jolynn McDonal	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Place Lodi with Stockton, Tracy, Galt, foothills
9sjoaquin_20110624_70_before5pm	6242011	J. Mark Hamilton	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Place Lodi with San Joaquin, not Santa Rosa
9sjoaquin_20110624_71_before5pm	6242011	Robert Russell	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not group Lodi with Yolo, Napa, Marin, and Solano counties, but with San Joaquin. Take Tracy instead.
9sjoaquin_20110624_72_before5pm	6242011	Bruce Fry VP of Operation	yes	Mohr Fry Ranches	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should group with Victor, Lockeford, Clements, Acampo, San Juaquin, not Vacaville, Dixon, Woodland, Solano, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol.
9sjoaquin_20110624_73_before5pm	6242011	Pat Maddox	yes	Western Printing and Graphics	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi not Bay area or East Contra Costa, but San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_74_before5pm	6242011	Claire Lima	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not change Lodi s distict
9sjoaquin_20110624_75_before5pm	6242011	Karen Griggs	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Keep San Joaquin intact. Do not separate Lodi from Stockton.
9sjoaquin_20110624_76_before5pm	6242011	Mark Quackenbush	yes	Nationwide Insurance	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not place city of Lodi with Bay area communities
9sjoaquin_20110624_77_before5pm	6242011	C. Walther	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi is in San Joaquin Valley, not Contra Costa
9sjoaquin_20110624_78_before5pm	6242011	Chris Phelps, Realtor	yes	Schaffer and Company Realtors	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not redistrict Lodi to Napa

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_68_before5pm	San Joaquin, Contra Costa	Stockton, Tracy, Manteca, Lodi		no	yes	hospitals, community	
9sjoaquin_20110624_69_before5pm		Stockton, Tracy, Galt, foothills		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_70_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_71_before5pm	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_72_before5pm	San Joaquin, Solano, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol	Lodi, Victor, Lockeford, Clements, Acampo, Vacaville, Dixon, Woodland		no	yes		agriculture, winegrape pricing district, jobs, tourism, tax revenue, charity
9sjoaquin_20110624_73_before5pm	San Joaquin, Contra Costa	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_74_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_75_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Stockton		no	yes		agriculture, water, retail
9sjoaquin_20110624_76_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_77_before5pm	San Joaquin, Contra Costa	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_78_before5pm	Napa	Lodi		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_68_before5pm			no			Bay area has very different community	
9sjoaquin_20110624_69_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_70_before5pm			no			nothing in common with Santa Rosa	
9sjoaquin_20110624_71_before5pm			no			Preserve city and county boundaries, there are commuters in tracy who travel to Bay Area for work, not Lodi to Santa Rosa	
9sjoaquin_20110624_72_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_73_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_74_before5pm			no			it will hurt our city	
9sjoaquin_20110624_75_before5pm	schools,		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_76_before5pm			no			Different issues between valley and bay. Draw lines within geographic and economic boundaries.	
9sjoaquin_20110624_77_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_78_before5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_79_before5pm	6242011	Cindy Ward	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Put Lodi with San Joaquin, not Contra Costa
9sjoaquin_20110624_80_before5pm	6242011	Jan Sherman, Broker Owner	yes	Sherman and Associates	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi with Northbay, put with San Joaquin county
9sjoaquin_20110624_81_before5pm	6242011	LouAnn Edens	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi out of San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_82_before5pm	6242011	Gail Jones, AP Specialist	yes	Lodi Memorial Hospital	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi with North Bay Counties, keep with San Joaquin.
9sjoaquin_20110624_83_before5pm	6242011	Charlene Lange	yes	LangeTwins Winery and Vineyards	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi has nothing in common with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano Counties.
9sjoaquin_20110624_84_before5pm	6242011	Phyllis Roche	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be in San Joaquin or joined with Galt and Elk Grove, not Bay area
9sjoaquin_20110624_85_before5pm	6242011	Kenneth Kramlich	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Redistricting is bad for Lodi. Is not North Bay
9sjoaquin_20110624_86_before5pm	6242011	Joe and Janet Knobloch	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be in the Bay area
9sjoaquin_20110624_87_before5pm	6242011	Joe and Ann Mehrten	no		Clements	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be in San Joaquin, not Napa.
9sjoaquin_20110624_88_before5pm	6242011	Judy Green	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi is not North Bay, keep with San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_89_before5pm	6242011	Kevin Van Steenberge	yes	Lodi Iron Works, Inc	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County
9sjoaquin_20110624_90_before5pm	6242011	Phil Loechler	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_91_before5pm	6242011	Peggy and Jerry Fry	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin and Solano, but San Joaquin

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_79_before5pm	Contra Costa, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_80_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_81_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_82_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_83_before5pm	Yolo, Napa, San Joaquin, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_84_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Galt, Elk Grove		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_85_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_86_before5pm		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_87_before5pm	San Joaquin, Napa	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_88_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_89_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_90_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_91_before5pm	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, marin, Salano	Lodi		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_79_before5pm			no			Nowhere near each other, do not have same type of agriculture	
9sjoaquin_20110624_80_before5pm			no			Fair and equal representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_81_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_82_before5pm			no			North Bay and SJ have different lifestyle and needs	
9sjoaquin_20110624_83_before5pm			no			Stop the government divisions, need unified representation in congress	Make it right and stop the games
9sjoaquin_20110624_84_before5pm			no			more compatible interests	
9sjoaquin_20110624_85_before5pm			no			We will lose political voice	
9sjoaquin_20110624_86_before5pm			no			Different values, will lose political voice	
9sjoaquin_20110624_87_before5pm			no			No transport, watersheds, communication, emergency, energy or agencies in common	
9sjoaquin_20110624_88_before5pm			no			Lodi is a small Valley town	
9sjoaquin_20110624_89_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_90_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_91_before5pm			no			These counties are distant	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_92_before5pm	6242011	Bob Lentz	no		Acampo	San Joaquin	yes	Put Lodi and Galt in central Valley Districts, not Bay area
9sjoaquin_20110624_93_before5pm	6242011	Marlene Jones	no		Tracy	San Joaquin	yes	Tracy Should be in district with Stockton, not Modesto. Lathrup should be in west assembly district, Lockford Eastern.
9sjoaquin_20110624_94_before5pm	6242011	R. Wayne Craig, President	yes	Craig Realty Advisors Inc	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Include Lodi in district within Central Valley, not Bay Area
9sjoaquin_20110624_95_before5pm	6242011	Dave and Pat Croft	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in Bay area, put in San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_96_before5pm	6242011	Cheryl Kirwann, Donor Operation	yes	Delta Blood Bank	Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should remain in San Joaquin county. Yolo Napa, Marin, Solano counties are too far away. Single senate district
9sjoaquin_20110624_97_before5pm	6242011	Barry and Doree Weber	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi out of San Joaquin. Do not put with North bay cities
9yolo_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	Julie Sontag	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Davis is part of Yolo county, not Sacramento
9yolo_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Carol Souza Cole	no		Woodland	Yolo	yes	Do not divide Yolo. Woodland should be grouped with Yolo, Davis, Winters, and West Sacramento
9yolo_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Michael Koltnow	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County intact, include Woodland with Davis.
general_20110624_before5pm	6242011	Pam Brown, MFT	no				yes	North Coast should be together
5sbarbara_20110624_1_41	6242011	Jim Hensley	no				yes	Do not cut Lompoc valley into two districts
5sbarbara_20110624_2_41	6242011	Leonard A. Todd	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into 2 districts.
5sbarbara_20110624_3_41	6242011	Richard S and Nelda M Frenk	no				yes	Do not split Lompoc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_92_before5pm		Lodi, Galt		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_93_before5pm		Tracy, Stockton, Lathrup, Lockeford	I 5, I 205	no	yes	transportation, suburban	agriculture
9sjoaquin_20110624_94_before5pm		Lodi		no	yes	grape growing region, environmental concerns	economic future
9sjoaquin_20110624_95_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_96_before5pm	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_97_before5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9yolo_20110624_1_before5pm	Sacramento, Yolo	Davis, Sacramento		no	no		
9yolo_20110624_2_before5pm	Yolo	Woodland, Davis, Winters, West Sacramento	I 80 corridor	no	yes	civic and political diversity	
9yolo_20110624_3_before5pm	Yolo	Woodland, Davis		no	yes	shopping, schools,	vitality of downtown
general_20110624_before5pm				no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_1_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_2_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_3_41		Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_92_before5pm			no			100 miles away represenattives	
9sjoaquin_20110624_93_before5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_94_before5pm	air quality standards, bird flyways		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_95_before5pm			no			different values and lifestyle	
9sjoaquin_20110624_96_before5pm			no			nothing in common, effective representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_97_before5pm			no			Population difference, voting differences	
9yolo_20110624_1_before5pm			no			Needs to remain unified to preserve farmland	
9yolo_20110624_2_before5pm	School district, projects, school boards, way of life, principles		no				
9yolo_20110624_3_before5pm			no			is bizarre to divide Yolo among nine representatives	
general_20110624_before5pm			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_1_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_2_41			no			Will diminish representation and increase ballot costs	
5sbarbara_20110624_3_41			no			Unfair to single out one city	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110624_4_41	6242011	Kelly Owen	no				yes	Opposed to splitting Lompoc. Should be kept with Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks, Vandenberg Village
5sbarbara_20110624_5_41	6242011	Mitzi S. Alberston	yes	Lompoc Unified School District	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Against splitting Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_6_41	6242011	Victoria L. Sholes	no				yes	Do not divide Lompoc into 2
5sbarbara_20110624_7_41	6242011	Glenn Owen	no		Vandenberg Village	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc, leave Lompoc with Mesa Oaks, Mission Hills, and Vandenberg Village
5sbarbara_20110624_8_41	6242011	John P. Thermos	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	DO not break up Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110624_9_41	6242011	Mellissa J. DeBacker	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into two districts.
5sbarbara_20110624_10_41	6242011	Victoria Sholes	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_11_41	6242011	Charles Sholes	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Lompoc should be whole, not split up
5sbarbara_20110624_12_41	6242011	Cathy Trevino, GRI	yes	Coldwell Banker Select Realty	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc together in Santa Barbara county
5sbarbara_20110624_13_41	6242011	Martha J. Travis	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not redistrict Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_14	6242011	J Costa	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide Lompoc into two.
5sbarbara_20110624_15	6242011	George Stillman	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in half.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110624_4_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_5_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_6_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_7_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_8_41		Lompoc		no	yes	isolated community, 20 miles from population center	
5sbarbara_20110624_9_41		Lompoc		no	yes	Lompoc shares burdens and concerns	
5sbarbara_20110624_10_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_11_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_12_41	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes		suffers from economy, unique in population and lower social economic status
5sbarbara_20110624_13_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_14		Lompoc		no	yes	local concerns,	
5sbarbara_20110624_15		Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110624_4_41			no			Cannot be properly served if split	
5sbarbara_20110624_5_41			no			close-knit, do not pit neighbor against neighbor	
5sbarbara_20110624_6_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_7_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_8_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_9_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_10_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_11_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_12_41	keep residents together, new Space Center		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_13_41			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_14	representation, electoral importance and influence is diminished otherwise		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_15			no			should be represented by one individual at senate and assembly levels, not two	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110624_16	6242011	Karen L. Osland	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split the Lompoc valley into artificial districs.
5sbarbara_20110624_17	6242011	Edward York Jr.	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split up Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_18	6242011	Frank M. Signorelli	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not Split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_19	6242011	Timothy J Harringon, President	yes	Terralink Consulting, Inc	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc, include in one district with unincorporated areas
5sbarbara_20110624_20	6242011	Walter Manfria	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not redistrict Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_21	6242011	Ella E. Gale, Ph.D	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not allow Lompoc to be split
5sbarbara_20110624_22	6242011	G. Donna Williams	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide Lompoc, keep in one district
5sbarbara_20110624_23	6242011	Dulcie Sinn	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_24	6242011	Robin Dunaetz	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in half
5sbarbara_20110624_25	6242011	Myra Manfrina	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not cut Lompoc in half.
5sbarbara_20110624_26	6242011	Robert W Manfrina	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide Lompoc for our representation
5sbarbara_20110624_27	6242011	John Thermos	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not break up city of Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110624_29	6242011	Marion L. Butch Browder	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lomoc together as a singe represented group, include Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks, etc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110624_16		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_17		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_18		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_19		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_20		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_21		Lompoc		no	yes		New ventures in outer space and the wine industry
5sbarbara_20110624_22		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_23		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_24		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_25		Lompoc		no	yes	been a whole city since 1880	
5sbarbara_20110624_26		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_27		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_29		Lompoc		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110624_16	Valley, rural and urban, is a unified whole		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_17	Needs to belong to single districts		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_18	Diverse Ideas, solutions		no				There are only 3,300 at the prison, 60,000 residents in valley
5sbarbara_20110624_19			no			Is an assault on the rights of voters, tax payers and community	
5sbarbara_20110624_20			no				please honor Mayors request
5sbarbara_20110624_21	need to keep united political identity		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_22			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_23	Would only exacerbate neglect, added expense of printing election material		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_24	would increase election costs to split.		no				do not need different representatives
5sbarbara_20110624_25			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_26			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_27	isolated community		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_29	like minded, common needs and rep. requirements, would cost more in election fees		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110624_30	6242011	Catherine E. Rudolph	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110624_31	6242011	Lisa Erotas	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not cut Lompoc valley into two districts.
5sbarbara_20110624_32	6242011	Jessie H. Sheldon	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not cut Lompoc into two districts
5sbarbara_20110624_33	6242011	Barry Fredieu, President	yes	AFGE Local 3048	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into two districts
5sbarbara_20110624_34	6242011	Arthur Smith, Jr	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc. More in tune with Orcutt, Santa Maria and Nipomo. Nothing in common with Santa Barbara, Ventura, Oxnard
5sbarbara_20110624_35	6242011	Stephen Pepe	yes	Clos Pepe Vineyards LLC	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110624_36	6242011	DeWayne Holmdahl	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Lompoc should only have one assemblyman or senator
5sbarbara_20110624_37	6242011	Jane Dedges	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Lompoc needs to be in one district
5sbarbara_20110624_38_38	6242011	Joy Browder	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into two districts.
1sdiego_20110524_1_before5pm	6242010	Nick Dieterich	no				yes	Keep all Rancho Santa Fe and Escondido within 74th Assembly. Keep Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, Valley Center, San Pasqual, Harmony Grove, Elfin Forest, Whispering Palms, Cielo, Crosby Estates, The Farms, Rancho Santa Fe together.
1sdiego_20110524_2_before5pm	5242011	Josie L. Calderon	yes	MABPA	Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Chula Vista should be represented as a whole, not East and West

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110624_30		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_31		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_32		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_33		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_34		Lompoc, Ocrutt, Santa Maria, Nipomo, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Oxnard		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_35		Lompoc		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110624_36		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_37		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110624_38_38		Lompoc		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110524_1_before5pm	San Diego	Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, Valley Center, San Pasqual, Harmony Grove, Elfin Forest, Whispering Palms, Cielo, Crosby Estates, The Farms, Rancho Santa Fe	West of I-5	no	yes		
1sdiego_20110524_2_before5pm	San Diego	Chula Vista		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110624_30	one vote, one person,		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_31	Large voter block and substatial influence		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_32	Large voter block,		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_33	Difficult to represent our members, would make communication difficult for the prison		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_34	geographically		no				
5sbarbara_20110624_35	need representative		no				Why is it city folks always want to screw the farmer
5sbarbara_20110624_36			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_37			no				
5sbarbara_20110624_38_38	Prison is only small portion of population.		no				
1sdiego_20110524_1_before5pm	political, economic, rural area		no				
1sdiego_20110524_2_before5pm	Resources should be distributed equally		no				Proud of agricultural beginnings

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110524_1_before5pm	5242011	Carol Haskell	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella with Imperial County. Imperial would be better served with San Diego or Orange.
2sbernardino_20110624_1_before5pm	6242011	Mary and Jerry Mihld	no			San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110624_2_before5pm	6242011	Deboarh Huston	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Redlands should not be divided.
2sbernardino_20110624_3_before5pm	6242011	Deborah Arroyo	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Agrees that Redlands should be split North and South
2sbernardino_20110624_4_before5pm	6242011	Debbie Pry	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	
2sbernardino_20110624_5_before5pm	6242011	Dan Crow	no				yes	Keep Redlands whole, group it with neighbors of East valley of San Bernardino County
2sbernardino_20110624_6_before5pm	6242011	Herrick Johnson	no				yes	Supports Inland Actions maps for San Bernardino and Riverside counties
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Anne Taylor	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Supports maps. Coachella Valley should be grouped with Desert Hot Springs and excluded from the Imperial Valley and San Diego
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Charlene Withers	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Supports maps. Do not place East Coachella Velley (Indio, Coachella, Mecca) with the Imperial Valley in Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110524_1_before5pm	Imperial, San Diego, Orange			no	no		employment, business opportunities
2sbernardino_20110624_1_before5pm				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_2_before5pm		redlands		no	yes	would create animosity to divide	
2sbernardino_20110624_3_before5pm		Redlands	North, South	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_4_before5pm				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_5_before5pm	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110624_6_before5pm	San Bernardino, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Diego, Riverside, Imperial	Desert Hot Springs	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley	no	no		
2riverside_20110622	Imperial	Indio, Coachella, Mecca	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley	no	yes	Desert Cities in the Coachella Valley have the same communal interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110524_1_before5pm	coachella valley has nothing to offer		no				
2sbernardino_20110624_1_before5pm			no				What are you thinking
2sbernardino_20110624_2_before5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_3_before5pm			no			need congressman to represent North and Northeast better	
2sbernardino_20110624_4_before5pm			no				Unacceptable choice
2sbernardino_20110624_5_before5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110624_6_before5pm			no				
2riverside_20110622	Coachella Valley and Desert Hot Springs are united by a common interest, which excludes Imperial Valley and San Diego	No	no				Thank you for not succumbing to the political pressure to place Coachella Valley with Imperial County
2riverside_20110622	Coachella Valley interests are distinct from Imperial Valley interests	No	no				Thanks for not succumbing to political pressure to split up the Coachella Valley

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110622	6222011	John W. Kopp	no			Riverside	yes	Does not support the preliminary maps because they unfairly nest previously distinct Assembly districts to make one Senate district. Next maps should address the complaints made by MALDEF, NALEO, and the NAACP to address the VRA section 2 districts.
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Sheryl Hamlin	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Supports maps. Appreciates that the Coachella Valley has been kept together as a district
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Terrence W. Halloran	no				yes	Banning and Beaumont should be in a Congressional District that includes the Coachella Valley and the San Jacinto Valley, not San Bernadino County
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Peter R. McWilliams	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Indio should not be considered part of the largely rural and sparsely populated Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Carolyn Daniels	no				yes	Coachella Valley should be kept within one district
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Bette Myers	yes	Valley Creditors Service, PresidentCEO		Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley should be considered part of Riverside County.Coachella Valley will be best served by maintaining the lines drawn by the CRC with respect to Riverside County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110622	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110622		Riverside	Coachella Valley	no	yes	Coachella Valley is distinct from other areas of Riverside County because it has a low crime rate	Coachella Valley is united by a common industry of tourism
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino	Banning, Beaumont	Coachella Valley, San Jacinto Valley	no	no		
2riverside_20110622	Imperial	Indio	Imperial Valley	no	yes	The eastern end of Coachella Valley has its own identity distinct from Imperial Valley and County	
2riverside_20110622	San Diego		Coachella Valley	no	no		
2riverside_20110622	Riverside		Coachella Valley	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110622		Yes Next maps should address the complaints made by MALDEF, NALEO, and the NAACP to address the VRA section 2 districts.	no				Offers best wishes for the bipartisan effort made by the CRC
2riverside_20110622	Coachella Valley should be contiguous because it has a vested interest in tourism and low crime rates	No	no				Thanks the CRC for its time and mentions the recent renovation of the local yacht club
2riverside_20110622		No	no				
2riverside_20110622	Indio should not be included with Imperial Valley because it does not share a common identity or a rural atmosphere	No	no				
2riverside_20110622		No	no			Confusing to be represented by a state senator from San Diego as the Coachella Valley never has contact with that person.	
2riverside_20110622		No	no				Thanks the CRC for its hard work

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Dr. Bill	no			Riverside	yes	The preliminary maps, which place Desert Hot Springs with the Coachella Valley and excludes Imperial Valley, are good. Adding Desert Hot Springs to Coachella Valley and Riverside County (and without adding the Imperial Valley) is great
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Michelle Romero	yes	The Greenlining Institute, Claiming Our Democracy Fellow	Berkeley	Alameda	yes	Several formerly incarcerated citizens are concerned about potential gerrymandering that inflates the relative voice of the prison population over the communities in which the prisons are located
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Jeanette Hayes	yes	Time for Change Foundation	San Bernadino	San Bernadino	yes	Concerned about gerrymandering. The lines drawn within and around San Bernadino are unfair because it takes away from the voting power within that district. San Bernadino should not be divided.
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Concerned Citizen (Anonymous)	no		San Bernadino	San Bernadino	yes	As the lines are drawn now, San Bernadino is underrepresented at both the Assembly and Senate levels.
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Sherry Ervin	no		San Bernadino	San Bernadino	yes	San Bernadino County should be considered one whole Assembly and one whole Senate district. To break up San Bernadino into other districts is unfair and decreases its voting power.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110622	Riverside	Desert Hot Springs	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley	no	no		
2riverside_20110622				no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino	San Bernadino		no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino	San Bernadino		no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino	San Bernadino		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110622		No	no				Thanks the CRC for its hard work
2riverside_20110622		No	no				The goal of the Greenlining Institute is to increase awareness of and participation in the redistricting process by low income communities and communities of color.
2riverside_20110622		No	no				
2riverside_20110622		Yes Senate districts for San Bernadino are not in compliance with the VRA	no				The lines make no sense.
2riverside_20110622		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Annie Jackson (written signature almost illegible so last name may be incorrect)	yes	AARP	Fontana	San Bernadino	yes	Keep San Bernadino as a whole county. Keep Fontana separate from Realto and include in ONT, R.C. Upland.
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Juanita Burnett	yes	Time for Change Foundation	San Bernadino	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split San Bernadino
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Dana Robertson	yes	Time for Change Foundation	San Bernadino	San Bernadino	yes	San Bernadino County should not be divided on any legislative level because it would be unfair and would impact the funding the cities within the county receive.
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Celia Jasso	yes	Time for a Change	San Bernadino	San Bernadino	yes	Keep San Bernadino County intact at all legislative levels. Do not include it with Riverside County at the Senate district level and include Redlands in San Bernadino County at the Congressional district level.
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Stacy Duncanson	yes	Time for Change Foundation	San Bernadino	San Bernadino	yes	Do not remove Redlands from San Bernadino County at the Congressional district level of redistricting. It is part of the San Bernadino culture.
2riverside_20110622	6222011	Duplicate of 8	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110621	6212011	Jim Appleton	yes	University of Redlands, President	Redlands	San Bernadino	yes	Support the maps made by Inland Action for the San BernadinoRiverside counties. Let Riverside be represented by a single Congressional district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino	Fontana, Realto		no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino	San Bernadino		no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino			no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Bernandino	Redlands		no	no		
2riverside_20110622	San Bernadino	Redlands		no	no		
2riverside_20110622				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110621	San Bernadino	Riverside		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110622		No	no				
2riverside_20110622		No	no				
2riverside_20110622		Yes Dividing San Bernadino County violates the VRA because neither of the resulting districts would be represented equally	no				
2riverside_20110622		No	no				
2riverside_20110622		No	no				
2riverside_20110622		No	no				
2sbernardino_20110621		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110621	6212011	Virginia Paleno	no	California Professional Real Estate	Crestline	San Bernadino	yes	Crestline has a unique culture because of its location in the mountains and should not be separated from other communities within the mountains, particularly if it is to be placed within San Bernadino County.
2sbernardino_20110621_3	6212011	Duplicate of 10a-b	no				no	
3orange_20110621_3	6212011	Michael Patino	no		Brea	Orange	yes	Placentia, Brea, La Habra, and Yorba Linda United should be one Congressional district because school boundaries overlap. It is not appropriate to have Anaheim (west of the 57 freeway) as part of this district. This also applies to SenateAssembly maps.
3orange_20110621_3	6212011	Janet Watts	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Orange County should stay Orange County (some cities should not be redistricted to LA). Rossmoor should remain in the district.
3orange_20110621_3	6212011	C. Warren Gruenig	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Dana Point should not be divided geographically or be placed outside of any county that includes neighboring south Orange County cities.
3orange_20110622_2	6222011	Julie Simer	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Dana Point should not be divided within the South Orange County district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110621	San Bernadino	Crestline		no	yes	Crestline shares responsibilities, aid, incomes, traffice, snow removal, and emergency task forces with other mountain community cities like Lake Arrowhead and Big Bear.	
2sbernardino_20110621_3				no	no		
3orange_20110621_3	Orange	Placentia, Brea, La Habra, Yorba Linda United	Freeway 57	no	yes	North Orange County communities should be kept together because they share fire prevention issues.	
3orange_20110621_3	Orange	Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110621_3	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Dana Point shares ocean water quality, regional transportation (both local and state), regional land use planning and affordable housing concerns with neighboring south Orange County cities.	
3orange_20110622_2	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110621		No	no				
2sbernardino_20110621_3		No	no				
3orange_20110621_3	Fire prevention issues are shared by North Orange County communities.	No	no			Appreciates that any decrease in Hispanic vote was balanced by an increase in an Asian voice.	Special interest groups are trying to slice up the North Orange County communities for political reasons.
3orange_20110621_3		No	no				
3orange_20110621_3	Dana Point and south Orange County cities share social interests.	No	no				
3orange_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110622_2	6222011	Joe Carchio	yes	City of Huntington Beach, Mayor	Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Urges support for the map drawn for redistricting by the West Orange County Water District, which places Huntington Beach with Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, and Westminster.
3orange_20110622_2	6222011	Barbara Bennett	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Do not allow Los Alamintos and Rossmoor to be redistricted to the Long Beach Congressional District. This will impact probation issues - an LA County representative of the court will not be as well versed with the OC court and its probation services.
3orange_20110622_2	6222011	Anita Meister-Boyd	no			Orange	yes	Makes no sense to place San Juan CapistranoSan Clemente with San Diego as these areas of the OC are geographically separated from San Diego by Camp Pendleton. Los Alamitos has more in common with OC due to the beach and is separated from LA by the river.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110622_2	Orange	Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, and Westminster.		no	yes	Huntington Beach shares the same school districts and is working to consolidate its services with the cities that are served by the West Orange County Water District. These cities should be kept together and distinct from Irvine.	
3orange_20110622_2	Orange	Los Alamintos, Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110622_2	Orange, San Diego, Los Angeles	San Juan CapistranoSan Clemente, San Diego, Los Alamitos, Los Angeles	Los Angeles River, Camp Pendleton	no	yes	Does not believe that the Orange County lines have been drawn in an inconsistent manner, a move which does not protect communities of interest.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110622_2		No	no				
3orange_20110622_2		No	no				
3orange_20110622_2		No	no			Three major problems with OC redistricting maps 1. Cong. Districts OC south county has been incorrectly placed with San Diego County. 2. Assem. Dis OC should have 6 full districts, but only has 5. 3 Sen Dis OC needs 3 sen seats, but only has 1.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110622_2	6222011	Dolores Frisby	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Does not like that her home in Los Alamitos may no longer belong to Orange County, but rather to Long Beach. It needs to be next to Cypress and Garden Grove.
4langeles_20110617_4	6172011	Cam Noltemeyer	no				yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley.
4langeles_20110618_2	6182011	Joe and Christel Arguijo	no		Newbury Park	Ventura	yes	Do not split the city of Thousand Oaks into two parts for the Assembly and State Senate districts.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Gloria G Potrzuski	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Dan Silver	yes	Endangered Habitats League	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Communities on both the coast and on the inland side of the Santa Monica mountains should be kept together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110622_2	Orange	Los Alamintos, Long Beach, Cypress, Garden Grove		no	no		
4langeles_20110617_4	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	Antelope Valley	yes	no		
4langeles_20110618_2	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Thousand Oaks shares common social interests with Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Camarillo than it does with Los Angeles County, the San Fernando Valley, and Santa Clarita.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains, Pacific Ocean	no	yes	Santa Clarita has little in common with Malibu, and it does not respect certain environmental factors of life in each city.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110617_4		No	no				
4langeles_20110618_2		No	no				Please avoid politicizing the process.
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Janet Conroy	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	The redistricting of Venice will prevent disabled persons from using public transport to speak with their elected representatives. The entire 90291 zip code should be in the Santa Monica district.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Larry Roseman	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Mary Conly-Nestlerode	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Maintain the integrity of the West Valley, as it is bounded by the 405 freeway, the Santa Monica mountains, and the western LA county line.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Sandy Mittan	no		Lakewood	Los Angeles	yes	The maps created by the Chinese American Citizens Alliance displayed at the hearing on June 17 in Whittier provides a much better representation of the Gateway Cities needs than the draft maps.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Venice		no	no		
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles		405 Freeway, Santa Monica mountains, LA County line, West Valley	no	yes	West San Fernando Valley shares its identity with the entirety of the West Valley.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Gateway Cities		no	yes	Artesia and Cerritos have more in common with Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, and Bell Gardens (Gateway Cities) than with cities in Orange County. Gateway Cities Council provides leadership in transport, housing, air quality.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3	If the Gateway cities are split up, it will be difficult to have cohesive representation in Sacramento and Washington DC	No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Jeanne L. Papazian	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	John Monsen	yes	Citizens for the San Gabriel Mountains	Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Federal public land in the San Gabriel Mountains should be placed in the same Congressional districts as the foothill and San Gabriel River watershed communities south of the range. Cities stretch along 210 Fwy from Sylmar to Rancho Cucamonga.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Laura Clendening	no		Chino Hills	San Bernadino	yes	The redistricting of Chino Hills will provide better services to disabled persons.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles, San Bernadino	Sylmar, Rancho Cucamonga	210 Freeway, San Gabriel Mountains, San Gabriel River	no	yes	Communities along the San Gabriel Mountains have extensive geographic, economic, and recreational connections. They are the most frequent visitors to the mountains and have the highest stake in their management.	
4langeles_20110621_3	San Bernadino	Chino Hills		no	yes	The redistricting of Chino Hills congressional district to include Ontario and Fontana better serves the interests of the Chino Hills community. Better than the current map which includes Mission Viejo.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Richard Bloom	yes	City of Santa Monica (Mayor), Santa Monica Bay Restoration Cmmte (Chair), Westside Cities Council of Govts (Chair), California Costal Commission (Member), Santa Monica Mtns Conservancy (Board member).	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	The LASCV district lacks compactness as it streches from the coast at Malibu to the Kern County line (appx 110 miles roundtrip).
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Sandy Emberland	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Accepts the EVENT maps. Remove Santa Clarita from the LASCV state senate district (makes a better fit with other high-desert communities), let Thousand Oaks remain intact, and extend the district along the 101405 Freeway to include Santa Monica Bay.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Marcia Hanscom	yes	Ballona Institute (Co-director), Wetlands Defense Fund (Director), Coastal Law Enforcement Action Network (Managing Director)			yes	Proposed Assembly District cuts right through the middle of the state-owned ecological reserve (Ballona Wetlands). Draw northern boundary line at Washington Blvd, then Lincoln Blvd to the 90 Fwy, and then follow the 90 Fwy to the east (as far as Alla).

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles, Kern	Malibu, Santa Monica, Santa Clarita		no	yes	LASCV senate district does not respect the criteria for the formation of new districts becase the Santa Clarita Valley has no common relationship with the communities of the Santa Monica Mtns and coastal areas like Malibu and Pacific Palisades.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica Bay	101 Freeway, 405 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles		Washington Blvd, Lincoln Blvd, 90 Fwy, Fiji Way, Los Angeles River, Ballano Wetlands, Pacific Ocean	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3	Keep the Ballona Wetlands in one congressional district so they can be better protected.	No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Walter J Potrzuski	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Lou Alfonso	no				no	
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Shani Hiland	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110621_3				no	yes	Chino Hills should not belong to or aligned with OC or LA (should remain with San Bernadino County). Chino Hills shares key services (school district, fire, police) with adjacent communities.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3	Sharing relevant services.	No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Irene Hernandez-Blair	no		Chino	San Bernadino	no	
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Patricia Meccia	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	no	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Dana Cop	yes	Santa Clarita Chamber of Commerce, President	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Extend the Assembly district of Santa Clarita to include Agua Dulce (which is adjacent to the 14 Fwy). Congressional district should include all of the Santa Clarita Valley (place Newhall and the community of Valencia within the district).

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_3				no	yes	Place Chino and Chino Hills together in the same Assembly district as they share the same school, fire, and water districts. Community members also join forces for the non-profit and charitable events. Remove Fontana, draw Chino Hills into Pomona Valley.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Agua Dulce, Santa Clarita (also neighborhoods of Newhall, Valencia).	14 Fwy, Santa Clarita Mountains	yes	yes	Santa Clarita and Agua Dulce share social interests they fight against mega mines and Agua Dulce is in the Santa Clarita portion of the One Valley One Vision General Plan process.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_3		Yes Current maps which place Chino Hills with Orange and LA counties does not comply with VRA as minority voters would be underrepresented.	no				Holding hearings on Fathers Day disrespects cultural heritages and limits attendance at hearings.
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3	Re senate districts, it makes no sense to include both inland and coastal communities. For all districts, keep the Santa Clarita Valley as whole and distinct (including Agua Dulce and community of Newhall).	No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Gary Aven	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Cynthia Scott	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Tina Ivanov	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Adam Scott	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Kelly Constantine	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Catherine McClenahan	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	Abby Gilad	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110621_3	6212011	William Douglass	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Edward Hosken	no		Palo Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Does not want to be included in the 36th district again as it will limit his conservative voice. Does not want to be part of Santa Monica or Venice.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Veronica Nourafchan	no		Palo Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110621_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	no	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Venice		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110621_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Sue Schmitt	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Judy Allegra	no				yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts and please add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Sue M. Forbes	no				yes	It does not make sense to pair Topanga Canyon with Santa Clarita. It is both geographically and politically divergent.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Elaine Hanson	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Revisit Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District called the Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Paul Glicker	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Please reconsider the proposed LASCV districts.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Ellen C. Garrett	no				yes	Topanga has always identified with Santa MonicaWest Los Angeles. Please reconsider the proposed LASCV district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita (also Newhall neighborhood)	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley	yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Topanga Canyon, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles			no	yes	Placing Topanga with Santa Clarita for the Senate District runs contrary to the distinct environmental, political, and geographical concerns in Topanga.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Monica		no	no	Placing Topanga with Santa Clarita for the Senate District runs contrary to the distinct environmental, political, and geographical concerns in Topanga.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Joe Klocko	no				no	
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Richard Kern	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Brian Folb	no		Toluca Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Thank you for keeping our community of interest (Toluca Lake) intact. Need to be represented by one district (Hollywood SD 22).
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Linda and David Tennies	no		Chino Hills	Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2				no	yes	The southwest portion of the Santa Clarita Valley should not be excluded from the proposed Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Congressional district in order to be in accordance with the commissions community of interest criteria.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Toluca		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2				no	yes	Chino and Chino Hills should be united because they share the same School District, Fire District, and Water District. They also share similar philanthropic ideals.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Mary D Hall	no				yes	Santa Clarita should be kept one district (not added to the San Fernando Valley). Newhall, Canyon Country, and Placerita Canyon should not be removed from Santa Clarita Valley.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Brian Saunders	no				yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Frieda Wang	no				yes	Would like to see Harbor City, Lennox, and West Carson stay with the Beach Cities for congressional redistricting.
4langeles_20110622_2	6172011	Ruthann Levision, David Hauser, Dana Martin, Debbie Martin, John Higby, Russel Mers, Sandi Parris, JJ Cacavas	yes	Sand Canyon Homeowners Association	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Their neighborhood (Sand Canyon) is split into 2 different congressional districts, a move which impacts more than 950 homeowners. The boundary line should be moved to the mountaintop instead of Placerita Canyon Road.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Brad Folb	yes	Paramount Contractors and Developers Incorporated, President		Los Angeles	yes	Thank you for keeping Hollywood as a whole in one district, represented by Senate District 22.
4langeles_20110622_2	6172011	Mary Ann Lutz	yes	City of Monrovia, Mayor	Monrovia	Los Angeles	yes	Please reduce the size of the San Gabriel Mountain Foothill congressional district. Do not separate Monrovia from Pasadena for the Assembly district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita Valley (Newhall neighborhood, Canyon Country, Placerita Canyon)	yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita (neighborhood of Newhall)	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Harbor City, Lennox, and West Carson.		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita (Sand Canyons neighborhood)	Placerita Canyon Road, Santa Clarita mountains, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley	yes	yes	Sand Canyon homeowners are a community of interest because they share school districts - moving them into two separate congressional districts would detract from their excellence.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Hollywood)		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Monrovia, Pasadena		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Wayde Hunter	no				yes	Do not use Balboa Blvd in Granada Hills as a boundary for Santa Clarita and San Fernando-East LA senate districts. Instead, continue the eastern boundary of the Santa Clarita District along the 5 Fwy to the 405 Fwy and turn west along the 118 Fwy.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Michael Fuss	no		Kagel Canyon	Los Angeles	yes	Placing Kagel Canyon outside of the Foothill Community District would cause further strife in political representation. Currently, Kagel Canyon is being poorly represented.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Jack Simonson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep the neighborhoods stretching from West Hollywood to Silverlake together in state legistlative districts.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Vikki Holmes	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Please add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Kamran Nikravan	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Granada Hills, Santa Clarita	5 Freeway, 405 Freeway, 118 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon		no	yes	Kagel Canyon shares similar interests in horses, foothill environment, fire danger, and crime prevention with Sunland Tujunga, La Cresenta, and Burbank.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes	Keep neighborhoods from West Hollywood to Silverlake together because it has LGBT interests.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita (Newhall neighborhood)		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no			Strongly opposes redistricting.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Robert Klemm	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep the foothill cities of Sunland, Tujunga, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale, and Burbank together.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Chris (last name withheld)	no			Los Angeles	yes	Political representation for Santa Clarita should be from Santa Clarita (Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, Canyon County) and not from San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Matt Takahashi	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Place the peninsula cities in districts with beach cities to the north (like Hawthorne and Lawndale). Do not include Venice and Santa Monica in the district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Erik Counseller	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Consider placing the Eastern San Gabriel Mountains in the district of those to the South of it (Rancho Cucamonga).
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Henry Nivichanov	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts and add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Sam Kbushyan	no			Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Sunland, Tujunga, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale, and Burbank		no	yes	Share desire for open space, views of the mountains and hills, have rural lifestyles, and, ultimately, think of themselves as part of the Crescenta Valley and the San Gabriel Foothills.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Lawndale, Venice, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Rancho Cucamonga	San Gabriel Mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				Thank you for your hard work to represent the Armenian-American community in Southern California

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Garo Keurjikian	yes	Little Armenia Chamber of Commerce, President		Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Luana Law	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita intact. Do not move Newhall into San Fernando Valley district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	William Oberholzer	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne and Lawndale in the San Pedro district, and eclsude Venice and Santa Monica.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Richard Fisk	no			Lost Angeles	yes	Do not divide the city of Santa Clarita, but rather use the 5 Fwy as the southeastern boundary for the district (and not the current lines).
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	CR Hudson	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the city of Santa Clarita intact by placing the community of Newhall within the Santa Clarita Valley lines.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Marc Stirdivant	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the city of Pasadena intact and do not divide it by using State Route 134.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Carol Hunt	no		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne and Lawndale are part of the 36th congressional district, not Santa Monica. This is clearly demonstrated by the special education breakdown that has been in place for the past 20 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Lawndale, Venice, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	5 Fwy, Balboa Blvd	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale	State Route 134	no	yes	The cities of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena share a common standard of living, an airport, and public safety concerns.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Lawndale		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				Thank you for your hard work to represent the Armenian-American community in Southern California
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Benjamin Landau	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Linda Vernick	no			Los Angeles	yes	Requests that Santa Monica and Venice be excluded from the 36th congressional district and that Gardena, Hawthorne, and Lawndale be included.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Michele and Gary Johnson	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Look at historical needs and modern interests when thinking about the 36th congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Sue M. Forbes	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Venice, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles			no	yes	Topanga should be connected to the west side of LA and the west side of the San Fernando Valley because they share the need for land preservation, fighting smog, and clean water. Santa Clarita does not share these interests.	
4langeles_20110622_2				no	yes	Topanga should be connected to the west side of LA and the west side of the San Fernando Valley because they share the need for land preservation, fighting smog, and clean water. Santa Clarita does not share these interests.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				Thank you for your hard work.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Rolanda Mendelle	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	It is clear that Topanga is involved with the coastal commission, Santa Monica mountains, and the westside of LA. Santa Clarita is a completely different area.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Wynne Rich	yes	Member of the Granada Hills chamber of commerce, VFW, Rotary, and Boy Scouts.	Granada Hills	Los Angeles	yes	It will make me very unhappy to have a line drawn through Granada Hills.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Greg Maas	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Amanda Donovan	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	William Paige	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	The West Los Angeles area should not be a separate district from Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, Westwood, and Brentwood.
4langeles_20110622_2	6212011	Stacy Sledge	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Eileen Daniels	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Monica, LA, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Grana Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2				no	yes	The proposed senate map does not take into account the common interests (wildlife, environment) shared by Topanga, Malibu, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, and Thousand Oaks.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				Please get your act together and come up with another solution for Granada Hills.
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no			It looks like the high income areas are being separated from the low income areas in Los Angeles.	
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Carol Upton	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Alison Robinson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Granada Hills into two districts. Instead of Balboa Blvd as the dividing linie, use the 5 Fwy until it meets the 405.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Michael Lewis	no		Granada Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Granada Hills into two districts. Instead of Balboa Blvd as the dividing linie, use the 5 Fwy until it meets the 405.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Joanne Grosh	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Carol Upton	no			Los Angeles	yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, nest it with East Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita for the senate seat.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Ken Mazur	yes	Topanga Animal Rescue, Topanga Association for a Scenic Community	Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Place the assembly districts of West Side-Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica together to create a senate district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	duplicate of 17aaa	no				no	
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Karilyn Crolius	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Granada Hills	Balboa Blvd, 5 Freeway, 405 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Granada Hills	Balboa Blvd, 5 Freeway, 405 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles, Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorland, Simi Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	West Side LA, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Karilyn Crolius	no			Los Angeles	yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, nest it with East Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita for the senate seat.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Josie Kelly	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Strongly opposed to placing Topanga with Santa Clarita. It is far more beneficial to place Topanga with the West Side of LA.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Liz Bush	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	no	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional districts.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Beverly McCalla	no			Los Angeles	yes	Please keep the Santa Clarita Valley whole by drawing the district lines to include all of Newhall, especially south of Lyons Avenue.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Linda Tarnoff	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Newhall is far from the San Fernando Valley-Tujunga, separated by a mountain range.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Teresa Bunnell-Penner	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	There is no reason to place Topanga in the Santa Clarita District.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Steven Turner	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita as one city. Keep Newhall part of Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Julie Levine	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	It seems like it is a political decision to place Topanga with Santa Clarita and the San Fernando Valley. It has far more in common with west side, ocean culture.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	S L Wojciechowski	no			Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles, Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorland, Simi Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles,	Topanga, Santa Clarita, LA		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	Lyons Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita (Newhall)		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Topanga		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita (Newhall)		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Topanga, San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				Would like to know where Cerritos is positioned on the maps.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Dorothy Cole	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Robert K Comer	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Sheila ONeill OConnor	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Maddie Stodart	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts and add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Lani Luedde	no			Los Angeles	yes	Please exclude the Venice and Santa Monica areas from the 36th congressional district as they do not represent its demographics.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Lucia Affatato	no		North Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate North Hollywood from greather Los Angeles. Keep the communities that border Griffith Park and Hollywood in one assembly and senate district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	yes	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Venice, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Hollywood)		yes	yes	Hollywood and Los Angeles share social and cultural interests, as well as parks and recreational activities.	Imperative that Hollywood be kept with Los Angeles because it shares similar economic concerns related to the movie industry.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Laura McMillan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts and add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Hadley Rierson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep the communities that touch Griffith Park in one assembly district. This includes Atwater Village, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Hollywood proper, and Burbank.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	James Flournoy	no			Los Angeles	yes	Homes north of the Montebello Hills need to be with Rowemead for the congressional district. For senate district, let it expand east into the San Gabriel Valley instead of south over the hills. Keep assem. District lines south of 60 Fwy intact.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Bill Hopkins	no			Los Angeles	yes	The proposed new districts cut down the middle of Granada Hills and splits the North Neighborhood Council. To make better districts, use the 5 Freeway until it joins with the 405.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	B.J. Atkins	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two congressional districts and add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Richard B. Winslow	no		Topanga Canyon	Los Angeles	yes	Please consider placing Topanga with the West Side-Santa Monica Mountains district rather than with Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Thaddeus Wadleigh	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not place Topanga with Santa Clarita. Most Topanga residents spend time on the West Side (of LA) and in the Woodland HillsCalabasas area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes	Neighborhoods of LA share history, culture, shopping, employment patterns, key industries, and state issues.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	San Gabriel	60 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Granada Hills	5 Freeway, 405 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Monica, Santa Clarita, LA		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Topanga, Santa Clarita, Woodland Hills, Calabasas		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Sue Mansis	no		SunlandTujungaShadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Requests that SunlandTujungaShadow Hills be kept as is. Include Lakeview TerranceGlendaleLa Crescenta.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Peter Anton	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Please consider revisiting Senate District LASCV and nest these Santa Monica Assembly districts (West Side-Santa Monica Mountains and Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica Mountains) within a Senate District renoted as Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Frank Harper	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Please consider revisiting Senate District LASCV and nest these Santa Monica Assembly districts (West Side-Santa Monica Mountains and Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica Mountains) within a Senate District renoted as Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Ronald Sharrin	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Please consider revisiting Senate District LASCV and nest these Santa Monica Assembly districts (West Side-Santa Monica Mountains and Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica Mountains) within a Senate District renoted as Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Catherine Robin Rudnikoff	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Please consider revisiting Senate District LASCV and nest these Santa Monica Assembly districts (West Side-Santa Monica Mountains and Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica Mountains) within a Senate District renoted as Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, Lakeview		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	West Side LA, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	West Side LA, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	West Side LA, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	West Side LA, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	RC Brody	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Please consider revisiting Senate District LASCV and nest these Santa Monica Assembly districts (West Side-Santa Monica Mountains and Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica Mountains) within a Senate District renoted as Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Roy Emberland	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Remove Santa Clarita from the LASCV map. Place Santa Clarita with its high-desert neighbors in the Antelope Valley. Replace Santa Clarita Valley with the Santa Monica Bay area. It is easily accessable through the Pacific Coast Highway, Fwys 101 and 405.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Charell Charlie	no		Pico Rivera	Los Angeles	yes	Would prefer a district that consists of Pico Rivera, Whittier, Downey, Montebello, La Mirada, Norwalk, and Santa Fe Springs.
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Jill Lederer and Jan Smith	yes	Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce, President and Director of Governmental Affairs (respectively)	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Supports Thousand Oaks remaining a part of Ventura County. Thousand Oaks should not be split into two separate assembly districts identified as west of Lynn Road and north of Avenida de los Arboles. Thousand Oaks should remain one community in Ventura.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	West Side LA, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica		no	yes	Separating Topanga from the contiguous WestsideSanta Monica district does not serve the communitys interests	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Santa Monica	101 Freeway, Pacific Coast Highway, 405 Freeway	no	yes	Replacing Santa Clarita Valley with the Santa Monica Bay in LASCV would provide more geographical integrity and share communities of interest.	
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Pico Rivera, Whittier, Downey, Montebello, La Mirada, Norwalk, and Santa Fe Springs.		no	no		
4langeles_20110622_2	Ventura	Thousand Oaks	Lynn Road, Avenida de los Arboles	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_2	Thousand Oaks shares common interest, econcomic and social levels, service providers, and policefire protection as the ten other cities in Ventura County.	No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_2	6222011	Robert Moskowitz	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	The Senate district denoted as LASCV ignores more than 70 percent of the contiguous West Side-Santa Monica district and includes areas far to the north known as Santa Clarita. Revisit the LASCV and separate the northern and southern assembly districts.
4langeles_20110622_3	6222011	Ken Kiesselbach	yes	Young Professionals for Better Government		Los Angeles	yes	Proposes 10 changes to state assembly plan, most of which are geared towards paying respect to the neighborhood council boundaries in LA.
4langeles_20110622_3	6222011	Victor S. LoCicero	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	The section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 freeway and north of Sepulveda should be added to the section of Harbor Gateway already in the 36th cong. District. Same with all of Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110622_3	6222011	Claudia Hasenhuttl	no			Los Angeles	yes	Consider revisiting Senate District LASCV and nest the Santa Monica Assembly districts within a Senate District renoted as Santa Monica MountainsBay-West Side.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Santa Monica, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_3	Loa Angeles			yes	yes	Issues regarding communal environmental and coastal interests have not been resolved in the redistricting of LA.	
4langeles_20110622_3	Los Angeles	Palo Verde Estates, Harbor Gateway, Lennox, Gardena	405 Freewa, Sepulveda Blvd, Western Ave	no	no	Lawndale and Hawthorne (and not Venice and Santa Monica) share shopping, recreational, and job-oriented (aerospace) interests. These cities should be placed back into the 36th congressional district.	
4langeles_20110622_3	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, LA		no	yes	Santa Clarita has common needs like the environment, land-use, parks, emergency preparedness and response.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_2	Thousand Oaks-Santa Monica Mountains district has little in common with the communities of Santa Monica MountainsBay and the West Side. Majority of Santa Clarita and communities of Santa Monica MountainsBay consider this to be an awkward senate district	No	no				
4langeles_20110622_3		Yes Voting rights are not being accounted for in LA.	no				
4langeles_20110622_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_3		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110622_3	6222011	Julie Henry	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do no split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts and add the cities of Newhall and Sand Canyon at Placerita Canyon into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley Congressional district.
4langeles_20110622_3	6222011	Kathy Klocko	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110622_3	6222011	Jean Coleman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	Robert Romanelli	yes	University of California, Santa Barbara (Instructional Development)	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara County whole, move the 33rd SLO district to Monterey County and make two Assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	Candy Waldron	no		Solvang	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide Santa Barbara County into two districts. It would not be fair to the small population and large geographic area.
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	Douglas Waldron	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara whole, move the 33rd SLO district north to Monterey County and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110622_3	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall, Sand Canyon		yes	no		
4langeles_20110622_3				no	yes		
4langeles_20110622_3	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita (Newhall)		yes	no		
5sbarbara_20110621_2		Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110621_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110621_2	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Monterey		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110622_3		No	no				
4langeles_20110622_3	In order to comply with the commissions guidelines, the entire Santa Clarita Valley should be within one congressional, state senate, state assembly, and board of equalization district.	No	no				
4langeles_20110622_3		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	Joan Leon	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara should not be split into two districts for State and Assembly. The south coast of the county has more in common with the rest of Santa Barbara County than they do with Ventura and the LA area.
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	John Caulfield	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Please keep Santa Barbara as a whole Assembly and Senate district. It needs to be fairly and accurately represented.
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	Anthony Ayala	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Dividing Lompoc into three new districts is an act of gerrymandering and inconsistent with the guidelines that mandate cities and communities should remain intact.
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	Paul G. Rosso	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	The proposed senate and assembly districts do not make sense - they zigzag across streets and important landmarks (like schools and hospitals) with no concern for continuity.
5sbarbara_20110621_2	6212011	Justin LeCavalier	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Reconsider the plans to split Lompoc into two districts and zones. People do not live in Lompoc solely for the prison.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Michael McCoramck	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Please keep Santa Barbara County as a whole district. It governs itself as a contiguous geographic community.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Douglas Mackenzie	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep one assembly district to Santa Barbara County and two to Ventura County. The 33rd district is best reserved to Monterey County and should not be drawn to cut Santa Barbara in half.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110621_2	Santa Barbara, LA	Santa Barbara, LA		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110621_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110621_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110621_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc	Bailey Avenue, West Ocean Avenue, North K Street, East and West College Avenue, North Seventh Street, East Pine Avenue, North O Street, West Laurel Avenue, North K Street, North A Street	yes	no		
5sbarbara_20110621_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Ventura			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110621_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Gina Perry	no		Montecito	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep one assembly district to Santa Barbara County and two to Ventura County. The 33rd district is best reserved to Monterey County and should not be drawn to cut Santa Barbara in half.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Bill Freudenstein	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara whole, split Ventura into two districts.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	J. Jeffrey Havlik	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Santa Barbara county.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Frank Marino	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Urges the council to keep Santa Barbara whole for the purposes of both state officies and the House of Representatives seat.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	John M Deacon	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Opposed to splitting Santa Barbara into two separate districts. Redraw the maps to make sure it remains intact.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Patt Wardlaw	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Fairest way to treat the tri-counties is to keep Santa Barbara as a district itself, make two districts out of Ventura County, and give SLO its own districts or add parts of Monterey County to it.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Jim Perry	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Mr and Mrs James K Kunkle	no		Santa Ynez	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Elaine Bashford	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				The citizens of Santa Barbara have long suffered from inadequate representation due to gerrymandering.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				Santa Barbara has been split and gerrymandered for decades.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				CRC has a unique opportunity to bring reason to the infamous central coast map.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Anita and Bob Gleason	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not cut Santa Barbara in half. Move district 33 to the north, which is easier than breaking up Santa Barbara County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Debbie Isbell	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Ed and Anne Goulart	no		Carpinteria	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Susan Perry	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Randall Fox	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Tricia Dixon	no		Goleta	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Roberta MacKenzie	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Robert Manning	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split the city of Lompoc and the surrounding area. Lompoc, Mission Hills, and Vandenberg Villiage is a contiguous population center that should not be split up for representation in the state assembly and senate.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				Please be objective and do the right thing in redistricting California.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				Quit selling out the Central Coast.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Shirley Eyre	no		Solvang	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Ken Ostini	no			Santa Barbara	yes	It is unfair to split the city of Lompoc in both its Senate and Assembly districts. Please reconsider these boundaries and keep Lompoc whole - it needs its own united voice.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Nicholas Cooper	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	The southside of Lompoc is continuously and unfairly treated. Do not unfairly redistrict Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Dr and Mrs John Sawyer	no			Santa Barbara	yes	It does not make sense to split Lompoc into two districts. It is important to keep the community intact.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Robert Manning	no			Santa Barbara	yes	It is not reasonable to split Lompoc. Lompoc, Mission Hills, and Vandenberg Village (and associated outlying areas) comprise a political area and must be kept whole.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Jeanette E Watson	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Helga Schmidt	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	James R Langley	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as one district. This will best serve the interests and needs of both the county and its constituents.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Eric Christianson	no		Solvang	Santa Barbara	yes	Every effort should be made to keep Santa Barbara whole and as one district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc, Mission Hills, Vanderberg Village		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				Disgusted with how the Central Coast and Santa Barbara in particular has been treated with respect to its districts.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Terry Hammons	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Opposes the splitting of Lompoc for the purpose of redistricting. There should only be one represtentative for all levels of government.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	James Hurst	no		Goleta	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Dennis Headrick	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep the city of Lompoc as one district, if only to cut down on administrate work. The current map perpetuates the process of gerrynmandering.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Brian N Kopeikin	no		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep the community of Santa Barbara whole. It should be a bipartisan effort.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Lin Graf	no		Carpinteria	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Edwin Weston	no			Santa Barbara	yes	The city of Lompoc should not be split down the middle as proposed. It needs total representation, and election costs would be higher if the districts were to be split.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara			no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Splitting Santa Barbara is counter to the guidelines for the CRC to respect communities with similar interests and needs.	No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2	The proposed splitting of Santa Barbara violates the basic premise of keeping communities intact and the spirit of the voter initiative to end politically-motivated districting.	No	no				Predicts that the proposed maps will end up in court as another scheme of political manipulation.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Melinda Johansson	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Mary Ferris	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	duplicate of 19h	no				no	
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Lisa White	no			Santa Barbara	yes	No reason to split Lompoc, particularly if it violates the CRC guidelines for communities of interest.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Gregory Gandrud	no		Capinteria	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split the 35th Assembly district in half. Instead, use this opportunity to create a 35th assembly district that is entirely comprised of Santa Barbara county. This would ensure fair and balanced representation of minorities.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Mary Weston	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc. The city should have equal representation and splitting the city would result in higher election costs.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Kathi Heringer	no		Solvang	Santa Barbara	no	
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Peter Kruse	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Santa Barbara as a whole county, move the 33rd district north to Monterey, and make two assembly districts in Ventura County.
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Bob Lingl	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into two districts for state assembly and senate. Lompoc is a single community and deserves equal representation by elected officials.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2				no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2				no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2				no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura			no	no		
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				Supports the work of the CRC.
5sbarbara_20110622_2			no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2	The CRC should try harder to keep the county of Santa Barbara whole in accordance with their guidelines for a community of interest.	No	no				Do not give in to political pressure to make the Sana Barbara area one that is removed from a rural lifestyle found in Santa Ynez Valley.
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				
5sbarbara_20110622_2		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110622_2	6222011	Carol Benham	no			Santa Barbara	yes	While the new maps for Lompoc are an improvement over the current 24th congressional district, splitting Lompoc in half is tantamount to disenfranchising 42,000 people.
5ventura_20110621_2	6212011	Richard C Main	no		Santa Paula	Ventura	yes	The proposed maps are gerrymandered to attempt to dislodge Rep. Gallegly. This is simply Democratic politics and a continuation of the policies of Gov. Brown to eliminate the Republican party.
5ventura_20110621_3	6212011	Ronald Kirk	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Equal representation will be denied if Ventura county is split up.
5ventura_20110621_3	6212011	Danielle Smith	no			Ventura	yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, it should be nested with East Ventura County. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita for a senate seat.
6fresno_20110622	6222011	Carol Streit	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	It is illogical to place Shaver Lake (located only 40 miles from Fresno) in the Sacramento congressional district. Sanger and Shaver Lake should be placed with Fresno.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes		
5ventura_20110621_2	Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110621_3	Ventura			no	yes		
5ventura_20110621_3	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Camarillo, Moorpark, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley		no	no		
6fresno_20110622	Fresno	Fresno, Sacramento	Shaver Lake	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110622_2	Lompoc should remain intact because it shares communal influences from Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, and Mesa Oaks. These communities regularly dine, shop, and travel interchangeably.	No	no				
5ventura_20110621_2		No	no				
5ventura_20110621_3	Please observe the historical sanctity of the eastern portion of Ventura County. Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and Camarillo form a coherent community of values.	No	no				
5ventura_20110621_3		No	no				
6fresno_20110622		No	no			It is best to draw regional districts according to populations and sizes.	Do not succumb to political temptations.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6merced_20110621_2	6222011	Marshall Stephen Jones	no			Merced	yes	Merced and Santa Clara should not be placed together as they have different needs, and Merced is far more rural - which requires a different political sensibility than the one for Santa Clara.
6merced_20110621_2	6222011	N Montgomery	no			Merced	no	
6merced_20110621_2	6222011	Joy Gort	no		Merced	Merced	yes	Please keep Merced distinct from coastal communities so it has fair representation.
6merced_20110621_2	6222011	Janet McGuinness	no		Merced	Merced	yes	It is a mistake to place Merced county with San Jose and Santa Cruz. Leave the 12th senate district the way it is.
6merced_20110622	6222011	Andrea Clark	no			Merced	yes	If the draft maps become permanent, then the Central Valley will lose its voice to San Jose in political matters in Sacramento.
6merced_20110622	6222011	John M. Derby	no			Merced	yes	It is simply common sense to allow Merced and Stanislaus counties to remain together, as any change will give more political power to the coastal counties of Santa Cruz and San Jose. This is not in the best interests of representative government.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6merced_20110621_2	Merced	Merced, Santa Clara		no	yes	Merced should remain a distinct district because it has more development issues than Santa Clara, including education, youth programs, rural agricultural needs, and pollution prevention.	
6merced_20110621_2				no	yes	Merced has no community interest with the coastal counties and it is opposed to the draft maps.	
6merced_20110621_2	Merced	Merced		no	yes	Merced should remain distinct from coastal communities. It is smaller and much poorer - and thus requires extra care.	
6merced_20110621_2	Merced	Merced, Santa Cruz, San Jose		no	no		
6merced_20110622	Merced	San Jose, Sacramento	Central Valley	no	yes	The central valley has no community interest with the coastal counties.	
6merced_20110622	Merced, Stanislaus			no	yes	The new draft maps will be unrepresentative of the agricultural needs of the central valley (Merced and Stanislaus counties).	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6merced_20110621_2		No	no				
6merced_20110621_2		No	no				
6merced_20110621_2		No	no				
6merced_20110621_2		No	no				
6merced_20110622		No	no				
6merced_20110622		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6merced_20110622	6222011	Henry Xiong	no			Merced	no	
6merced_20110622	6222011	Tommy Flores	no		Merced	Merced	yes	Do not pair Merced with more affluent counties or cities.
6merced_20110622	6222011	Linn Carlson	no			Merced	no	
6merced_20110622	6222011	Andree Soares	no			Merced	yes	Adamently opposed to incorporating the coastal communities into Valley Region 6.
6merced_20110622	6222011	Dorothy Kielty	no			Merced	yes	Merced needs to be a single and fully represented district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6merced_20110622				no	yes	The central valley has no community interest with the coastal counties.	
6merced_20110622	Merced			no	yes	Merced should remain distinct from affluent counties and cities (like Turlock in Stanislaus County) because it needs to develop its own distinct educational services for children with learning disabilities.	
6merced_20110622				no	yes	The central Valley (Merced) has no community interest with the coastal counties.	
6merced_20110622	Merced			no	no		
6merced_20110622	Merced			no	yes	Merced faces different challenges than the ones faced on Monterey and Santa Clara. Placing these districts together will only hurt Merced and allow its educational and economic interests to be overshadowed by more affluent communities.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6merced_20110622		No	no				
6merced_20110622		No	no				
6merced_20110622		No	no				
6merced_20110622		No	no				
6merced_20110622		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6merced_20110622	6222011	Dawn Brown	no			Merced	yes	The Coastal Ranges should be used as a natural boundary line for the 12th senate district. Merced could also be placed with Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Tulare, Kern, San Benito, Mariposa.
6mono_20110615	6152011	Susan Meade Sanders	no		Crowley Lake	Mono	yes	Route 80 and Route 49 are the logical north and south borders for the Placer, El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolomne, Mariposa, Mono, and Alpine Counties.
6stanislaus_20110621_2	6212011	Carmela Perez	no		Modesto	Stanislaus	yes	It is best to keep the poorer areas separate from the more affluent areas in Stanislaus County and in the Central Valley so as to better represent the needs of their constituents. The proposed maps for Stanislaus County look good.
6toulumne_20110621	6212011	David Risard	no		Sonora	Toulomne	yes	Supports realigning voter districts in the central Sierra so that it includes El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, and Toulomne counties. This move appropriately consideres the needs of the constituents.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6merced_20110622	Merced, Mariposa, San Benito, Stanislaus, Fresno, Madera, Tulare, Kern	Merced	Coastal Ranges	no	yes	Merced (senate district 12) needs to have representation that respects its unique agricultural, water, and air quality needs - not those of Silicon Valley.	
6mono_20110615	Placer, El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolomne, Mariposa, Mono, Alpine		Route 80, Route 49	no	yes	Inyo and Mono counties shouuld comprise a Trans-Sierra community of interest assembly district (attached maps). This also includes the foothills area of Madera county.	
6stanislaus_20110621_2	Stanislaus			no	no		
6toulumne_20110621	Toulomne	El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, and Toulomne		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6merced_20110622		No	no				
6mono_20110615		Yes	yes		Proposed alterations to Mono, Inyo, and Madera counties would strengthen the Hispanic community of interest.		
6stanislaus_20110621_2		No	no				
6toulumne_20110621		No	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6toulumne_20110621	6212011	Domenic Torchia	no		Columbia	Toulomne	yes	In agreement with the maps for the Sierra Nevada FoothillsMother Lode districts.
6toulumne_20110622	6222011	Tillman Sherman	no		Columbia	Toulomne	yes	In agreement with the maps for the Sierra Nevada FoothillsMother Lode districts.
6toulumne_20110622	6222011	Chris Caldwell	yes	Toulomne County Chamber of Commerce (Chair-elect), Caldwell Insurance Services (Multiline Accounts Executive)	Sonora	Toulomne	yes	In agreement with the current districts drawn for Toulomne county.
6toulumne_20110622	6222011	John and Karen Bargmann	no		Sonora	Toulomne	yes	In agreement with the current Toulomne county maps.
1sdiego_20110626_4_4_Redacted	6262011	Gail and Chuck Kendall	no		Rancho Santa FE	San Diego	yes	San Diego should be with North County
2riverside_20110626_1_19_Redacted	6262011	Jeffery M. Howard	yes	Law offices of Jefferey M. Howard	Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Do not group Imperial county with Coachella Valley.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6toulumne_20110621	Toulomne		Sierra Nevada, Mother Lode	no	yes	Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, and Toulumne are a family unit and have similar interests. This gives these counties a voice in the appropriation of their natural resources.	
6toulumne_20110622	Toulomne		Sierra Nevadas, Mother Lode	no	yes	Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, and Toulumne are a family unit and have similar interests. This gives these counties a voice in the appropriation of their natural resources.	
6toulumne_20110622	Toulomne			no	yes	Placing Toulomne with other counties that have an interest in timber, water, and minerals is a good move and can only enhance their communal interests.	
6toulumne_20110622	Toulomne			no	yes	The Toulomne redistricting is good because it recognizes the unique issues of water, forest fire fighting, and educational funding.	
1sdiego_20110626_4_4_Redacted	San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe		no	yes		
2riverside_20110626_1_19_Redacted	Imperial	Coachella		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6toulumne_20110621		No	no				
6toulumne_20110622		No	no				
6toulumne_20110622		No	no				
6toulumne_20110622		No	no				
1sdiego_20110626_4_4_Redacted	interests and needs		no				
2riverside_20110626_1_19_Redacted			no			agriculture v. tourism and retirement	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110626_2_19_Redacted	6262011	Dennis and Nancy Davis	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio intact, include in Coachella
2riverside_20110626_3_19_Redacted	6262011	Inez Cardozo-Freeman	no				yes	Wrong to separate Imperial County from Coachella Valley, do not connect to San Diego
2riverside_20110626_4_19_Redacted	6262011	Mary Ames	no				yes	Perris Congressional district should be redrawn to include all of Temecula
2riverside_20110626_5_19_Redacted	6262011	Paul Clay	no				yes	District of Murrieta and Temecula is faulted. Include them and move northern parts to other districts to the north
2riverside_20110626_6_19_Redacted	6262011	Chuck and Diane Brady	no		Desert Hot Springs	Riverside	yes	Coachella valley should not be with Imperial valley
2riverside_20110626_7_19_Redacted	6262011	Carole Sumner Krechman, President	yes	Peacemaker Corps Association	Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Put Eastern Coachella with Imperial in CA 45th
2riverside_20110626_8_19_Redacted	6262011	Kathleen DeRosa, Mayor	yes	Cathedral City	Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley intact, do not put with Imperial
2riverside_20110626_9_19_Redacted	6262011	Ira L. Robinson	no		Temecula	Riverside	yes	Get all of Temecula and Pechanga Indian Reservation innto the Perris district. Do not put with San diego county.
2riverside_20110626_10_19_Redacted	6262011	Vincent J. Battalglia, LEEP AP	yes	Renova Energy Corp.		Riverside	yes	Do not redistrict Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110626_11_19_Redacted	6262011	Arthur S. Copleston	no				yes	Imperial County and Riverside County are one community. San Diego is metroplitan and far
2riverside_20110626_12_19_Redacted	6262011	Rosalyn Weissmann	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Imperial county should be with Coachella Valley, not San Diego

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110626_2_19_Redacted		Indio, Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110626_3_19_Redacted	Imperial, San Diego	Coachella, San Diego		no	yes	Latinos, poverty, unemployment	
2riverside_20110626_4_19_Redacted		Temecula	115 corridor	no	yes	Indians,	wine country, communities, hospitals, commercial centers
2riverside_20110626_5_19_Redacted	Riverside	Murietta, Temecula	substantial mountain ranges	no	no		
2riverside_20110626_6_19_Redacted	Imperial Valley	Coachella		no	no		
2riverside_20110626_7_19_Redacted	Imperial	Coachella		no	yes		
2riverside_20110626_8_19_Redacted	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110626_9_19_Redacted	San Diego	Temecula, Pechanga		no	yes		
2riverside_20110626_10_19_Redacted	Riverside	Coachella Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110626_11_19_Redacted	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego		Hwy 8	no	yes	Latino Community	agriculture
2riverside_20110626_12_19_Redacted	Imperial, San Diego	Coachella Valley		no	yes	Latino Residents	agriculture, tourism, health care, rural

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110626_2_19_Redacted			no				happy with maps
2riverside_20110626_3_19_Redacted			no			based on fear	
2riverside_20110626_4_19_Redacted	people of Temecula would be underrepresented in new district		no				
2riverside_20110626_5_19_Redacted			no			does not make any sense	
2riverside_20110626_6_19_Redacted			no				
2riverside_20110626_7_19_Redacted	historically, salton sea, challenges		no				
2riverside_20110626_8_19_Redacted			no			No COI between Imperial and Coachella, economy is tourism, new map is fair	
2riverside_20110626_9_19_Redacted	right to effective representation		no				
2riverside_20110626_10_19_Redacted	Engery utilities, irrigation district, renewable resources		no				
2riverside_20110626_11_19_Redacted	Salton Sea, Solar energy,		no			agrarian vs. urban	
2riverside_20110626_12_19_Redacted	public utitlity district		no			san Diego county shares nothing	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110626_13_19_ Redacted	6262011	Mark Weissmann	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley and Imperial County should share reps. Cochella should not be with Western Riverside
2riverside_20110626_14_19_ Redacted	6262011	Jim Albrecht	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not add Imperial County to Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110626_15_19_ Redacted	6262011	Lilia Briceno	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not put Imperial County with Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110626_16_19_ Redacted	6262011	JoAnn Pepper	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Imperial County should be with East Riverside County, Palo Verde Valley
2riverside_20110626_17_19_ Redacted	6262011	Ofelia Valdez-Yeager	no		Riverside	Riverside	yes	Put Riverside, Moreno Valley and Perris together
2riverside_20110626_18_19_ Redacted	6262011	Brian S. Harnik	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Supports maps, Coachella Valley is a distinct community
2riverside_20110626_19_19_ Redacted	6262011	Charles and Jo Anne Dyson	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not split Coachella Valley, do not put with Imperial
2sbernardino_20110626_1_7_ Redacted	6262011	Jim Dodd	no				yes	Desert area needs own representative
2sbernardino_20110626_2_7_ Redacted	6262011	Scott Folkens	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide city of San bernardino, combine with Rialto, Colton, Grand Terrance, Loma Linda, Highland, Redlands
2sbernardino_20110626_3_7_ Redacted	6262011	Valerie Lichtman	no		San Bernardino	San Bernardino	yes	Keep San Bernardino whole
2sbernardino_20110626_4_7_ Redacted	6262011	Lois Lauer	no				yes	Supports Inland Action plan, objects to splitting Redlands
2sbernardino_20110626_5_7_ Redacted	6262011	Marry Ann Ruiz	no		Chino	San Bernardino	yes	Put San Gabriel Mountains north of Rancho Cucamonga in same district as mountain communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110626_13_19_ Redacted	Imperial, Riverside	Coachella Valley		no	yes	population demographics	agriculture, opportunities for alternative energy
2riverside_20110626_14_19_ Redacted	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110626_15_19_ Redacted	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110626_16_19_ Redacted	Imperial, Riverside	Coachella Valley	mountain ranges	no	yes	Latino population, lower income,	
2riverside_20110626_17_19_ Redacted	Riverside	Riverside, Moreno Valley and Perris		no	yes		
2riverside_20110626_18_19_ Redacted		Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110626_19_19_ Redacted	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110626_1_7_ Redacted				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110626_2_7_ Redacted	San Bernardino	Rialto, Colton, Grand Terrance, Loma Linda, Highland, Redlands, San Bernardino	10, 215, 210 Freeways	no	yes	Latino Population	
2sbernardino_20110626_3_7_ Redacted	San Bernardino	San Bernardino		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110626_4_7_ Redacted	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110626_5_7_ Redacted	San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga	LA county line, national forest boundary, I15	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110626_13_19_ Redacted	Salton Sea		no				
2riverside_20110626_14_19_ Redacted			no			politics should not be a part of redistricting process	
2riverside_20110626_15_19_ Redacted			no			different issues	first map is good
2riverside_20110626_16_19_ Redacted	suburban and rural, climate, irrigation, associations, air quality		no				
2riverside_20110626_17_19_ Redacted	medical facs, shopping, parks, entertainment, school districs, new jobs		no				
2riverside_20110626_18_19_ Redacted			no				
2riverside_20110626_19_19_ Redacted	for the good of the entire valley		no				
2sbernardino_20110626_1_7_ Redacted			no				
2sbernardino_20110626_2_7_ Redacted	water, transportation, aeducation districts		no				
2sbernardino_20110626_3_7_ Redacted			no				
2sbernardino_20110626_4_7_ Redacted			no				
2sbernardino_20110626_5_7_ Redacted	geographic, economic and recreational connections to the mountains		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110626_6_7_Redacted	6262011	Bruce and Carol Fertig	no		Crestline	San Bernardino	yes	SB mountains from Crestline to Big Bear should be in same districts
2sbernardino_20110626_7_7_Redacted	6262011	Cynthia Andrew	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Redlands. Include with Loma Linda and Highlands
3orange_20110626_1_6_Redacted	6262011	Donna L. Murray	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not split Dana Point
3orange_20110626_2_6_Redacted	6262011	Sue Rasmussen	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Include costa mesa, Fountain Valley, and Westminster with Huntington Beach in Orange County, no others.
3orange_20110626_3_6_Redacted	6262011	Sherry Frymoyer (duplicate)	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not divide Dana Point or place outside Orange County
3orange_20110626_5_6_Redacted	6262011	Laura Ouimet, Executive Director	yes	Dana Point Chamber of Commerce	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not divide dana point or place outsdie Orange County
3orange_20110626_6_6_Redacted	6262011	Yvonne Tsai	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine identifies South County, not North county
4langeles_20110626_1_43_Redacted	6262011	Barbara Koffman	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Brentwood Glen, keep with Brentwood
4langeles_20110626_2_43_Redacted	6262011	Susan Sills Casamassima	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood west of 405 with Brentwood, not westwood
4langeles_20110626_3_43_Redacted	6262011	Lee Brubaker	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divde Brentwood. Not part of westwood
4langeles_20110626_4_43_Redacted	6262011	Ashton Clarke Rice	no		Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not place Altadena with San Bernardino County. Place with all of Pasadena.
4langeles_20110626_5_43_Redacted	6262011	Arnold and Linda Levee	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict 90049, do not separate.
4langeles_20110626_6_43_Redacted	6262011	Andrew and Barbara Strasmore	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Brentwood Glen away from Waxmans district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110626_6_7_Redacted	San Bernardino	Crestline, Big Bear		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110626_7_7_Redacted		Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland		no	no		
3orange_20110626_1_6_Redacted	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110626_2_6_Redacted	Orange	Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley, Westminster, Huntington beach		no	no		
3orange_20110626_3_6_Redacted	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes		
3orange_20110626_5_6_Redacted	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes		
3orange_20110626_6_6_Redacted	Orange	Irvine		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_1_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood, Brentwood Glen	west of 405	no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_2_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood, Westwood	405	no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_3_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood, Westwood		no	no		
4langeles_20110626_4_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Altadena, Pasadena		no	yes	common interests	
4langeles_20110626_5_43_Redacted	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110626_6_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood Glen		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110626_6_7_Redacted			no				ok with flat land
2sbernardino_20110626_7_7_Redacted	need one congress member		no				
3orange_20110626_1_6_Redacted			no				
3orange_20110626_2_6_Redacted			no			other areas have no significance with our city	
3orange_20110626_3_6_Redacted	ocean water quality, transportation, land use planning, affordable housing		no				
3orange_20110626_5_6_Redacted	ocean water quality, transportation, land use planning, affordable housing		no				
3orange_20110626_6_6_Redacted	water districts, colleges, shopping		no			N and S very different	
4langeles_20110626_1_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_2_43_Redacted	needs are similar		no			Henry Wasman should keep Santa Monica	
4langeles_20110626_3_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_4_43_Redacted	school district, police department		no				
4langeles_20110626_5_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_6_43_Redacted			no				what other steps can we take?

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110626_7_43_Redacted	6262011	Albert Perdon	no		Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	Consider redrawing lines for Artesia and Cerritos or place in Orange County
4langeles_20110626_8_43_Redacted	6262011	Mary Ann Garvey	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110626_9_43_Redacted	6262011	Sara Homer	yes	Santa Monica Mountains and Seashore Foundation	Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Monica Mountains area should remain intact
4langeles_20110626_10_43_Redacted	6262011	Erwin and Caren Sokil	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide 90049
4langeles_20110626_11_43_Redacted	6262011	Joan C. Lavine, Attorney at Law	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not place rural and urban areas in same districts. Do not combine Southern Ventura County with Northwewstern Los Angeles.
4langeles_20110626_12_43_Redacted	6262011	Sarita Unger	no				yes	90049 needs to be kept as one district
4langeles_20110626_13_43_Redacted	6262011	Ronni Massok	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Do not Divide Brentwood Glen From Brentwood
4langeles_20110626_14_43_Redacted	6262011	Nancy Freedman, Chairman	yes	Brentwood Community Council	Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood along San Vicente Blvd.
4langeles_20110626_15_43_Redacted	6262011	Cindy Winebaum	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood into two districts.
4langeles_20110626_16_43_Redacted	6262011	Anna Soto	no		Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pomona in same district as Ontario, Chino, Montclair
4langeles_20110626_17_43_Redacted	6262011	Barry Kaplan	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide mountains-coast into 3 Congressional districts. Do not carve up Santa Monica Mountains
4langeles_20110626_18_43_Redacted	6262011	Elissa Siegel	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood Glen, do not put with Westwood

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110626_7_43_Redacted	Los Angeles, Orange	Artesia, Cerritos		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_8_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_9_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Santa Monica	405, 101, 1, 23	no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_10_43_Redacted				no	no		
4langeles_20110626_11_43_Redacted	Los Angeles, Ventura			no	no		
4langeles_20110626_12_43_Redacted				no	no		
4langeles_20110626_13_43_Redacted		Brentwood, Brentwood Glen	West of 405	no	no		
4langeles_20110626_14_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood, Brentwood Glen	Mulholland Dr to North, 405 Freeway to East, 26th st to west, Wilshire Boulevard to South	no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_15_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_16_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Pomona, Ontario, Chino, Montclair		no	no		
4langeles_20110626_17_43_Redacted	Los Angeles,	Santa Monica Mountains		no	no		
4langeles_20110626_18_43_Redacted	Los Angeles	Westwood, Brentwood, Brentwood Glen	405 freeway	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110626_7_43_Redacted	need representation, voting rights		no				
4langeles_20110626_8_43_Redacted	cohesive, active, civic minded community,		no				
4langeles_20110626_9_43_Redacted	significant natural resources, Santa Monica Mountains and seashore, tranportation, geography, economic, social		no				
4langeles_20110626_10_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_11_43_Redacted			no			Rural v. suburban, unworkable	
4langeles_20110626_12_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_13_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_14_43_Redacted	programs to protect land and use, representation, business		no				
4langeles_20110626_15_43_Redacted	VA plays big part of our lives		no				
4langeles_20110626_16_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_17_43_Redacted			no			return to current single congressional district bboundary lines, or SMMNRA	
4langeles_20110626_18_43_Redacted	schools, worship, stores		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110626_19_43_Redacted	6262011	Lori Noflin	yes	Carson Connected	Carson	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Carson.
4langeles_20110626_20_43_Redacted	6262011	Chuck Lagreco	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood Glen with Brentwood
4langeles_20110626_21_43_Redacted	6262011	Ann Karagozian	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Brentwood, do not pair with Westwood
4langeles_20110626_22_43_Redacted	6262011	Jim Dawson	no				yes	San Fernando Valley should be with Westside LA. Nest LAVSF and LAMWS into LASCV senate district.
4langeles_20110626_23_43_Redacted	6262011	David Siegrist	no				no	
4langeles_20110626_24_43_Redacted	6262011	Mary Ree	no				yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura, not Malibu. Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley with Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110626_25_43_Redacted	6262011	Lynn Brown	yes	Equestrian Trails, Inc		Los Angeles	yes	Do not change Griffith park, keep with one Assemblyman
4langeles_20110626_26_43_Redacted	6262011	Chris Bloom	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood whole
4langeles_20110626_27_43_Redacted	6262011	Cliff Evans	no				no	
4langeles_20110626_28_43_Redacted	6262011	Bruce Benson	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put SM mountains into senate LASCV. Say yes to Santa monica Bay Westside distict
4langeles_20110626_29_43_Redacted	6262011	Mary Ree	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall to Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110626_19_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Carson		no	yes	race lines	
4langeles_20110626_20_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood, Brentwood Glen	405 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110626_21_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood, Westwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_22_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_23_43_ Redacted				no	no		
4langeles_20110626_24_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles, Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110626_25_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Griffith Park		no	no		
4langeles_20110626_26_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_27_43_ Redacted				no	no		
4langeles_20110626_28_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Bay Westside		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_29_43_ Redacted		Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110626_19_43_ Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_20_43_ Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_21_43_ Redacted	needs and interests, local schools, interactions with representative		no				
4langeles_20110626_22_43_ Redacted	resources and quality of life protection, transort, education, religious, recreation, colleges, 101 freeway		no				
4langeles_20110626_23_43_ Redacted			no				maps shown on the web make no sense
4langeles_20110626_24_43_ Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_25_43_ Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_26_43_ Redacted	neighbborhood Council, VA, concerns		no				
4langeles_20110626_27_43_ Redacted			no				Do not to pressure and the rhetoric of Frank Luntz
4langeles_20110626_28_43_ Redacted	tranportation corridors, schools, water districts		no				
4langeles_20110626_29_43_ Redacted			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110626_30_43_Redacted	6262011	Shery Smith	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Put Sunland-Tujunga with Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale, Burbank.
4langeles_20110626_31_43_Redacted	6262011	Mary A. Rouse	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Brentwood Glen from Brentwood.
4langeles_20110626_32_43_Redacted	6262011	Dolores K. Shapirto	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood Glen with Brentwood, not Westwood
4langeles_20110626_33_43_Redacted	6262011	Joe Spano	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep SMMNRALas Virgenes in One distirct.
4langeles_20110626_34_43_Redacted	6262011	Ken and Flo Chotiner	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood together.
4langeles_20110626_35_43_Redacted	6262011	Paula Mejia	no		Downey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Downey together.
4langeles_20110626_36_43_Redacted	6262011	Joann Slimocosky	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Monica Mountains area must not be fragmented.
4langeles_20110626_37_43_Redacted	6262011	Michael G Evans (duplicate)	yes	Law Office of Michael G. Evans	Valencia	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita. Put in Antelope Valley Santa Clarita congressional district
4langeles_20110626_38_43_Redacted	6262011	Mark Emtiaz	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood.
4langeles_20110626_39_43_Redacted	6262011	Bianca Richards, Counselor	yes	Pasadena City College	Pasa Dena	Los Angeles	yes	South Pasadena should not be split. Should be with Pasadena, San Marino, La Canada, East LA, Maywood, Vernon, Commerce
4langeles_20110626_40_43_Redacted	6262011	Carol Mueller	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Palos verdes should be in Beach Cities district.
4langeles_20110626_41_43_Redacted	6262011	David R. Garfinkle, President	yes	Tarzana Property Owners Association, Inc	Tarzana	Los Angeles	yes	Reunify Western San Fernando Valley COI.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110626_30_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, La Crescenta, Montrose, Glendale, Burbank, Sunland-Tujunga		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_31_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood Glen, Brentwood	West of 405 freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110626_32_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	brentwood Glen, Brentwood, Westwood	405	no	no		
4langeles_20110626_33_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110626_34_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_35_43_ Redacted		Downey		no	no		
4langeles_20110626_36_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Santa Monica	mountains	no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_37_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110626_38_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_39_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Pasadena, San Marino, La Canada, East LA, Maywood, Vernon, Commerce, South Pasadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_40_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Palos Verdes, Beach cities		no	yes		
4langeles_20110626_41_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Santa Clarita	Santa Susanna Mountains, Techapi mountain	no	yes	ethnic	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110626_30_43_Redacted	open space, mountains, rural lifestyles		no				
4langeles_20110626_31_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_32_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_33_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_34_43_Redacted	Veterans Administration facility		no				
4langeles_20110626_35_43_Redacted			no				
4langeles_20110626_36_43_Redacted	education, public safety, conservation		no				
4langeles_20110626_37_43_Redacted			no				attached letter from the mayor
4langeles_20110626_38_43_Redacted	work as a community		no				
4langeles_20110626_39_43_Redacted	strong heritage, legacy, history		no				
4langeles_20110626_40_43_Redacted	shopping, businesses		no				
4langeles_20110626_41_43_Redacted	geometrically		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110626_43_43_ Redacted	6262011	Philip Lane	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita in one district. Do not split of area South of Placerita Canyon Road
6kern_20110626	6262011	Roy Malahowski	no			Kern	yes	Remove small area in Fresno County from Tulare and put in Fresno. Census tract 20 should be part of Metro Bakersfield COI. Keep Lancaster and Palmdale Together.
6merced_20110626	6262011	Teresa Talbott	no			Merced	yes	Do not combine Merced with coastal areas
7scruz_20110626	6262011	Antonio Rivas	yes	TCLEO		Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Hollister and Salinas Valley in same district as Watsonville. Move Scotts valley and Davenport to 17th district
8sfrancisco_20110626	6262011	Joni Eisen, President	yes	Potrero Hill Democratic Club	San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Please give Portero Hill an odd number district number
8sonoma_20110626	6262011	Kathleen Johnson	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not split Sonoma county, nothing in common with Yuba, Colusa, Glen
9amador_20110626	6262011	Jan Schmididger	yes	Hardy Custom Builders	Sheep Ranch	Amador	yes	Amador, Calaveras, and Toulumne should be in single districts
9dnorte_20110626	6262011	Carl Fagerskog	no			Del Norte	yes	Include Del Norte with other coastal counties.
9edorado_20110626	6262011	Don Nicodemus	no				yes	Davis goes with Yolo, Yuba and Sutter with WSAC. Yuba district gets Modoc, Lassen. MTCAP gets Placer, Stockton gets waterways
9sacramento_20110626	6262011	John R. Munn	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not divide Sacramento into separate districts, do not add Davis.
20110626	6262011	Ofelia Valdez-Yeager	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110626_43_43_ Redacted	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	Placerita Canyon Road	no	no		
6kern_20110626	Fresno, Tulare	Lancaster, Bakersfield, Palmdale, Tulare		no	yes	Latino residents	
6merced_20110626	Merced			no	no		
7scruz_20110626		Hollister, Salinas Valley, Scotts Valley		no	yes	Farm workers who speak Spanish and are low-income	agriculture
8sfrancisco_20110626		San Francisco		no	no		
8sonoma_20110626	Sonoma, Yuba, Colusa, Glen			no	no		
9amador_20110626	Amador, Calaveras, Toulumne			no	no		
9dnorte_20110626	Del Norte			no	no		
9edorado_20110626	Yuba, Sutter, Modoc, Siskiyou, Placer, San Joaquin	Stockton		no	no		
9sacramento_20110626	Sacramento,	Sacramento, Davis	I 80, Yolo Causeway	no	no		
20110626				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110626_43_43_ Redacted			no				
6kern_20110626			no				
6merced_20110626			no				
7scruz_20110626		provide Latino Voters with opportunity to elect candidates of their choice.	no				
8sfrancisco_20110626			no				
8sonoma_20110626			no			agriculture and arch-conservative vs. small farms, coast and environmental protection	
9amador_20110626			no				
9dnorte_20110626			no				
9edorado_20110626			no				
9sacramento_20110626			no			medium size city vs. larger city	
20110626			no				attached letter from Connie Galambbos Malloy about Perris with maps

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110626_1_6_Redacted	6262011	Sheryl Hamlin	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Combine Imperial and San Diego Counties
1imperial_20110626_2_6_Redacted	6262011	Barbara Nordine	no		Indio	Imperial	yes	Imperial should remain in Coachella Valley district
1imperial_20110626_3_6_Redacted	6262011	Paula Auburn	no				yes	Imperial shares a COI with Coachella Valley
1imperial_20110626_4_6_Redacted	6262011	W. Shire	no			Imperial	yes	Include Coachella Valley and Imperial county in one district
1imperial_20110626_5_6_Redacted	6262011	Dale walters, P.E.	no		Rancho Mirage	Imperial	yes	Southern Colorado Desert Valleys should be redistrict to include Coachella in a single district
1imperial_20110626_6_6_Redacted	6262011	Adriana Soares	no		Moreno Valley	Imperial	yes	Imperial should go to Riverside county, not large enough
1sdiego_20110626_1_4_Redacted	6262011	Chuck Kendall	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	Rancho Santa Fe should be with North Country
1sdiego_20110626_2_4_Redacted	6262011	Susan M. Colbourne	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	Align Rancho Santa Fe with Northern Boundaries
1sdiego_20110626_3_4_Redacted	6262011	Rob Schaefer	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	Rando Santa Fe should be in SANOC district
9sjoaquin_20110624_12	6242011	F. William Russell	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_13	6242011	Patrick Fischer	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_14	6242011	Veronica Atwood	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_15	6242011	Mark Chandler	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_16	6242011	Gary Daniel	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110626_1_6_Redacted	Imperial, San Diego			no	yes		
1imperial_20110626_2_6_Redacted	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
1imperial_20110626_3_6_Redacted	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
1imperial_20110626_4_6_Redacted	Imperial	Coachella Valley	through the pass to Beaumont and Banning	no	no		
1imperial_20110626_5_6_Redacted	Imperial	Colorado Desert, Coachella Valley		no	yes		
1imperial_20110626_6_6_Redacted	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
1sdiego_20110626_1_4_Redacted		Rancho Santa Fe		no	no		
1sdiego_20110626_2_4_Redacted		Rancho Santa Fe		no	yes	more rural than urban	
1sdiego_20110626_3_4_Redacted		Ranch Santa Fe		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_12	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_13	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_14	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_15	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_16	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110626_1_6_Redacted	share border issues		no				
1imperial_20110626_2_6_Redacted			no				
1imperial_20110626_3_6_Redacted			no				
1imperial_20110626_4_6_Redacted			no				
1imperial_20110626_5_6_Redacted	geography, climate, economic and population homogeny		no				
1imperial_20110626_6_6_Redacted			no				
1sdiego_20110626_1_4_Redacted			no				
1sdiego_20110626_2_4_Redacted			no				
1sdiego_20110626_3_4_Redacted			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_12	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_13	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_14	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_15	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_16	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_17	6242011	Bonnie H. Patrick	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_18	6242011	June Aaker	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be with San Joaquin, Not Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano
9sjoaquin_20110624_19	6242011	Steven Diede	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_20	6242011	Gus Prouty	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_21	6242011	Ron Crooham	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_22	6242011	Laurence Fred Helelr	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_23	6242011	Kathy Sherrill	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_24	6242011	Rex Young	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should stay with San Joaquin, not SF Bay and Napa Valley.
9sjoaquin_20110624_25	6242011	Daniel E. Phelps	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_26	6242011	Jennifer Plane	no		Stockton, Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_27	6242011	Beth Logue, Assistant Store Manager	yes	Wells Fargo	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_17	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_18	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_19	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_20	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_21	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_22	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_23	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_24	San Joaquin, San Francisco, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes		agriculture, economy, industry, work
9sjoaquin_20110624_25	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_26	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_27	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_17	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_18			no			No similar interests or concerns as North Bay	Please see attached letter
9sjoaquin_20110624_19	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_20	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_21	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_22	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_23	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_24	representation, population		no			Bay Area and Napa different industries, needs, populations from Lodi	
9sjoaquin_20110624_25	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_26	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_27	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_28	6242011	Michael Cary	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi out of San Joaquin, do not connect to Santa Rosa.
8sfrancisco_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011		no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Do not split LGBT community by putting Diamond Heights, Upper Haight with Richmond and Sunset. Do not split neighborhoods
8sfrancisco_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Edward Lortz	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	One district for SF
8smateo_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Ken Sutherland	no				yes	Do not carve Menlo Park out of its district
8smateo_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Russ Peterson	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Align Menlo Park with Palo Alto, Portrola Valley and Atherton.
8smateo_20110625_3_Redacted	6252011	Bill Lamkin	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not split Menlo Park. El Camino, Middlefield, Hwy 101
8smateo_20110625_4_Redacted	6252011	Jill Morgan	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not cut Menlo Park, keep with Atherton, Portola Valley and Woodside
8smateo_20110625_5_Redacted	6252011	Pamela Martin	no			San Mateo	yes	Not in favor of redistricting, districts should remain as currently set.
8smateo_20110625_6_Redacted	6252011	Bob and Diane Frankle	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not split Menlo Park into 2 districts
8smateo_20110625_7_Redacted	6252011	William A. Berry	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not split Menlo Park. Belongs with Palo Alto. Redwood city belongs with Redwood Shores and San Carlos
8smateo_20110625_8_Redacted	6252011	Tery Griffith	no				yes	Do not split Menlo Park or any small city, town.
8smateo_20110625_9_Redacted	6252011	Patrick E. White	no				yes	Menlo Park, Atherton and Portola Valley should be kept in one district, not split up.
8smateo_20110625_10_Redacted	6252011	Steve Cole	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Keep Menlo Park in one district. Do not split with Redwood City at the Boundary of San Mateo and Santa Clara
9amador_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	Johanna Atman, Ph.D	yes	Whole Life Therapies	Murphys	Amador	yes	Keep Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_28	San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110625_1_Redacted	San Francisco	San Francisco	Arguello, Geary, Stanyan, Clarendon, I280, 101	yes	yes	LGBT community, asian community	
8sfrancisco_20110625_2_Redacted	San Francisco	San Francisco		no	no		
8smateo_20110625_1_Redacted		Menlo Park		no	no		
8smateo_20110625_2_Redacted	San Mateo	Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Portrola Valley, Atherton		no	yes		
8smateo_20110625_3_Redacted	San Mateo	Menlo Park, El Camino, Middlefield	Highway 101	no	no		
8smateo_20110625_4_Redacted	San Mateo	Menlo Park, Atherton, Portola Valley, Woodside		no	yes	communities associated with	
8smateo_20110625_5_Redacted				no	no		
8smateo_20110625_6_Redacted		Menlo Park		no	yes		
8smateo_20110625_7_Redacted		Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Redwood City, Redwood shores, San Carlos		no	no		
8smateo_20110625_8_Redacted		Menlo Park		no	no		
8smateo_20110625_9_Redacted		Menlo Park, Atherton, Portola Valley		no	no		
8smateo_20110625_10_Redacted		Menlo Park, Redwood City, San Mateo, Santa Clara		no	no		
9amador_20110625_1_Redacted	Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_28			no			Do not create district that spans over 5 county lines	
8sfrancisco_20110625_1_Redacted			no				See attached map
8sfrancisco_20110625_2_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_1_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_2_Redacted	voting communities, representation		no				
8smateo_20110625_3_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_4_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_5_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_6_Redacted	close, small town community, diminishes importance		no				
8smateo_20110625_7_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_8_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_9_Redacted			no				
8smateo_20110625_10_Redacted			no			no compelling reason	
9amador_20110625_1_Redacted			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9amador_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Judith Marvin	no				yes	Keep Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne in same district.
9calaveras_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	William W. Moore	no		Valley Springs	Calaveras	yes	Keep boudaries. Central Sierra Foothills is COI
9calaveras_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Eileen Phillips	no			Calaveras	yes	Keep Calaveras with other two lode counties
9humboldt_20110625_1_Redacted	6252011	James DeSotel	no				yes	Keep Coastal Communities together, with Western Siskiyou
9humboldt_20110625_2_Redacted	6252011	Anita Marlin	no				yes	Keep Coastal Communities together, with Western Siskiyou
9sjoaquin_20110624_1	6242011	James A. Floyd	no		Acampo	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_2	6242011	Ron McGuire	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_3	6242011	Terry Goldberg	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_4	6242011	Kevin E. Stevens	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_5	6242011	Gregg Fontes	no		Woodbridge	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_6	6242011	J.D. Salisbury	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9amador_20110625_2_Redacted	Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne			no	no		
9calaveras_20110625_1_Redacted		Central Sierra Foothills		no	yes		
9calaveras_20110625_2_Redacted	Calaveras			no	no		
9humboldt_20110625_1_Redacted	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9humboldt_20110625_2_Redacted	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110624_1	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_2	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_3	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_4	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_5	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_6	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9amador_20110625_2_Redacted			no				
9calaveras_20110625_1_Redacted			no				Good Work
9calaveras_20110625_2_Redacted			no				
9humboldt_20110625_1_Redacted	rivers, ocean and shoreline protection, harbors, redwood parks, 101 corridor		no				
9humboldt_20110625_2_Redacted	rivers, ocean and shoreline protection, harbors, redwood parks, 101 corridor		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_1	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_2	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_3	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_4	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_5	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_6	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_7	6242011	Julie Clemings	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_8	6242011	Robert H. Patrick	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_9	6242011	F. William Russell	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_10	6242011	Don Pham	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
9sjoaquin_20110624_11	6242011	Kris Robinson	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties. Keep Lodi and San Joaquin in single district
1imperial_20110511_marquez	5122011	Ruben Marquez	no			Imperial County	yes	Give Imperial County own CongressmanState Assemblyman
1sdiego_20110510_ofield	5102011	Helen Ofield	yes	Lemon Grove Historical Society	Lemon Grove	San Diego	yes	Keep Lemon Grove together
1sdiego_20110505_ponder	552011	Mary Alice Ponder	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Keep District 4, Jacob Center together.
1imperial_20110415_farrow	4152011	Andrew Farrow	no		Pine Valley	Imperial County	yes	State Senate District 40Congressional District CA 51 comprised of completely different, geographically disassociated communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_7	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_8	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_9	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_10	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110624_11	Yolo, Napa, Marin, San Joaquin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
1imperial_20110511_marquez	Imperial County			no	no		
1sdiego_20110510_ofield		southeast San Diego, South La Mesa, Spring Valleyzipcodes 91945, 91941, 92114		yes	yes	Volunteerism	No industrial base, very few large companiestiny group of monied residents and a much larger group of impoverished residents
1sdiego_20110505_ponder				yes	no	District 4	
1imperial_20110415_farrow				yes	yes	Completely different communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_7	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_8	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_9	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_10	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110624_11	representation		no			No one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
1imperial_20110511_marquez	Current State AssemblymanCongressman livework at least 80 miles from where most of population is		no				Taking task of doing hard work of redistricting state fairly
1sdiego_20110510_ofield	If split, undermine unityeven distribution of raceincome regardless of ethnicity. Distinct identity and proud history.		no				
1sdiego_20110505_ponder	Give community a say		no				
1imperial_20110415_farrow	Try to separate by community, as the current lines show unethical gerrymandering.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110509_monroy	592011	Mario and Margie Monroy	no				no	
1sdiego_20110223_waldron	2232011	Michael and Marie Waldron	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Bring all citiescommunities into one AD. Currently, Escondido split by 7475 Ads
1sdiego_20110514_thongrivong	5142011	Khamp K. Thongrivong, speaker 051411052	yes	Pan Pacific Law Enforcement Association, Lao American Coalition		San Diego	yes	Two temples (726 44th St. and 205 65th St.) put into the same 78th AD, also including areas of Chollas View Neighborhoods (E of 805, S of 8, N of Market Street)
1sdiego_20110411_marston	5112011	Jeff Marston and Steve Peace, Co-Chairs	yes	California Independent Voter Policy			no	
1sdiego_20110513_cooper	5132011	Shirley and Norman Cooper	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Rancho Bernado is part of San Diego City, but are included into Vista, 25 miles east, to maximize the Republican voting area of Vista.
1sdiego_20110513_sanfilippo	5132011	Val Sanfilippo	no		San Diego	San Diego	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110509_monroy				no	no		
1sdiego_20110223_waldron		Escondido		no	yes	Confusion for residents about who assemblyperson is	
1sdiego_20110514_thongrivong				no	yes	social, cultural, religious gatherings for Lao community; give this community the opportunity to petition the same Assembly member on issues affecting community, share common interests with Southeast Asian and East African Refugees	
1sdiego_20110411_marston				no	yes	Vista does not have much in common with Rancho Bernardo.	
1sdiego_20110513_cooper				no	yes	Want majority Democratic districts in SD county because it is majority Democratic.	
1sdiego_20110513_sanfilippo				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110509_monroy			no				Please follow the law about drawing district lines.
1sdiego_20110223_waldron	Extra costs associated with printing election materials for one city, confusion as to who is assemblyperson.		no				
1sdiego_20110514_thongrivong	See social interest column		no				
1sdiego_20110411_marston			no				Please do not be partisan, as over 50 of California voters identify themselves as independent or non-partisan
1sdiego_20110513_cooper			no				Investigate vote being cheated by Republicans.
1sdiego_20110513_sanfilippo			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110513_schreiber	5132011	Betsy Schreiber, speaker 051311011	no		Encinitas	San Diego	yes	
1sdiego_20110513_zivotsky	5132011	Ann Zivotsky	no			San Diego	yes	Oceanside removed from 73rd AD and put into 74th AD.
1sdiego_20110514_peters	5142011	Silvia Peters	no		Oceanside	San Diego	yes	Oceanside similar to Encinitas and Cardiff by the Sea.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110513_schreiber		Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Del Mar, Rancho Santa Fe, Fairbanks, and northern part of city from Del Mar to Carmel Valley.		no	yes	All share same school districts, sewage treatment district, water districts; most services are integrated in that area. Paramedic district runs from Del Mar to Encinitas; Del Mar and Solana Beach share fire chiefs	
1sdiego_20110513_zivotsky		Put together Oceanside, Carlsbad, Vista, San Marcos, and coastal cities of Encinitas and Solana Beach		no	no		
1sdiego_20110514_peters		Oceanside NOT similar to Vista and Escondido, but more similar to Encinitas and Cardiff by the Sea.		no	yes	Oceanside has native Californian views	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110513_schreiber	All share same school districts, sewage treatment district, water districts; most services are integrated in that area. Paramedic district runs from Del Mar to Encinitas; Del Mar and Solana Beach share fire chiefs		no				
1sdiego_20110513_zivotsky	Oceanside more connected to Camp Pendleton; Oceanside not connected at all to rest of 73rd Assembly Dana Point, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Nigel and Laguna Hills socially and economically.		no				
1sdiego_20110514_peters	Vista and Escondido do not embrace racial diversity, void of social events, too many social problems, riots, demonstrations, abundance of churches, very conservative, lack political diversity and tolerance. Not at all like Oceanside.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110514_schreiber	5142011	Betsy Schreiber, speaker 051311011	no			San Diego	yes	San Marcos, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Fairbanks Ranch, North Western city of San Diego
1sdiego_20110515_crimmins	5152011	Michael Crimmins, continuation of testimony of speaker 051411061	no			San Diego	yes	Redraw CA-53 as a coastal community, and the rest of SDs remaining 4 CDs (49, 50, 51, 52) should fall into place
1sdiego_20110517_anonymous	5172011	Unknown	no				yes	CD 53, SD 39, SD 78, San Diego City and South Bay communities. Delete Riverside from Chula Vista AD or SD, as Riverside biased against Chula Vista Hispanic community. Border communities of Imperial can be matched with E Chula VistaSD County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110514_schreiber		San Marcos, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Fairbanks Ranch, North Western city of San Diego		no	yes	Share school districts, sanitation facilities, sewer system, water districts	
1sdiego_20110515_crimmins		Remove Lemon Grove and Spring Valley from CA-53 and use Interstate 15 as eastern boundary. Put La Jolla (currently CA-50 to west of I-805) into CA-53. Expand CA-53 boundaries north into Del Mar, Solana Beach, and Encinitas to reach target pop.	Move existing east boundary line in Imperial Beach to Interstate 5 (from 14th Street). A suitable eastern boundary for CA-53 would be I-5 for sure or possibly I15.	no	no		
1sdiego_20110517_anonymous		SD39 Delete communities included in City of Poway and SD City District 1 Del Mar Ranch, Carmel Ranch, Rancho Penasquitos, Rancho Bernardo. AD78 Nest with AD for South Bay Communities (Coronado, National City, Chula Vista West, City of Imperial Beach)	CD53 52 N, 5W, 15 E, 8 S.	no	yes	San Diego and South Bay share transportation (one trolley, easy to transfer buses between downtown SD and Chula Vista), geography (both sit on mesas, bays, and beaches), history (oldest, most urban sections of SD), parks (Balboa Park, Coronado Hotel Del	SD and South Bay largely made up of small houses, condos apartments, mid to low income

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110514_schreiber			no				
1sdiego_20110515_crimmins			no				
1sdiego_20110517_anonymous			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110517_johnson	5172011	L.A. Johnson	no		Desert Hot Springs	Riverside	yes	CD 45 Include Desert Hot Springs. Do not combine Desert Cities with Imperial Valley.
1sdiego_20110517_meyer	5172011	Rachel Meyer	no		Ramona	San Diego	yes	All Inland areas should be combined El Cajon, Santee, Poway, Santa Ysabel, Julian
1sdiego_20110517_ruiz	5172011	Sonia Ruiz	no		Carlsbad	San Diego	yes	Include Oceanside, Vista, parts of San Marcos, Escondido in CD 50. Include Oceanside in AD 74.
1sdiego_20110517_ryon	5172011	Andrea Ryon	no				yes	Carlsbad with coastal north county communities
1sdiego_20110517_wachter	5172011	Carolyn Wachter	no		Carlsbad	San Diego	yes	Include Carlsbad in the district of the coastal cities in the same vacinity
1sdiego_20110518_kafka	5182011	Mary Kafka	no		Ramona	San Diego	yes	Put Ramona (currently separated into 3 districts 66, 75, 77) into one district. Do not separate ethnic groups.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110517_johnson				no	yes	Desert cities of Riverside are resort and retirement communities. Imperial Valley an agricultural, military, and a border county, shares connection with SD through I-8	
1sdiego_20110517_meyer			Along Hwy 67	no	yes	Hwy 67 commonly traveled road, Julians and Santa Ysabels citizens travel through Ramona to and from shopping, working, etc.	
1sdiego_20110517_ruiz				no	yes	Spanish Language and Latino culture. Latinos have been subjected to anti-immigrant hostility.	Major discrepancy in educational attainment for Latinos especially when compared to non-Hispanic Whites.
1sdiego_20110517_ryon		Carlsbad, Oceanside, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Rancho Santa Fe, Del Mar		no	yes	Similar identities, demographics, cultures, weather, common work, transportation, leisure patterns	Coastal communities viewed as one market to SANDAG and San Diego media. Separate from inland north county communities
1sdiego_20110517_wachter				no	no		
1sdiego_20110518_kafka				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110517_johnson			no				
1sdiego_20110517_meyer			no				
1sdiego_20110517_ruiz			no				
1sdiego_20110517_ryon			no				
1sdiego_20110517_wachter			no				
1sdiego_20110518_kafka			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110518_rees	5182011	Judy Rees	no		Carlsbad	San Diego	yes	Oceanside and Carlsbad should be part of a coastal corridor district and not grouped with inland communities.
1sdiego_20110519_chan	5192011	David Chan	no				yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)
1sdiego_20110519_dekock	5192011	LaRu DeKock	no		University City	San Diego	yes	Redraw gerrymandered AD 77 so that University City in its natural community.
1sdiego_20110519_gallardo	5192011	Fred Gallardo	yes	COPAO			yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)
1sdiego_20110519_grospe	5192011	Joy Grospe	no				yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110518_rees		Can also include Camp Pendleton down the coast including Del Mar, La Jolla or Vista.		no	yes	Coastal Identity and shared social interests, similar demographics, SANDAG regional planning identifies north coastal v inland areas, overlapping school districts, common hospital districts, common I-5 and Hwy 101 routes	
1sdiego_20110519_chan				no	no		
1sdiego_20110519_dekock				no	no		
1sdiego_20110519_gallardo				no	no		
1sdiego_20110519_grospe				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110518_rees			no				
1sdiego_20110519_chan			no				
1sdiego_20110519_dekock			no				Thank you for performing a valued civic duty.
1sdiego_20110519_gallardo			no				
1sdiego_20110519_grospe			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110519_karnik	5192011	Avinash Karnik	no				yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)
1sdiego_20110519_low	5192011	Robin Low	no				yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)
1imperial_20110519_ortega	5192011	Antonio Ortega	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Include Imperial County with Coachella Valley, not with San Diego County
1sdiego_20110519_pulido	5192011	Alberto Pulido	yes	Latino Redistricting Committee			yes	See 8 maps attached.
1sdiego_20110519_quon	5192011	Peter Quon	no		Bonita	San Diego	yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110519_karnik				no	no		
1sdiego_20110519_low				no	no		
1imperial_20110519_ortega				no	yes	Imperial County and Coachella Valley share important environmental concerns, transportation corridors, population characteristics.	IC and CV share natural resources; both have seen a surge in development and potential interest from developers of renewable energy- bring much needed job growth, workforce, development boards, businesses in both Valleys. Mutually beneficial partnerships
1sdiego_20110519_pulido				no	no		
1sdiego_20110519_quon				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110519_karnik			no				
1sdiego_20110519_low			no				
1imperial_20110519_ortega	Salton Sea, Colorado River, New River are important shared prioritiesconcerns whicih must be protected and prioritized by State and Federal represenatives		no				
1sdiego_20110519_pulido			no				
1sdiego_20110519_quon			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110519_sitter	5192011	Cassidy Sitter	no			San Diego	yes	CA-53
1sdiego_20110519_tu	5192011	Yen Tu	yes	Yen Tu Consulting		San Diego	yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)
1sdiego_20110520_aba_sdiego	5202011	Joni Low, President and CEO	yes	Asian Business Association of San Diego		San Diego	no	Supports efforts of SCAPAL and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) to draw lines for AD and SD which keep Asian and Pacific Islander neighborhoods together
1sdiego_20110520_anderson2	5202011	Mike Anderson	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep East County district intact and separate from Imperial County.
1sdiego_20110520_goodwin	5202011	Joi Goodwin	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep Lakeside apart from Imperial County (too far and not connected in any way)
1sdiego_20110520_jones	5202011	Rionna Jones, follow-up testimony speaker 051411042	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110519_sitter		Expand CA-53 N to include Solana Beach, Del Mar, Encinitas along coast. Remove Lemon Grove and Spring Valley from CA 53 because their removal would premit the remaining 4 districts to be re-drawn with ease.	Move boundary line in Imperial Beach further east to I-5. Establish 5 or 15 as eastern boundary. Including La Jolla W of I-805 in CA-53.	no	yes	Coastal community	
1sdiego_20110519_tu				no	no		
1sdiego_20110520_aba_sdiego				no	no		
1sdiego_20110520_anderson2				no	no		
1sdiego_20110520_goodwin				no	yes	Connected to other communities in immediate area through roads, water needs, schools, emergency services, demographics, lifestyles	Local economy
1sdiego_20110520_jones				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110519_sitter			no				
1sdiego_20110519_tu			no				
1sdiego_20110520_aba_sdiego			no				
1sdiego_20110520_anderson2			no				
1sdiego_20110520_goodwin			no				
1sdiego_20110520_jones			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110520_kingstons	5202011	David and Charlotte Kingston	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	East San Diego County has unique economic and cultural circumstances that should be recognized and represented as one.
1sdiego_20110520_montgomery	5202011	Eric Montgomery	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep Lakeside within SD County
1sdiego_20110520_niman	5202011	Linda and Clifford Niman	no		Alpine	San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110520_parks	5202011	Michael Parks	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep Lakeside separate from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110520_roberts	5202011	Roger Roberts	no		La Mesa	San Diego	yes	Do not combine San Diego East County with Imperial County.
1sdiego_20110520_santos	5202011	Pat Santos, voter	yes	Lakeside Chamber of Commerce	Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep Lakeside separate from Imperial Valley County
1sdiego_20110520_voorakkara	5202011	Sidharth Voorakkara	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Keep Mission Hills, Bankers Hill, Little Italy, Hillcrest, North Park, Normal Heights, and Mission Bay.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110520_kingstons		El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Ramona, Alpine, Poway		no	no	El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Ramona, Alpine, Poway share transportation and water concerns that are most similar to SD County communities.	El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Ramona, Alpine, Poway share economies.
1sdiego_20110520_montgomery				no	yes	Lakeside not connected to Imperial County in terms of different political needs and ethnic associations	Imperial Valley a very rural area.
1sdiego_20110520_niman				no	no		
1sdiego_20110520_parks				no	no		
1sdiego_20110520_roberts		El Cajon, La Mesa, Santee, Ramona, Poway, Alpine, Jamul, Lakeside, Harbison Canyon, Crest, and several others should be kept separate from Imperial County		no	yes	Common infrastructure and civic relationships	
1sdiego_20110520_santos				no	no		
1sdiego_20110520_voorakkara				no	yes	frequent Mission Bay parks, restaurants, friends, government resources within these boundaries	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110520_kingstons			no				
1sdiego_20110520_montgomery			no				
1sdiego_20110520_niman			no				
1sdiego_20110520_parks			no				
1sdiego_20110520_roberts			no				
1sdiego_20110520_santos			no				
1sdiego_20110520_voorakkara			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110520_washington	5202011	Pat Washington	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Support map that has been presented by the Latino Redistricting Committee.
1sdiego_20110521_buckel	5212011	Don Buckel	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Do not merge Lakeside and other East County Communities with Imperial County
1sdiego_20110521_herzog	5212011	CM Herzog	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Do not merge Lakeside and East County with Imperial County
1sdiego_20110521_sander	5212011	Caprice Sander	no			San Diego	yes	Keep East County together but separate from Imperial
1sdiego_20110521_slagle	5212011	Alice Slagle	no		El Cajon	San Diego	yes	Keep El Cajon and Lakeside separate from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110521_soule	5212011	Judy Soule	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep Lakeside separate from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110522_boettger	5222011	Ray Boettger	no		Escondido	San Diego	no	Have one district that covers all of Escondido. Ideally, it would cover Inland north SD only.
1sdiego_20110522_nelson	5222011	Deb Nelson	no			San Diego	no	Do not redistrict any East County towns in SD county, because we are already suffering a financial crisis, and taxes would surely be raised.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110520_washington				no	yes	Hard, dedicated and inclusive work of Latinos, Asians, and African Americans.	
1sdiego_20110521_buckel				no	no		
1sdiego_20110521_herzog				no	no		
1sdiego_20110521_sander				no	yes		Does not make economic sense to include East County area of SD with Imperial County.
1sdiego_20110521_slagle				no	no		
1sdiego_20110521_soule				no	yes	Spend as much time in San Diego as they do in Lakeside.	
1sdiego_20110522_boettger			Areas along Hwy I15 have a common interest.	no	no		
1sdiego_20110522_nelson				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110520_washington		Please be fair to be consistent with Voting Rights Act, and be realistic about how far African Americans and the LGBT community still have to go in terms of both social and political advancements in CA	no				
1sdiego_20110521_buckel			no				
1sdiego_20110521_herzog			no				
1sdiego_20110521_sander			no				
1sdiego_20110521_slagle			no				
1sdiego_20110521_soule			no				
1sdiego_20110522_boettger			no				
1sdiego_20110522_nelson			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110522_petersen	5222011	Tim and Mona Petersen	yes	Rock Canyon Vineyards	Alpine	San Diego	no	Do not include East County SD with Imperial Valley
1sdiego_20110522_waldron	5222011	Marie Waldron	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Do not split Escondido in 74th and 75th district; rather, combine it into one district.
1sdiego_20110523_frank	5232011	Lynn Frank	yes	Witherow Roofing	Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep Lakeside with San Diego and separate from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110523_ahring	5232011	Becky Ahring	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Keep Lakeside with San Diego and separate from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110523_bass	5232011	Traci Bass	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Dont let Escondido be split.
1sdiego_20110523_bunch	5232011	Billy and Jeanne Bunch	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Escondido needs to be unified into one Assembly seat.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110522_petersen				no	yes	East County residential, rural, cool weather, wildfire concerns. Imperial desert farming community, migrant workers	Imperial county low income, high unemployment.
1sdiego_20110522_waldron				no	yes	Escondidos agricultural history and interests should be represented.	
1sdiego_20110523_frank				no	yes	Lakeside more similar to San Diego than to Imperial County	
1sdiego_20110523_ahring				no	yes	Imperial would ignore Lakesides needs.	
1sdiego_20110523_bass				no	yes	Escondido should be in a district with other inland cities-makes no sense to put it with coastal cities.	
1sdiego_20110523_bunch		Group Escondido with San Marcos, Valley Center, Vista, Fallbrook		no	yes	Escondido has nothing in common with coastal cities. It has different environmentaltransportatio n issues. Even local newspaper has an inland and a coastal section.	Different economies based on different geographies. Inland cities - agricultural, older infrastructure, needing jobs.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110522_petersen			no				
1sdiego_20110522_waldron			no				
1sdiego_20110523_frank			no				
1sdiego_20110523_ahring			no				
1sdiego_20110523_bass			no				
1sdiego_20110523_bunch			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110523_casillan	5232011	Rohanee Casillan	no			San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110523_cumba	5232011	Mark Cumba	no		San Diego	San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110523_hansen	5232011	Cathy Hansen	no		Lakeside	San Diego	yes	Opposed to joining Lakeside with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110523_casillan				no	yes	Supports efforts of SCAPAL (Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR (Coaltion of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting) in keeping Asian Pacific Islander neighborhoods and communities together in San Diego County.	
1sdiego_20110523_cumba				no	yes	Supports efforts of SCAPAL (Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR (Coaltion of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting) in keeping Asian Pacific Islander neighborhoods and communities together in San Diego County.	
1sdiego_20110523_hansen				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110523_casillan			no				
1sdiego_20110523_cumba			no				
1sdiego_20110523_hansen			no				Read What is redistricting? a description of the Citizen Redistricting Commission and how the Commission decides the lines to be drawn, then made decision.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110523_hollingworth	5232011	Tracy Hollingworth	yes	East San Diego County Association of REALTORS	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Keep San Diegos East County together and separate from Imperial County
1sdiego_20110523_huynh	5232011	Hai Huynh	yes	Law Office of Peter D. Chu	San Diego	San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110523_le	5232011	Tiffany Le	no		San Diego	San Diego	no	Supports testimony of 5132011 San Marcos speaker 34, 5142011 San Diego speakers 36, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46
1sdiego_20110523_lorenzo	5232011	Marty Lorenzo	yes	DLA Piper LLP	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)
1sdiego_20110523_menez	5232011	Krystal Menez	no			San Diego	no	Supports testimony of 5132011 San Marcos speaker 34, 5142011 San Diego speaker 36, 20, 44

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110523_hollingworth		El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Ramona, Alpine, Poway		no	yes	East County cities share transportation and water concerns, are most similar to surrounding San Diego cities	Imperial County has an agricultural economy different from East San Diegos
1sdiego_20110523_huynh				no	yes	Supports efforts of SCAPAL (Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR (Coaltion of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting) in keeping Asian Pacific Islander neighborhoods and communities together in San Diego County.	
1sdiego_20110523_le				no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_lorenzo				no	no		
1sdiego_20110523_menez				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110523_hollingworth			no				
1sdiego_20110523_huynh			no				
1sdiego_20110523_le			no				
1sdiego_20110523_lorenzo			no				
1sdiego_20110523_menez			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110523_uyeji	5232011	Kimberly Uyeji	yes	Kimberly Hisa Attorney At Law	San Diego	San Diego	no	Keep Asian American Pacific Island neighborhoods in San Diego together (5132011 San Marcos speakers 34, 36, 17, 18, 33, 35, 37, 13; 5142011 San Diego Speakers 17, 18, 20, 28, 44, 46, 21, 22, 23, 45, 52)
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Frank Salazar	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Do not move 80th AD. For once Imperial Valley feels like part of the process being naligned with Coachella Valley.
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Sonia Lopez	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	no	Retain Imperial Valley and San Diego Senate and Congressional Districts together
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5222011	Robert Rubio	yes	Elks, Calexico Lodge	Calexico	Imperial County	yes	Keep Imperial County with Coachella Valley
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Everardo Cervantes	no			Imperial County	yes	Imperial Valley does not receive fair representation since its district is shared by cities like San Diego. District should be composed of similar communities.
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Olivia Delgado	no		Heber	Imperial County	no	Keep Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley together because Imperial Valley is recognized as a voting rights population that is protected under law. But more importantly because of that Imperial Valley has an opp. to be heard.
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Bianka Velez	yes	Comite Civic Del Valle			no	Sent Olivia Delgados letter
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Jarvis Crawford	no			Imperial County	yes	Keep Coachella Valley with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110523_uyeji				no	no		
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	no		
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	yes	High concentration of Latinos in both areas that give the Latino population the opportunity to exercise voting power.	The two are dependent on each other for resources, that of food as well as material resources.
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	no	Imperial County has agricultural, water rights. Future of Salton Sea common to both areas.	
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	no		
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	no		
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	no		
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110523_uyeji			no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				Next time, please consider a hearing in Imperial County
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Carmen Lopez	yes	President, Latina Latino Indigenous People Unity Coalition; member Latina Redistricting Committee	San Diego	San Diego	yes	SD Imperial Valley, San Diego. AD connect Coachella with Imperial. CD kept together as one both Imperial and SD counties. No nesting. wrote on her 51411 testimony - speaker 35
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Rosa Ley	no			Imperial County	yes	Current 80th AD and 40th SD. Doesnt make sense to group Imperial Valley with rest of Riverside County, only Coachella Valley. speaker 3 on 51411
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	5232011	Martin Nolasco	no				no	Sent a Letter of Support
2sbernardino_20110318_gamboa	3182011	Benjamin Gamboa	no			San Bernadino	yes	Highland, a suburb of the San BernadinoRiverside area, should see considerable growth in representation at the conclusion of this process.
2sbernardino_20110506_karmatz	562011	Bernard Karmatz	no			San Bernadino	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	yes	Educational experience ties Imperial with San Diego. Education is important to utilize agricultural resources in most efficient way. Large Latino populations. Bilingual and Bicultural.	Food industry in Imperial
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				no	yes		Latino communities that are significantly on farm work. Imperial County depends on San Diego and Mexico for our businesses and services like health care.
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm				yes	no		
2sbernardino_20110318_gamboa	San BernadinoRiverside area			yes	yes	Area has been gerrymandered into districts which arent representative of the communities they are supposed to representative. Afraid highly partisan groups will continue to gerrymander.	
2sbernardino_20110506_karmatz				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm	Give Imperial Valley voice by uniting so they can make an impact	Give Imperial Valley representation supporting the Voting Rights Act	no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				
1imperial_20110523_prior_to_5pm			no				
2sbernardino_20110318_gamboa			no				
2sbernardino_20110506_karmatz			no				Have meeting on a weekday, rather than on a Sunday to be more inclusive of nearby government employees and surrounding constituents.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110509_kopp	592011	George Kopp	no		Joshua Tree	San Bernadino	yes	Desert communities of Morongo Valley, Yucca Valley, Joshua Tree, Twentynine Palms kept together
2sbernardino_20110511_hernandezblair	5112011	Irene Hernandez-Blair	no		Chino	San Bernadino	yes	Chino should not be in the same ADSDCD as Los Angeles and Orange Counties. All legislative districts should be kept within communities within the same county.
2sbernardino_20110512_agrella	5122011	Chris Agrella	no			San Bernadino	yes	San Bernadino needs the most updating out of all boundary lines currently in place. While San Bernadino county is large, its communities can be much better represented than they currently are.
2sbernardino_20110512_chapman	5122011	Steve Chapman	no			San Bernadino	yes	Redraws CD-43, CD-41, CD-25 (Please see attached PDF)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110509_kopp		Morongo Valley, Yucca Vallley, Joshua Tree, Twentynine Palms		no	yes	share common concerns	share common economic interests
2sbernardino_20110511_hernandezblair		Chino, Chino Hills, Ontario, Montclair should be made into their own AD. CDSD should be maintained within these boundaries and NOT go into LA or Orange Counties.		yes	yes	Residents shop, worship, seek entertainment, enjoy life in THEIR county, not others.	
2sbernardino_20110512_agrella				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110512_chapman	San Bernadino County	(Please see attached PDF)		no	yes	common cultural area, with historic ties among communities; mountain communities and East Valley comunities linked through common transportation and cultural markets	share common economic markets

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110509_kopp	share common socialeconomic interests. Assemblywoman Connie Conway has never been to Joshua Tree.		no				
2sbernardino_20110511_hernandezblair	People associate with their own community, which does not include LA or Orange County		no				
2sbernardino_20110512_agrella			no				
2sbernardino_20110512_chapman	Reasons stated in attached PDF.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110503_smith	532011	Raymond Smith	yes	Riverside County Board of Supervisors, Public Information Officer		Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110427_price	4272011	Milton Price	no			Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110504_shackelford	542011	Karen Shackelford	no		Norco	Riverside	yes	Do not allow Norco to be divided into Orange County and Riverside County
2riverside_20110504_nissley	542011	Linda Nissley	no		Norco	Riverside	yes	Keep Norco as one district
2riverside_20110505_kilpatrick	552011	Beverly Kilpatrick	no		Norco	Riverside	yes	Keep Norco as one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110503_smith				no	yes		
2riverside_20110427_price				no	yes		
2riverside_20110504_shackelford		Norco		no	yes	Population of mostly like-minded people who enjoy semi-rural lifestyle. Keep Norco separate from Eastvaley and Corona.	
2riverside_20110504_nissley		Norco		no	yes		
2riverside_20110505_kilpatrick		Norco		no	yes	Rural animal keeping lifestyle	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110503_smith	Fractionalizing Riverside would diminish local agencies effectiveness in seeking coordinated assistance from legislators. Need to protect interest of a poor minority population. Need to address health, transportation, education and safety issues.		no				
2riverside_20110427_price	Riverside should have more representation. San Diegos North County deserves to be separated and have its own representation.		no				
2riverside_20110504_shackelford	Help likeminded Norconians be represented by one representative to understands town and desires of majority of population		no				
2riverside_20110504_nissley	Do not confuse small city with multiple districts		no				
2riverside_20110505_kilpatrick	Too small to be divided up		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110506_gosch	562011	Eric Gosch	yes	Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group	San Jacinto Valley	Riverside	yes	Group Hemet and San Jacinto in a single congressional district, see attached Google Earth image
2riverside_20110506_kopp	562011	John Kopp	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110510_chapman	5102011	Stephen Chapman	no			San Bernadino	yes	Please see map. East San Bernadino valley together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110506_gosch		Hemet and San Jacinto		no	yes	Geographically distinct (surrounded on three sides by hillsmtns, no other cities share borders; 100 year common history of agriculture, recent suburbanization, one local weekly newspaper, city councils finally cooperating	common economic base, shared work opportunitieseconomic challenges, city councils working to resolve difficult economic issues
2riverside_20110506_kopp				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110510_chapman		Loma Linda, Redlands, Highland, Yucaipa, mountain cities, unincorporated areas of San Bernadino mountains together.	mtns N slope in San Bernadino County from Wrightwood on W through the Lucerne Valley then to Yucca Valley and Riverside County boundary can extend this area. AD remainder of northern and eastern San Bernadino county can extend the area.	no	yes	common transportation, education, cultural affairs	single market area for economic commerce

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110506_gosch	In social interest and economic interest columns		no				
2riverside_20110506_kopp			no				Please make sure to take note of newly incorporated City of Eastvale and proposed borders of City of Jurupa Valley, see attached map for reference.
2sbernardino_20110510_chapman			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110512_garcia	5122011	George Garcia (14 copies)	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley area into one district, Imperial County areas in another district. Cities west of the mountain range be part of a different and separate voting district.
2riverside_20110513_alley	5132011	Nancy Alley	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_brown	5132011	Laurie Brown	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_conkey	5132011	Harlan Conkey	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_creek	5132011	Nancy Creek	no				yes	Include Coachella Valley with Riverside County
2riverside_20110513_davis	5132011	Linda Davis	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Keep CD-45 intact and in Riverside County ONLY, have nothing in common with Imperial county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110512_garcia				no	yes	Rancho Mirage has nothing in common with Hemet, Menifee, Temecula, Perris, and Moreno Valley areas. Large gay and lesbian population in Palm SpringsCoachella Valley that does not exist in Hemet Perris, Temecula, Moreno Valley..	Agriculture huge in Coachella Valley and Imperial Valleys. Industries around that indsutry share common interests apart from areas of Hemet, Temecula, Moreno Valley.
2riverside_20110513_alley				no	yes		Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110513_brown				no	yes	Coachella Valley resort communities with hotels, restaurants, and events. Mode of transporation PS airport, I10, Hwy 111. Big retirement community. Imperial is an hour drive away.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110513_conkey				no	yes	Desert cities have formed a close working relationship with each other. Major retirement center.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110513_creek				no	yes	maintain common interest for this area retirement, medical centers	maintain common interest for this area tourism
2riverside_20110513_davis				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110512_garcia	Group based on where people shop, travel, work, go to school.		no				
2riverside_20110513_alley			no				
2riverside_20110513_brown			no				
2riverside_20110513_conkey			no				
2riverside_20110513_creek			no				
2riverside_20110513_davis			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110513_endres	5132011	Sherri Endres	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_grace	5132011	Byron and Jean Grace	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_gummig	5132011	Monica Gummig	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110513_endres				no	yes	Coachella Valley PSP airport, Hwy 111, Hwy 10, resort community, compact geo area, shared local media, home owners have homes in LA or OC, retirement community, shared health care; Imperial County rural farm community, Int. 8 connects Imperial to SD	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110513_grace				no	yes	Coachella PS airport, Hwy 111, Hwy 10, large retirement population, suburban, govts which do not include Imperial. Imperials Mexican border issues shared with SD.	Imperial-agriculture, high unemployment, poverty challenges; Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110513_gummig				no	yes	Separate healthcare systems and environmental issues. Imperial should be kept with San Diego, while Coachella Valley should keep ties to L.A. and Orange County, many of whose residents have second homes in Coachella Valley.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110513_endres			no				
2riverside_20110513_grace			no				
2riverside_20110513_gummig			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110513_hunters ofsuncity	5132011	The Hunters of Sun City	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Do not combine CD-45 with Imperial County.
2riverside_20110513_kay	5132011	Terry Kay	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_kay	5132011	Elaine Leib (at end of Terry Kay email)	no				no	
2riverside_20110513_mcwillia ms	5132011	Peter McWilliams	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley intact; keep CD in Riverside County only and do not combine with Imperial ValleyCounty
2riverside_20110513_odonnell	5132011	Carol ODonnell	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110513_hunters ofsuncity				no	yes	As semi-retirees, do not with to go from a resort-atmosphere, suburban type living style to a rural community	
2riverside_20110513_kay			Reasonable boundaries Coachella Valleys surrounding mountain ridges, possibly including High Desert area of Morongo Valley thru to 29 Palms, including Joshua Tree National Park	no	yes	Coachella Valley focuses on recreation, seniors, education, health	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-alternative energy
2riverside_20110513_kay				no	yes	20 Coachella Valley homes are seasonal, well above state avg of 2.2. Palm Desert has 48,445 residents up from 41,155 in 2000.	
2riverside_20110513_mcwillia ms				no	no		
2riverside_20110513_odonnell				no	yes	Coachella share transportation sources, a health care system, associations of govts and media sources, all cities are geographically contiguous, fast-growing retirement community, suburban. Imperial assoc with SD. Distinct environmental issues.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110513_hunters ofsuncity			no				
2riverside_20110513_kay			no				
2riverside_20110513_kay			no				
2riverside_20110513_mcwillia ms			no				
2riverside_20110513_odonnell			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110513_schlegel	5132011	Stuart and Nancy Schlegel	no		La Quinta	Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110513_single	5132011	Nancy Single	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_spada	5132011	George and Marietta Spada	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110514_swensen	5142011	Bob Swensen	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_wahlert	5132011	Len Wahlert	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110513_willard	5132011	Ann Willard	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110514_botts	5142011	Bob Botts	yes	Banning City Council, member and former Mayor	Banning	Riverside	yes	San Gorgonio Pass area Calimesa, Banning, Beaumont; desire to be kept together in one AD, SD, and CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110513_schlegel				no	yes		Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110513_single				no	yes	Coachella Valley filled with retirees, Imperial County mostly farmland, rural	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110513_spada				no	yes		Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_swensen				no	no		
2riverside_20110513_wahlert				no	no		
2riverside_20110513_willard				no	yes	Coachella Valley has a large number of retirees	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_botts			Isolated in San Gorgonio Pass between Western Riverside County on West and Coachella Valley cities on East. Both Coachella area and cities of Riverside, Moreno Valley, Hemet, etc. represent very different demographics.	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110513_schlegel			no				
2riverside_20110513_single			no				
2riverside_20110513_spada			no				
2riverside_20110514_swensen			no				Hope CRC will be careful to not favor one political party over another
2riverside_20110513_wahlert			no				
2riverside_20110513_willard			no				
2riverside_20110514_botts			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110514_christie	5142011	unknown	no			Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110514_czanstke	5142011	George Czantske	no				yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110514_davis2	5142011	Linda Davis	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110514_davis	5142011	Jeff and Linda Davis	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110514_drayton	5142011	Marjorie and Bruce Drayton	no			Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley
2riverside_20110514_mead	5142011	John Mead	no			Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110514_christie				no	yes	Coachella Valley shared transportation, fastest growing retirement population, shared healthcarestandard of livingsuburban lfiestyle, share local media, LA based newspapersTVradio; Imperial County distinct environmental issues Salton Sea, New River.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_czanstke				no	yes	Imperial Valley has environmental problems from New River and Salton Sea, and shares a border with Mexico and all that entails. Afraid Coachella would get short end of representation	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_davis2				no	yes	125 golf courses and country clubs in Coachella Valley	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_davis				no	yes		Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_drayton				no	yes	Coachella Valley has fastest growing retirement population, has shared health care system dedicated to aging population	Coachella has higher standard of living than in Imperial County. Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_mead				no	yes		Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110514_christie			no				
2riverside_20110514_czanstke			no				
2riverside_20110514_davis2			no				
2riverside_20110514_davis			no				
2riverside_20110514_drayton			no				
2riverside_20110514_mead			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110514_pettis	5142011	Greg Pettis	yes	City Council of Cathedral City, member	Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	CD should be Imperial County eastern Riverside County from Blythe to BanningBeaumontCalimesa Pass; One AD in Imperial County should come north to include Coachella Valley cities Blythe, Coachella, Indio, La Quinta with unincorporated areas
2riverside_20110514_pursley	5142011	Mr. and Mrs. William Pursley	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley (counties) into one CD.
2riverside_20110514_smith	5142011	Smith (gdbjsmith)	no			Riverside	yes	Do not combine, in a CD, Coachella Valley with Imperial ValleyCounty.
2sbernardino_20110511_marquez	5112011	Sherry Marquez	no		Antelope Valley	San Bernadino	yes	Agree with GAVEAAVBOT proposed district.
2riverside_20110518_hockenberry	5182011	Mr and Mrs Jon Hockenberry	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110514_pettis	geographic comment cont AD2 westward from Washington and include Indian Wells, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, unincorporated areas.		I10 and CA Hwy 86 are central connections for area, CA Hwy 60 at the BanningBeaumont Pass should be considered dividing line for districts. In La Qunita Washington St should be the boundary line for the AD.	no	yes		Need 3-legged stool of financial drivers tourism, agriculture, alternative fuels. Coachella takes care of tourism and alternative fuel (wind solar), ImperialBlythe takes care of agriculture, Imperial also takes care of alternative energy (geothermal)
2riverside_20110514_pursley				no	yes	Coachella Valley shares transportation PS airport and I10. Fastest growing retirement population in state.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2riverside_20110514_smith				no	yes		Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourist.
2sbernardino_20110511_marquez				no	yes		
2riverside_20110518_hockenberry	Imperial	La Quinta	-	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110514_pettis	Coalition of economic organizations that have worked together for years (Coachella Valley Economic Partnership, Imperial Valley Economic Development Corporation, Mexicali Valley) dealing with economic factors and occasionally transportation.		no				Appreciate if Cathedral City and Thousand Palms would remain in the same district, since Cathedral City in process of expanding sphere of influence to include all of unincorporated area of Thousand Palms east to Washington A
2riverside_20110514_pursley			no				
2riverside_20110514_smith			no				
2sbernardino_20110511_marquez	Form one all-encompassing High Desert Senate District with Antelope Valley and those communities in Victor ValleyMojave Desert communities of San Bernadino and Inyo Counties to keep them intact in an Assembly District.		no				
2riverside_20110518_hockenberry			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110518_kelly	5182011	Mary Helen Kelly	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep 45th Congressional District and 64th Assembly District in Riverside County
2riverside_20110518_madson	5182011	Nancy Madson	no		Coachella	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside County together
2riverside_20110518_matthews	5182011	Mark Matthews	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside County together
2riverside_20110518_miller	5182011	Glenn A. Miller	yes	mayor pro tem, Indio	Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside County together
2riverside_20110518_pendleton	5182011	Dereth Pendleton	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Dont combine Coachella Valley with another region
2riverside_20110518_pfeiffer_j	5182011	Janet Pfeiffer	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella intact and dont combine it with Imperial County
2riverside_20110518_pyle	5182011	Patricia Carlile Pyle	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley intact
2riverside_20110518_rios	5182011	Manny Rios	no		Coachella	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella intact and dont combine it with Imperial County
2riverside_20110518_scully	5182011	Patricia Scully	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside County together
2riverside_20110518_ashley	5182011	Barbara Ashley and company	yes		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial County
2riverside_20110518_updyke	5182011	Doris Updyke	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella intact and dont combine it with Imperial County
2riverside_20110518_withers	5182011	Charlene Withers	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside County
2riverside_20110521_beaty	5212011	Barbara Beaty	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside County
2riverside_20110522_foat	5222011	Ginny Foat	yes	city council member, Palm Springs	Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial County
2riverside_20110521_hoag	5212011	Anita W. Hoag	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Combine Eastern Riverside County and Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110518_kelly	Riverside	Palm Desert	-	no	yes	Coachella Valley shares public protection services and instutitions of higher education	shared tourism industry
2riverside_20110518_madson	Riverside	Coachella, Indio, Thousand Palms	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_matthews	Riverside	-	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_miller	Riverside, Imperial	Indio	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_pendleton	-	-	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_pfeiffer_j	Imperial	Palm Springs, Coachella, Imperial	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_pyle	Riverside, Imperial	-	-	no	yes	good roads, schools, healthcare	shared tourism industry
2riverside_20110518_rios	-	Coachella	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_scully	Riverside, Imperial	-	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_ashley	Imperial	Indio	Interstate 8 highway	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_updyke	Riverside	Palm Desert	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110518_withers	Riverside	-	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110521_beaty	Riverside, Imperial	Palm Desert	Interstate 10	no	no		
2riverside_20110522_foat	Riverside, Imperial	Palm Springs	Interstate 10, San Jacinto Mountains, Santa Rosa Mountains	no	no		
2riverside_20110521_hoag	Riverside, Imperial	Palm Springs	-	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110518_kelly			no				
2riverside_20110518_madson			no				
2riverside_20110518_matthews			no				
2riverside_20110518_miller			no				
2riverside_20110518_pendleton			no				
2riverside_20110518_pfeiffer_j			no				
2riverside_20110518_pyle			no				
2riverside_20110518_rios			no				
2riverside_20110518_scully			no				
2riverside_20110518_ashley			no				
2riverside_20110518_updyke			no				
2riverside_20110518_withers			no				
2riverside_20110521_beaty			no				
2riverside_20110522_foat			no				
2riverside_20110521_hoag			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110522_mccoy	552011	Michael McCoy	no		Moreno Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not divide Moreno Valley, focus on metropolitan areas when drawing districts, be fair
2riverside_20110522_malachowsky	5222011	Janet Malachowsky	no			Riverside	yes	Combine Coachella Valley and Imperial County
2riverside_20110522_miller	5222011	Sharon Miller	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Combine Coachella Valley and Imperial County
2riverside_20110522_robinson	5222011	Ira L. Robinson	yes	delegate, Democratic Party	Temecula	Riverside	yes	Divide Riverside County into three congressional districts, include Temecula, Murrieta, and Wildomar in the same congressional, assembly, and senatorial districts
2sbernardino_20110515_hernandezblair	5152011	Irene Hernandez-Blair (amends input of 51111)	no		Chino	San Bernadino	yes	Keep City of Pomona with Chino, Chino Hills, Ontario and Montclair
2sbernardino_20110517_boudreaux	5172011	Diane Boudreaux	no		Chino	San Bernadino	yes	Keep the assembly district of Pomona, Ontario, Chino, and Monclair together
2sbernardino_20110517_leon	5172011	Norma Leon	no		Chino	San Bernadino	yes	Keep Pomona, Ontario, Chino, and Monclair together
2sbernardino_20110517_ruh	5172011	Bill Ruh	yes	councilmember, Montclair	Montclair	San Bernadino	yes	Keep Pomona, Ontario, Chino, and Monclair together
2sbernardino_20110518_crowe	5182011	Annette Crowe	no			San Bernadino	yes	Keep Pomona, Ontario, Chino, and Monclair together
2sbernardino_20110518_fleager	5182011	Michael Fleager	no		Chino Hills	San Bernadino	yes	Keep Chino Hills and surrounding areas together
2sbernardino_20110515_gehrke	5152011	Tim Gehrke	no			San Bernadino	yes	Keep San Bernardino district within the county lines
2sbernardino_20110518_rodriguez_f	5182011	Freddie Rodriguez	no		Pomona	San Bernadino	yes	Keep Pomona, Ontario, Chino, and Monclair together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110522_mccoy	-	Moreno Valley	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110522_malachowsky	Imperial	-	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110522_miller	Imperial	Palm Springs	-	no	no		
2riverside_20110522_robinson	Riverside	Temecula, Murrieta, Mildomar	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110515_hernandezblair	San Bernardino	Pomona, Chino, Chino Hills, Ontario, Montclair	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110517_boudreaux	-	Chino	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110517_leon	-	Pomona, Chino, Ontario	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110517_ruh	-	Chino, Montclair, Ontario, Pomona	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110518_crowe	-	Chino, Montclair, Ontario, Pomona	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110518_fleager	San Bernardino, Orange	Chino Hills, Chinoi	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110515_gehrke	San Bernardino, Riverside, Los Angeles	-	-	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110518_rodriguez_f	-	Chino, Montclair, Ontario, Pomona	I10, I15, SR 60, SR 71	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110522_mccoy			no				
2riverside_20110522_malachowsky			no				
2riverside_20110522_miller			no				
2riverside_20110522_robinson			no				
2sbernardino_20110515_hernandezblair			no				
2sbernardino_20110517_boudreaux			no				
2sbernardino_20110517_leon			no				
2sbernardino_20110517_ruh			no				
2sbernardino_20110518_crowe			no				
2sbernardino_20110518_fleager			no				
2sbernardino_20110515_gehrke			no				
2sbernardino_20110518_rodriguez_f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110518_pfeiffer_r	5182011	Janet Pfeiffer	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley, Coachella Valley separate.
2sbernardino_20110518_rodriguez_d	5182011	Dolores Rodriguez	no		Pomona	San Bernadino	yes	Keep Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario together
2riverside_20110518_swensen	5182011	29 Indio Voters (signed statement)	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley separate from Imperial Valley. Fix AD 80 and SD 40 so that Coachella Valley is not combined with Imperial. Put Imperial with San Diego.
2riverside_20110514_brower	5142011	Joy Brower	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley separate from Imperial County. If must combine, combine with Inland Empire part of Riverside
2riverside_20110515_albrecht	5152011	Jim Albrecht	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County tied to I-8 and keep Coachellas district tied to I10. Give up far western sectioneastern section.
2riverside_20110515_cunningham	5152011	Pat Cunningham	no			Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley in Riverside County
2riverside_20110515_drahos	5152011	Rita Drahos	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Do not include Imperial Valley with Coachella Valley because it is a ploy to get Dem seats.
2riverside_20110515_guild	5152011	Ann Guild	no			Riverside	yes	Include only Coachella Valley in CD 45. Do not combine it with Imperial County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110518_pfeiffer_r	Imperial Valley, Coachella Valley			no	yes	Coachella should not be responsible to contribute to Imperials education money.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourism
2sbernardino_20110518_rodriguez_d		Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario		no	yes	23 homeowners, children participate in same activities	Stable, working class communities with strong blue-collar, family roots
2riverside_20110518_swensen	Imperial Valley, Coachella Valley, San Diego			no	yes	Common livin standard, transportation. Imperial and San Diego share same border culture, I-8, university resources, health care.	Common economy
2riverside_20110514_brower	Imperial County, Coachella Valley, Inland Empire part of Riverside			no	yes	Border issues in Coachella different from those in Imperial	Imperial-agriculture.
2riverside_20110515_albrecht	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Local govts in Coachella Valley work very well together (police, fire departments, political side)	Imperial-agriculture. Coachella-growing centers of transportation, electronics, tourism, solar, warehousing businesses
2riverside_20110515_cunningham				no	no		
2riverside_20110515_drahos				no	no		
2riverside_20110515_guild	Imperial County, Coachella Valley			no	yes	Coachella-fast growing retirement group.	Coachella-tourism, Imperial-agricultural and better linked with SD.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110518_pfeiffer_r			no				
2sbernardino_20110518_rodriguez_d			no				
2riverside_20110518_swensen			no				
2riverside_20110514_brower			no				
2riverside_20110515_albrecht			no				
2riverside_20110515_cunningham			no				
2riverside_20110515_drahos			no				
2riverside_20110515_guild			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110515_lee	5152011	Jeanine Lee	no			Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley separate from Imperial County
2riverside_20110515_morton	5152011	Randall Morton	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not put Coachella Valley (Riverside County) with Imperial County
2riverside_20110515_pearl	5152011	Fred and Laura Pearl	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial County in a CD.
2riverside_20110515_swensen	5152011	Ellen Swensen	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella Valley with Imperial County. For CD 45, add Desert Hot Springs and unincorporated areas, then drop Moreno Valley and 1-2 other cities near to it
2riverside_20110516_engebretson	5162011	Richard Engebretson	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley separate from Imperial County
2riverside_20110516_grand	5162011	Stephen Grand	no			Riverside	yes	Do not lump Imperial County with Riverside and Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110516_henny	5162011	Christina Henny	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not change CD 45 to include Imperial (with Coachella). Add to it Desert Hot Springs, then remove 1-2 cities to the west.
2riverside_20110516_meachem	5162011	Neil Elaine Meachem	no			Riverside	yes	Keep CD 45 in Riverside County only (do not add Imperial County)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110515_lee	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Coachella does not care about Imperials problems Salton Sea issuesMexican border issues shared with San Diego	Coachella-tourism, Imperial-agricultural
2riverside_20110515_morton	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	If combined with Imperial County, interests of Coachella Valley will be lost	Coachella-tourism, higher standard of living. Imperial-agriculture.
2riverside_20110515_pearl	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Coachella-distinctive because of fastest-aging population	Coachella-tourism. Imperial-agriculture
2riverside_20110515_swensen	Imperial County, San Diego County, Coachella Valley	Desert Hot Springs, Moreno Valley		no	yes	Imperial and San Diego share important border issues, I-8, health care	Imperial and San Diego-agriculture
2riverside_20110516_engebretson	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Coachella demographics, home values, entertainment, topography	Coachella tourism
2riverside_20110516_grand	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Nobody in Imperial goes to Coachella.	Businesses will move out of Coachella to NevadaTexas if they are lumped with Imperial
2riverside_20110516_henny	Coachella, Imperial County	Desert Hot Springs		no	yes		Coachella-tourism, Imperial Valley-agriculture
2riverside_20110516_meachem	Riverside, Coachella			no	yes	Coachella retirement community, city life, fast-paced. Riverside-farming	Coachella-tourism, Imperial-agriculture

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110515_lee			no				
2riverside_20110515_morton			no				
2riverside_20110515_pearl			no				
2riverside_20110515_swensen			no				
2riverside_20110516_engebretson			no				
2riverside_20110516_grand			no				
2riverside_20110516_henny			no				
2riverside_20110516_meachem			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110516_miller	5162011	Donald Miller	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Coachella with Imperial
2riverside_20110516_price	5162011	Clarie Price	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Keep desert cities intat and compact, no ties to Imperial County
2riverside_20110516_rothstein	5162011	Sydelle Rothstein	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley separate from Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110516_swensen	5162011	Ellen Swensen	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley separate from Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110517_brennan_schmitz	5172011	Constance Brennan Jhan Schmitz	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley separate from Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110517_escobedo	5172011	Chris Escobedo	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley separate from Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110517_fisher	5172011	Ronald Fisher	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley separate from Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110517_fisichelli	5172011	Andrew Eleanor Fisichelli	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley separate from Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110517_hathaway	5172011	Michelle Hathaway	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley together and alone.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110516_miller	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley			no	no		
2riverside_20110516_price	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes		Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110516_rothstein	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley			no	yes	Imperial has distinct environmental issues (Salton Sea, geothermal energy). Coachella-wind and solar	Imperial-Agriculture, lower standard of living, Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110516_swensen	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Imperial-I-8	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110517_brennan_schmitz	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley			no	yes	Coachella-geographically contiguous, compact, its own local media, newspapers, TVradio, hosues in LAOrange County	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110517_escobedo	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley			no	yes	Many of those in Imperial use I-8 to go to SD for health services, shopping.	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110517_fisher	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley			no	yes	Coachella-transportation corridor to LAWest Riverside, shared health care system tied to Riverside, geographically contiguous	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110517_fisichelli	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley			no	yes	Imperial County shares with SD County border issues, I-8, transportation issues.	Imperial-agriculture. Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110517_hathaway	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110516_miller			no				
2riverside_20110516_price			no				
2riverside_20110516_rothstein			no				
2riverside_20110516_swensen			no				
2riverside_20110517_brennan_schmitz			no				
2riverside_20110517_escobedo			no				
2riverside_20110517_fisher			no				
2riverside_20110517_fisichelli			no				
2riverside_20110517_hathaway			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110517_keeney	5172011	Marian Keeney	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside district
2riverside_20110517_league	5172011	Paul League	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Imperial ValleyCounty with Riverside County in a CD
2riverside_20110517_richardson	5172011	Donna and George Kenneth Richardson	no		Desert Hot Springs	Riverside	yes	Keep CD 45 in Riverside county only.
2riverside_20110517_smith	5172011	Joan Smith	no			Riverside	yes	Coachella should stay with Riverside County, Imperial County should remain with SD County
2riverside_20110518_bickel	5182011	Jo Ann Alan Bickel	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella separate from Imperial Valley County
2riverside_20110518_burbage	5182011	Gretchen Burbage	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella separate from Imperial County
2riverside_20110518_ellis	5182011	Sharon and Lee Ellis	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Indio should be kept with Coachella Valley and included with Palm Springs, Palm Desert, La Quinta, etc.
2riverside_20110518_franzen	5182011	Richard Franzen	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley is better with closer portions of San Bernardino County or Orange County than eastern Riverside County or Imperial County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110517_keeney	Coachella Valley, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110517_league	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Coachella PS airport, Hwy 10111, retirement population, health care, standard of living, assoc. of govts, local media, geographically contiguouscompact	
2riverside_20110517_richardson	Coachella Valley, Riverside County			no	yes		Imperial-agriculture. Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110517_smith	Coachella Valley, Riverside County, Imperial County, San Diego County			yes	yes	Coachella-close, compact, share transportation (PS Airport, Hwy10111)	Imperial-agriculture. Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110518_bickel	Coachella, Imperial County			no	yes	Coachella-fastest growing retirement area in state	Imperial-agriculture. Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110518_burbage	Coachella, Imperial			no	yes	Coachella not close to Mexican border, to Imperials standard of living	Imperial-agriculture, Coachella-tourism
2riverside_20110518_ellis	Coachella	Indio, Palm Springs, Palm Desert, La Quinta, etc.		no	yes	Tourism, transportation, health care sytem, media, airport and associations of governments	
2riverside_20110518_franzen	Coachella Valley, San Bernadino County, Orange County, Riverside County, Imperial County			no	yes		Extend district to west where business corridors extend and economic ties already exist

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110517_keeney			no				
2riverside_20110517_league			no				
2riverside_20110517_richardson			no				
2riverside_20110517_smith			no				
2riverside_20110518_bickel			no				
2riverside_20110518_burbage			no				
2riverside_20110518_ellis			no				
2riverside_20110518_franzen			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110518_hobbs	5182011	Ken Hobbs	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley separate from Imperial County
3orange_20110425_matthews	4252011	Darlene Matthews	no		Newport Beach, CA	Orange County	yes	No more districts that stretch from shore to far inland. Newport Beach CD 48 should be (see cities). Adding Nuclear facilities and some input to from Camp Pendleton to OC 48 from CA 4944. Lop off SW leg of CA42 for CA 4047. (cont in counties field)
3orange_20110505_babcock	552011	Thomas Babcock	yes	Western Biomedical Enterprises	Fullerton	Orange County	yes	Leave Placentia, Fullerton, Brea whole.
3orange_20110505_kiger	552011	Travis Kiger, Planning Commissioner	yes	City of Fullerton	Fullerton	Orange County	yes	Leave Fullerton whole.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110518_hobbs	Coachella Valley, Imperial County			no	yes	Quality health care, regional airport, major freeway transportation systems, fastest growing retirement population	
3orange_20110425_matthews	Give CD 44 more Riverside, give CD 48 some of 44s and some of 49s beach areas move CD 47 to cover Irvines and Santa Anas larged biz needs and UCI, Santa Ana College, Orange Coast Coll., Saddleback Coll., Irvine Valley Coll.UCI most of JCCs to OC.	CD 48 San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point; Newport Beach, and islands, should NOT include Irvine, Tustin, Santa Ana; CD 40 Garden Grove, Stanton, Anaheim; Santa Ana, Irvine, Costa Mesa together; Anaheim, Garden Grove, Westminster.		no	yes	Current different needs do not serve the area well; consider groupings of areas of peoplelandactivities with similar needs; have coastpark areas together where possible.	larger city business needs and UCI, Santa Ana College, Orange Coast College Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College ferry
3orange_20110505_babcock		Placentia, Fullerton, Brea		no	yes	Representation consistent and clear. Residents have enjoyed a symbiotic relationship.	
3orange_20110505_kiger		Fullerton		no	yes	By having just one legislative representative at each level, Fullertons stance and representation are simplified, consistent, clear.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110518_hobbs			no				
3orange_20110425_matthews	similar interests		no			make squares for populated cities	In the future, allow for more poorer people to participate (cannot travel to sites because of rise in gasfood prices). Hopes result will represent all people more equally, and that political needs are considered as a distant last.
3orange_20110505_babcock	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110505_kiger	similar interests		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110505_shuff	552011	Pat Shuff, Assistant Treasurer72nd Assembly District Representative	yes	Republican Central Committee of Orange County	Fullerton	Orange County	yes	Do not split the city into different assembly districts. Combine two assembly districts to create one senate district.
3orange_20110505_thompson	552011	Chris Thompson, Fullerton School District Trustee	yes	Fullerton School District Trustee	Fullerton	Orange County	yes	Leave Fullerton whole.
3orange_20110506_aguirre	562011	Joe Aguirre, Placentia City Councilman	yes	Placentia City Councilman	Placentia	Orange County	yes	Leave Placentia, Fullerton, Brea whole.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110505_shuff				no	yes	Fullerton is fairly balanced ethnically; even if it werent, do not believe a neighborhoods ethnic makeup should be a consideration in drawing assembly or senate district boundaries.	
3orange_20110505_thompson		Fullerton		no	yes	Identify with being Fullertonians over being identifying with political, cultural, raicla, socio-economic interests. Interests in cityschoolstatenation tied together, should not be separated by economic status or political leanings	
3orange_20110506_aguirre		Placentia, Fullerton, Brea		no	yes	One legislative representative at each level is beneficial because cities often work together on issues (because have many similar perspectives and common concerns).	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110505_shuff	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110505_thompson	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110506_aguirre	similar interests		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110506_chung	562011	Judy Chung, Senior Pastor	yes	Placentia United Methodist Church	Placentia	Orange County	yes	Leave Placentia, Fullerton, Brea whole.
3orange_20110506_townsend	562011	Zonya Townsend, Central Committee Member	yes	72nd Assembly District Republican Party	Fullerton	Orange County	yes	Leave Fullerton whole.
3orange_20110506_wanke	562011	Chad Wanke, Council Member	yes	City of Placentia	Placentia	Orange County	yes	Leave Placentia, Fullerton, Brea whole.
3orange_20110506_whitaker	562011	Bruce Whitaker, City Council Member	yes	City of Fullerton	Fullerton	Orange County	yes	Leave Fullerton whole.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110506_chung		Placentia, Fullerton, Brea		no	yes	One legislative representative at each level means Fullerton, Brea, and Placentias stance and representation are simplified, consistent, clear. Many common concerns.	
3orange_20110506_townsend		Fullerton		no	yes	Important for Fullerton citizens to identify as a whole community and not be divided by legislative districts	
3orange_20110506_wanke		Placentia, Fullerton, Brea		no	yes	Keep current structure of having Fullerton, Placentia, Brea represented by same representative at each level, because share many common needs and residents are best served with this model.	
3orange_20110506_whitaker		Fullerton		no	yes	Education Community anchored by CSU Fullerton, location of only general aviation airport in OC, OC Superior Court, central locationessential link for rail transit in OC	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110506_chung	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110506_townsend	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110506_wanke	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110506_whitaker	similar interests		no				Thanks for committed serviceefforts to improve state, state of democracy

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110509_shaffer	592011	Wanda Shaffer	no			Orange County	no	
3orange_20110510_arroyo	5102011	Nelson Arroyo, President	yes	ACHP Services	Placentia	Orange County	yes	Do not alter District 72
3orange_20110511_baltes	5102011	Sandi Baltes, Educator	yes	La Habra City School District	Brea	Orange County	yes	La Habra City School District currently split between Assembly District 60 and 72--not as efficient as it could be by having a single Assembly member representing this school district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110509_shaffer				no	no		
3orange_20110510_arroyo				no	yes	Welfare and community cohesiveness of our cities and residents could be jeopardized should redistricting break them apart	
3orange_20110511_baltes				no	yes	Draw state legislative districts considering education, because school districts rely heavily on funding from state; school board and superintendent need to be able to communicate effectively and easily with Assembly and Senate reps.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110509_shaffer	similar interests		no				Impressed with Santa Ana hearing on May 5. Impressed with efforts to understand public speakersuse of technology. Please put great emphasis on ethnic common interests and on the high school districts.
3orange_20110510_arroyo	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110511_baltes			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110510_horton	5102011	Jan Horton, Former City Councilwoman	yes	City of Yorba Linda		Orange County	yes	Yorba Linda w Diamond Bar, Walnut, Rowland Hts NOT W Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita; North Orange Co, East San Gabriel Valley, Chino Hills; Heavily Latino cities (Santa Ana, part of Anaheim W of Hwy 55) belong together.
3orange_20110511_dovinh	5112011	Joe Dovinh, Planning Commissioner	yes	City of Garden Grove	Garden Grove	Orange County	yes	Do not fragment Westminster from Garden Grove
3orange_20110511_gallegos	5112011	Claudio Gallegos	no			Orange County	yes	Noted in cities column; Little Saigon should be kept together. In addition to this, please see spreadsheetsmaps attached, detailing 676869 ADs, 34 SD, 47CD, race stats for 67-73 AD .

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110510_horton		geographic comment cont Coastal communities from Seal Beach to Newport Beach share common environm concerns		no	yes	Environmental concerns for coastal communities; Yorba LindaBrea share undeveloped land deemed a wildlife corridor, which bridges three counties of Orange, San Bernadino, L.A., continuing east of 57 freeway to La Habra Heights and La Habra.	North Orange County, East San Gabriel Valley, Chino Hills have similar working class incomes and similar housing needs. All commute on Highway 57.
3orange_20110511_dovinh		Westminster, Garden Grove, parts of Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley		no	yes	Little Saigon should not be divided, as they have worked hard over many decades to build up neighborhoods and communities	Little Saigon is a power engine for economic growth.
3orange_20110511_gallegos		Santa Ana, Stanton, flatland area of Anaheim (W of Tustin Ave.), southern Fullerton (S of Chapman and Malvern), southern Orange (S of Collins St.), East Garden Grove (E of Euclid) and west Tustin (W of Newport Ave. N of I5 and W of Red Hill Ave, S of I5)	see cities	no	yes	similar populations connected by national origin, language (SpanishEnglish speakers, Vietnamese)	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110510_horton	Communities of interestsensible transportation corridors when need to break county lines to draw larger legislative districts, the senate and congressional districts		no				
3orange_20110511_dovinh	Little Saigon is a power engine for economic growth, fosters cultural diversity.		no				
3orange_20110511_gallegos	Two AD one centered in Santa Ana, the other in Anaheim, combined into one Senate district. CD Santa Ana, east Garden Grove, and flatland area of Anaheim. Little Saigon Garden Grove (W of Euclid), Westminster, Midway City, Fountain Valley		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110511_garcia	5112011	Ron Garcia, Councilmember and Immediate Past Mayor	yes	City of Brea	Brea	Orange County	yes	Yorba Linda w Diamond Bar, Walnut, Rowland Hts NOT W Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita; North Orange Co, East San Gabriel Valley, Chino Hills; Heavily Latino cities (Santa Ana, part of Anaheim W of Hwy 55) belong together.(Same ltr as JanHorton 14)
3orange_20110511_rodriguez	5112011	Victor Rodriguez, Chair of Chicano and Latino Studies Dept, Author	yes	CSU Long Beach		Orange County	yes	In Santa Ana, small affluent white group a power beyond their numbers. Please consider poorer Latino communities.
3orange_20110512_exelby	5122011	Alexandra Exelby	no			Orange County	yes	San Clemente should not be included with communities in Rivereside County.
3orange_20101228_gold	10282010	Alan Gold	no		Laguna Woods Village	Orange County	no	
3orange_20110118_macmurray	1182011	Ida MacMurray	no		La Habra	Orange County	yes	La Habra should not be divided into different Assembly and State Senate Districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110511_garcia		geographic comment cont Coastal communities from Seal Beach to Newport Beach share common environm concerns		no	yes	Same as Jan Hortons comment 14 (sent exact same email)	
3orange_20110511_rodriguez		Santa Ana		no	yes	Give poorer Latino communities more voice, especially in Santa Ana.	
3orange_20110512_exelby				no	no		
3orange_20101228_gold				no	no		
3orange_20110118_macmurray		La Habra		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110511_garcia	Same as Jan Hortons comment 14 (sent exact same email)		no				
3orange_20110511_rodriguez			no				
3orange_20110512_exelby	Would make sense to cross county lines so that joined with Oceanside in San Diego, CA.		no				
3orange_20101228_gold			no				
3orange_20110118_macmurray	Does not make sense to divide the lines based on whether a person lives east or west of Euclid. Please keep cities in tact because knowing who a communitys representive is should be easy.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110507_johnson	572011	Rogers Johnson	no		Cypress	Orange County	yes	
3orange_20110509_michel	592011	Dennis and Barbara Michel	no		La Mirada	Orange County	yes	La Mirada needs to be included with Buena Park. Move La Mirada back into an Orange County AD from the Los Angeles AD.
3orange_20110511_beamish	5112011	Tom Beamish, Councilmember	yes	City of La Habra	La Habra	Orange County	yes	Do not include La Habra in a seat with Los Angeles County cities of La Habra Heights, Norwalk, Downey, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera
3orange_20110510_arroyo	5102011	Nelson Arroyo, President	yes	ACHP Services	Placentia	Orange County	yes	Do not alter District 72 resulting in breakup of three cities.
3orange_20110515_carter	5152011	Mary Carter	no		Santa Ana	Orange County	no	Updated map files were sent to the Commission
3orange_20110509_cavecche	592011	Carolyn Cavecche	yes	mayor, city of Orange	Orange	Orange County	yes	Keep inland Orange County cities together, do not break the LAOrange county line for Congressional redistricting

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110507_johnson				no	yes	Cypress has a big middle class, but gerrymandered so that it gives a safe seat for Republican candidates	
3orange_20110509_michel		La Mirada, Buena Park	La Mirada boyrders of Coyote Creek Channel on East, Stanton Ave on West, Ashgrove on North, La Mirada Blvd on South.	no	yes	Buena Park and La Mirada share many community activities with each other.	
3orange_20110511_beamish		La Habra NOT with Los Angeles County cities of La Habra Heights, Norwalk, Downey, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera		no	yes	Representative for this hypothetical county would be based in L.A. and would not care about Orange County issues.	
3orange_20110510_arroyo				no	yes	Three cities have close ties through city hallscommunity organizationsresidentsfamilies	
3orange_20110515_carter				no	no		
3orange_20110509_cavecche	Orange	Fullerton, Brea, La Habra, Yorba Linda, Placentia, Anaheim, Orange	57 corridor, from 91 interchange to the 210 interchange	no	no		Similar transportation, housing, infrastructure needs; established commerical and industrial areas

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110507_johnson			no				
3orange_20110509_michel	Buena Park and La Mirada share many community activities		no				
3orange_20110511_beamish	La Habra is first and foremost an Orange County city, put with Fullerton, Brea, other north Orange County cities. If La Habra needs to be put with LA cities, it would be better to tie it with the 57 corridor.		no				
3orange_20110510_arroyo			no				
3orange_20110515_carter			no				
3orange_20110509_cavecche		Do not split Vietnamese community in Little Saigon	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110517_nelson	5172011	Scott W. Nelson	yes	mayor, city of Placentia	Placentia	Orange County	yes	keep communities along 57 corridor together in a Senate district
3orange_20110518_light	5182011	Lawrence Light	no		Mission Viejo	Orange County	yes	Redraw the district connecting Brea and Mission Viejo
3orange_20110521_dorr	5212011	John Dorr	no		Laguna Beach	Orange County	yes	Do not include San Clemente and San Juan Capistrano in a San Diego district
3orange_20110521_geehr	5212011	Janet Geehr	no		San Clemente	Orange County	yes	keep Orange County cities together and separate from San Diego County.
3orange_20110521_kelly	5212011	Cheryl Kelly	no		San Clemente	Orange County	yes	keep Orange County cities together and separate from San Diego County.
3orange_20110521_brook	5212011	Barbara Brook	no		-	Orange County	yes	Keep San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente with Laguna Niguel, Dana Point, and Laguna Beach
3orange_20110522_brawner	5222011	Barbara Brawner	no		San Clemente	Orange County	yes	keep Orange County cities together and separate from San Diego County.
3orange_20110522_gardner	5222011	Carol Gardner	no		San Clemente	Orange County	yes	keep Orange County cities together and separate from San Diego County.
3orange_20110522_gates	5222011	Cindy Gates	no		San Clemente	Orange County	yes	keep Orange County cities together and separate from San Diego County.
3orange_20110522_harter	5222011	Susanna Harter	no		-	Orange County	yes	Keep San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente in the same district
3orange_20110522_manning	5222011	Lisa Manning	no		Dana Point	Orange County	yes	Add San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente to 48th Congressional District
3orange_20110522_sherwood	5222011	Tana Sherwood	no		San Clemente	Orange County	yes	keep Orange County cities together and separate from San Diego County.
3orange_20110522_walker	5222011	Judy Walker	no		Dana Point	Orange County	yes	keep Orange County cities together and separate from San Diego County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110517_nelson	Orange, Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Brea, Fullerton, Placentia, Yorba Linda		no	yes	shared institutions of higher learning, public services, and wildlife preserves	Commute to work using State Route 57
3orange_20110518_light		Brea, Mission Viejo		no	yes	believes current district is gerrymandered	
3orange_20110521_dorr	Orange, San Diego	Dana Point, Mission Viejo, Laguna Beach, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano		no	yes	shared community apart from San Diego County	
3orange_20110521_geehr	Orange, San Diego	Huntington Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	shared community interests	
3orange_20110521_kelly	Orange, San Diego	Huntington Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	shared community interests	
3orange_20110521_brook	South	San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Laguna Niguel, Dana Point, Laguna Beach		yes	no		
3orange_20110522_brawner	Orange, San Diego	Huntington Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	shared community interests	
3orange_20110522_gardner	Orange, San Diego	Huntington Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	shared community interests	
3orange_20110522_gates	Orange, San Diego	Huntington Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	shared community interests	
3orange_20110522_harter		San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente		no	yes		
3orange_20110522_manning	Orange	San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente		no	yes	shared public facilities, media	shared commerce and tourism
3orange_20110522_sherwood	Orange, San Diego	Huntington Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	shared community interests	
3orange_20110522_walker	Orange, San Diego	Huntington Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	shared community interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110517_nelson			no				
3orange_20110518_light			no				
3orange_20110521_dorr	geography and similar interests		no				
3orange_20110521_geehr	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110521_kelly	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110521_brook			no				
3orange_20110522_brawner	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110522_gardner	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110522_gates	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110522_harter			no				
3orange_20110522_manning	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110522_sherwood	similar interests		no				
3orange_20110522_walker	similar interests		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110411_watts	4112011	Larry Watts	yes	Seyfarth Shaw, LLP		Los Angeles	yes	Brentwood and area that includes much of the Westside of Los Angeles from Beverly Hills west to the Pacific Ocean and south of the Santa Monica Mountains to roughly Palms Boulevard (Westside).
4la_20110412_kaplan	4122011	Larry Kaplan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Griffith Park City of Burbank (Rancho subdivision of equestrian properties), Universal City (including Universal Studios), LA neighborhoods of Hollywood Hills (including Hollywood Knoll, Cahuenga Terrace, Hollywoodland, Beachwood Cancyon, and The Oaks)
4la_20110413_brown	4132011	Lynn Brown, National Trail Coordinator, Equestrian Trails, Inc. (ETI)	yes	National Trail Coordinator Equestrian Trails, Inc., V.P. of the L.A. Equine Advisory Committee, Griffith Park Working Group member, Chair of Coalition for Safe Trails		Los Angeles	yes	Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods letter is exactly the same as the previous record

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110411_watts		Brentwood	should not be with the South Bay, mid-city and Ventura County and San Fernando Valley areas currently within A.D. 41 47 and S.D. 2	no	yes	Brentwood should be in the same Assembly and Senate districts and these districts should include the other communities located in the Westside geographic area,	
4la_20110412_kaplan	(from geographic comment continued) Los Feliz; Silver Lake; and Atwater Village	preferable that the Park and surrounding neighborhoods are drawn into one Assembly district (not just one Senate District)		no	yes	Largest municipal park with urban wilderness - largest expanse of public land, surrounded by municiapl neighboods, that features largely untouched lands; similar socio-economic qualities, employment patterns, trail and park access, traffic patterns	(from social interests continued) equestrian trails, equestrian zoned properties, foothill elevation and microclimates, urban watershed pathways, municipal fauna, crime patterns, history and outlook; economics of the park through entertainment industry
4la_20110413_brown				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110411_watts	Brentwood is currently split between three Assembly Districts (41, 42 47) and two Senate Districts (23 28).		no				
4la_20110412_kaplan	Split 3 AD, 2 SD, 4 CD; During a recent grassroots lobbying effort, residents in the same neighborhood group had to petition a very large group of legislators, causing confusion, dilution of resources, and lack of accountability.	.	no				
4la_20110413_brown			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110413_hollywoodcoccf	4132011	Sam Smith	yes	Chair of the Board, Hollywood Chamber of Commerce Community Foundation		Los Angeles	yes	Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods letter is exactly the same as the previous 2 records
4la_20110415_carr	4152011	Netty Carr and Sandra Caravella	yes	Co-Presidents of Friends of Atwater Village; volunteers working to improve neighborhood, neighborhood cleanups, mural projects		Los Angeles	yes	submitted map; keep Griffith Park and the communities that touch it; Atwater Park is a Los Angeles community that lies between the Griffith ParkLos Angles River to the west and the City of Glendale to the north and east. language from previous records
4la_20110415_fellerotto	4152011	Suzanne Feller-Otto, Silver Lake residenthome woner since 1987	yes	Member of FoSSL (Friends of Silver Lake Library), involved with SLIA (Silver Lake Improvement Association); SLRA (Siver Lake Residents Association); CERT (Civilian Emergency Response Team); GSL2000 (Gateway to Silver Lake beautification project)	Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods letter is exactly the same as the previous records

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110413_hollywoodcoccf				no	no		
4la_20110415_carr			Shares borders with Silver Lake to the south, Elysian Vlley to the southeast, and Los Feliz and Griffith Park across the river to the west. Our specific community boundaries include 134 Fwy (N), Railroad tracks (E), 5 Fwy (W), and 2 Fwy (S)	no	no		
4la_20110415_fellerotto				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110413_hollywoodcoccf			no				
4la_20110415_carr			no				
4la_20110415_fellerotto			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110415_brook	4152011	Vincent Brook, Adjunct Professor, USC, UCLA	yes	Silver Lake Improvement Association Board Member	Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods letter is exactly the same as the previous records
4la_20110308_hasroun	382011	Andy Hasroun	yes	Chamber President, Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce		Los Angeles	yes	submitted map; keep Griffith Park and the communities that touch it; Atwater Park is a Los Angeles community that lies between the Griffith ParkLos Angles River to the west and the City of Glendale to the north and east. language from previous records
4la_20110418_little	4182011	Paul Little	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Pasadena, Burbank and Glendale together in a single congressional district
4la_20110418_briskmanjungerwitt	4182011	Hon. Linda J. Briskman, Paul Junger Witt	yes	Briskman (Former Mayor and City Council member, city of Beverly Hills), Witt (CEO, Witt, Thomas, Harris Productions), both State Park and Recreation Commission	Beverly Hills and Brentwood respectively	Los Angeles	yes	keep our Westside communities together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110415_brook				no	no		
4la_20110308_hasroun				no	no		
4la_20110418_little		All of Pasadena, Burbank and Glendale		no	yes	Jointly own and operate Bob Hope Airport, charter cities with city managers, part-time councils, each operates own water and power utility, share ownership in power plants, operates public safety agencies, share cost operation of Verdugo Dispatch System	Retail, restaurant, hopsitality, office-based businesses, education institutions (Caltech, Art Center, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena City College, Glendate Community College, Woodbury University), entertainment industry (jobs), support services
4la_20110418_briskmanjungerwitt				no	no	Our recreation, tourism and transit needs are aligned and our financial health is supported by this region.	forge partnerships with the private and non-profit sectors to protect the Santa Monica Mountains and our coastline.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110415_brook			no				
4la_20110308_hasroun			no				
4la_20110418_little			no				
4la_20110418_briskmanjungerwitt	because we share common interests and should be in the same legislative and congressional districts with the communities of Malibu, Calabasas and Agoura Hills as well		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110419_morris	4192011	Randy Morris	yes	Morris Design Partners		Los Angeles	yes	stop the 46th District at the LAOrange County line
4la_20110419_orton	4192011	Bill Orton, deputy to a state lawmaker since 1992	no			Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach kept whole 2 rivers, shoreline, port; include portion tha tis west of LA River as well as portions of Seal Beach that run from the 405 Fwy to the ocean, from Seal Beach Blvd to county line
4la_20110421_wilk	4212011	Scott Thomas Wilk	yes	Governing Board Member, Santa Clarita Community College District		Los Angeles	yes	All of the Santa Clarita Valley (Agua Dulce to Castaic), Northwestern San Fernando Valley (Chatsworth, Porter Ranch, Northridge Granada Hills), Northeastern Ventura County (Fillmore and Santa Paula)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110419_morris		Palos Verdes Peninsula and Long Beach		no	no		
4la_20110419_orton		Long Beach, Old Town and Hill portions of Seal Beach	hydrological. Fully eight of the nine councilmanic districts in the city touch either the Pacific Ocean, the San Gabriel River or the Los Angeles River	no	yes	Ocean and rivers sustain estuaries, wetlands, flyways, plants, birds, marine animals	1 in 8 jobs stems from work at port of Long Beach, San Gabriel and LA rivers bring trash to Long Beach
4la_20110421_wilk				no	yes	watershed management, transportation corridors, regional economic development, higher education	25 OF Santa Claraita CCs studetns reside outside the service area (in northwest San Fernando Valley), partnerships with CSU Northridge, CCs Small Business Development Center serves this portion of San Fernando Valley, defense subcontractor work

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110419_morris	CD 46 is only one street deep along the ocean at Long Beach and San Pedro but does widen to grab the Ports of LA and Long Beach. Please split us off from Orange County and create a fair homologous district (same problems with AD 54)		no				
4la_20110419_orton			no				advocate of nesting
4la_20110421_wilk	Expansion to third campus on edge of Santa Clarity Valley at the Ventura County line		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110421_fox	4212011	Kit Fox (Associate Planner), Anthony M. Misetich (Mayor Pro Tem)	yes	City of Rancho Palos Verdes		Los Angeles	yes	Keep City of Rancho Palos Verdes with north coastal cities of the South Bay generally west of the 110 and 405 Fwys, south of LAX; keep away from eastern Long Beach, central Orange County, and Central Los Angeles County
4la_20110420_buckley	4202011	Dennis Buckley	yes	Chair of the Board of Directors, Pasadena Chamber of Commerce and Civic Association		Los Angeles	yes	exactly the same as Paul Littles letter. See previous record
4la_20110425_diamond	4252011	Francine Diamond	yes	Member, Heal the Bay; California Leage of Conservation Voters; Board Member of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board since 1999	Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries Pacific Ocean from Southern limits of Santa Monica to Ventura County Line
4la_20110425_read	4252011	Stephen Read, MD	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110421_fox		Rancho Palos Verdes, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo		no	yes	common transportation network to the Los Angeles region, bedroom community for regional aerospace and manufacturing hub of the South Bay, affinity and appreicatio of unique physical and cultural environment, coast, community organizations	Participation in the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG)
4la_20110420_buckley		Keep Pasadena, Glendale and Burbank in one CD		no	no		
4la_20110425_diamond		San Fernando Valley, Las Virgenes cities, Malibu and Westside	Santa Monica Mountains are a signficant natural landmark that residents have in common on both sides of the mountains. Watershed drains into Santa Monica Bay. These two landmarks should remain together as a COI.	no	yes	Share protected regional open space, protecting water quality is important for our cities, watersheds, tourism	Multi-billion dollar coastal economy, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation area
4la_20110425_read		San Pedro be respected and treated as an entity for all relevant districts		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110421_fox			no				page 2 of 3 was blank
4la_20110420_buckley			no				
4la_20110425_diamond	Community has worked well together for 20 years, resulted in proteection of hundreds of thousands of areas of public open space		no				Likes current Ventura County Line, Ocean, both sides of 101 Fwy through SF Valley from Woodland Hills to Studio City, Las Virgenes, the Santa Monica Mtns, Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Brentwood to E of the 405 S to OlympicWilshire, E to Beverly H.
4la_20110425_read	Disenfranchised and underrepresented due to current districts CD 54, SD with Inglewood in it		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110425_takaichi	4252011	Lynn M. Takaichi	yes	Charman, KennedyJenks Consultants (consulting engineering company)		Los Angeles	yes	Single AD representation for the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), incluiding Santa Clarity Valley)
4la_20110426_smith	4262011	Silissa Uriarte Smith	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together
4la_20110426_shehee	4262011	Linda Shehee, independent voter	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Azusa and Irwindale (and part of El Monte) with neighbors (northern part of San Gabriel Valley)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110425_takaichi				no	yes	Regional planning for Upper Santa Clara River Watershed, water conservation, water supply reliability, coordination of land use planning and water supply planning, Clean Water Act compliance consistent with the Basin Plan requirements	
4la_20110426_smith				no	yes	Long Beach has worked hard to create a distinct community of close to half a million residents in the last ten years; own bus system, city council, newspaper, health dept, high school	
4la_20110426_shehee				no	no	we shop, visit restaurants and combine our lives with the residents of those cities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110425_takaichi			no				
4la_20110426_smith			no				
4la_20110426_shehee	Districts 28 31 separate us from more Republican strongholds of Glendora, San Marino, LaVerne, Sierra Madre, Arcadia, and other towns; cuts us off politically		no			Please include Azusa and Irwindale in a new boundary with our neighbors so we are not dedicated to one party or another -but a true representation of a real district.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110426_monte	4262011	Lou La Monte	yes	Lou La Monte (Malibu City Councilmember), Barbara Kohn (President, Pacific Palisades Residents Association), Stuart Muller (President, Via Mesa HOA), George Wolfbert (President, Santa Monica Canyon HOA); all Members Pacific Coastal Highway Task Force	Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Pacific Coast Highway 1
4la_20110428_heal_the_bay	4262011	Mark Gold, D. Env.	yes	President, Heal the Bay	Santa Monica, 15 years	Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110426_franklin	4262011	Kermit Franklin	yes	Citizens Oversight Committee, AVUSD, Antelope Valley Partners for Health, Antelope Valley Independent Democratic Club and other organizations		Los Angeles	yes	Antelope Valley (East Side of Lancaster and Palmdale)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110426_monte		Traffic corridors uniting West Hollywood, Beverly Hills to Santa Monica, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades, Malibu	10 Fwy, 101 Fwy, Olympic, Santa Monica, Wilshire and Sunset Blvds; Kanan Dume Road, Malibu Canyon Rd, Topanga Canyon Rd, Beverly Glen, Coldwater Cnayon, Lauren Canyon	no	yes	Keep communities affected by the Pacific Coast Highway together vital transporation corridor for commutors, residents and tourists; keep roads safe, accessible, beautiful	Transportation, beaches, cultural destinations
4la_20110428_heal_the_bay		include the communities of Malibu, Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Topanga, Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, and Hidden Hills in the same district	Pacific Ocean is a boundary from southern border of Santa Monica to Ventura County Line	no	yes	Communities are part of the north Santa Monica Bay watershed that includes the Santa Monica Mountains and half ot he Bay and the Bays incredible coastline; SF Valley, Las Virgenes, Malibu and Westside share protected area of regional open space	Mountains attract visitors, areas owned by National Parks, State Parks, or the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy; water quality, watershed, environmental protection
4la_20110426_franklin				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110426_monte			no				
4la_20110428_heal_the_bay			no				
4la_20110426_franklin			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110426_davis	4262011	Stephen Davis	no			Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach Please try to have a district of Long Beach. Do not chop up Long Beach and have the pieces as parts of other districts Orange County, Compton, etc.
4la_20110426_abrahamse	4262011	Dee Abrahamse	no			Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach in a single CD
4la_20110427_johnson	4272011	Danyel Johnson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Please consider extending the 37th district south to encompass these Long Beach areas.
4la_20110427_worsham	4272011	Patricia Worsham	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Wants port, El Dorado Nature Center, Atlantic Ave. Corridor, marinas, colleges and beaches fused together into one district. The natural boundary of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers is an important geographical designator

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110426_davis				no	no		
4la_20110426_abrahamse				no	yes		
4la_20110427_johnson				no	no		
4la_20110427_worsham	Please look at the county boundary when considering where to put our city of 460,000 population.			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110426_davis			no				
4la_20110426_abrahamse	Currently I am in a congressional district that stretches from southern Orange County to Palos Verdes, and I dont feel that the issues of our city get attention from our congressional representative; other parts of the city are also broken up		no				
4la_20110427_johnson	The portions of the 46th district within the city boundaries of Long Beach, including the Port of Long Beach, should be represented in Washington along with the rest of the city, not by an Orange county rep.		no				
4la_20110427_worsham			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110427_rice	4272011	Daymond Rice and Stuart Waldman	yes	Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA); Rice 2011 Chairman, VICA; Waldman President, VICA		Los Angeles	yes	Maximize number of districts that are wholly within the San Fernando Valley ior in which the majority of voters are within the Valley; recognize geographic features and natural boundaries
4la_20110427_quinn	4272011	Tony Quinn	yes	Co-editor, California Target Book		Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110427_langston	4272011	Andreana Langston	no			Los Angeles	yes	W of Redondo could be grouped w Seal Beach Orange County; North of Del Amo could be grouped w Compton, Commerce and surrounding. Downtown Long Beach (S of 10th W of Long Beach lvd) could be grouped w San Pedro other port dependent areas.
4la_20110427_garcia	4272011	Councilmember Robert Garcia, Councilmember Gary DeLong	yes	Long Beach City Council		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together with Los Angeles County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110427_rice		The San Fernando Valley is a geographically-contiguous region bounded by the Santa Susana Mountains to the north and west, Mulholland Drive to the south and the San Gabriel Mountains to the east. It lies wholly within Los Angeles County	The San Fernando Valley is a geographically-contiguous region bounded by the Santa Susana Mountains to the north and west, Mulholland Drive to the south and the San Gabriel Mountains to the east. It lies wholly within Los Angeles County	no	yes	high density populations of Latino minority voters in the Cities of San Fernando (96.5) and North Hollywood (56.6), as well as the communities of Pacoima (90.3), Arleta (80), and Reseda (57.7)	Anglo populations Woodlahd Hills, West Hills, Encino, Tarzana, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Toluca Lake and the cities of Calabasas, Hidden Hills and Burbank are inconsistent with interests of West LA, Beverly Hills, West Hollywood, and Santa Monica
4la_20110427_quinn				no	no		
4la_20110427_langston		Long Beach is NOT one community of interest;		no	no		There is HUGE economic disparity between East and West of Redondo as well as between North Long Beach (North of Del Amo) and South of Del Amo.
4la_20110427_garcia				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110427_rice	only three of the twelve state Senate and Assemblymembers who represent portions of the Valley are current Valley residents		no			Number all districts sequentially from north to south; Nest ADs in SDs	
4la_20110427_quinn			no				Use CVAP instead of raw population when looking at race numbers; concerned about African American vote dilution in CD 37 if you restore San Pedro and Wilmington to CD 37
4la_20110427_langston			no				
4la_20110427_garcia			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110427_kincaid	4272011	Andrew Kincaid	no			Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110427_kaplan	4272011	Barry Kaplan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Please keep this as it is. Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, and West Hills are joined with Malibu and Santa Monica as a single legislative district, presenting a unified voice for the Santa Monica Mountain region.
4la_20110427_carry	4272011	Rich Carry	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach with Los Angeles County and do not group with Orange County
4la_20110427_arnold	4272011	Tracey Arnold	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	in favor of keeping Calabasas joined with Agoura Hills, Hidden Hills, West Hills, Malibu and Santa Monica
4la_20110427_brown	4272011	Patricia Brown	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	As a long-time resident of Studio City, I strongly object to having it redistricted. We are doing just fine the way we are.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110427_kincaid	Use county lines for boundaries		bridge needed to get to Seal Beach; respect geographic integrity	no	yes	The southeast corner of Los Angeles County is unique, organic and historical. The smaller Orange County beach communities on the other side of the San Gabriel River have not shared the same history or culture.	
4la_20110427_kaplan				no	no		
4la_20110427_carry				no	no		
4la_20110427_arnold			do not want to see the Santa Monica Mountains put up for sale to developers. Therefore do not redistrict Calabasas with the Valley but leave well enough alone	no	no		
4la_20110427_brown				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110427_kincaid	Naples, the Peninsula and Belmont Heights Shore were established on or after 1903 and were always oriented to Long Beach and Los Angeles County.		no				
4la_20110427_kaplan			no				
4la_20110427_carry	Orange County only cares about Orange County		no				
4la_20110427_arnold	Calabasas was incorporated as a city to specifically sever ties with the San Fernando Valley and focus on preserving the uniqueness of sme of the most beautiful open space in the state		no				
4la_20110427_brown			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110427_bryant	4272011	Gina Bryant	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Calabasas withi a contiguous district that encompasses the Santa Monica Mountains
4la_20110427_cityofhermosabeach	4272011	Peter Tucker	yes	Mayor, City of Hermosa Beach; Hermosa Beach City Council		Los Angeles	yes	Keep cities of the Santa Monica Bay together (Hermosa Beach City and eight other cities)
4la_20110427_deocampo	4272011	Alex De Ocampo	yes	District Representative, Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council		Los Angeles	yes	Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods letter is exactly the same as the previous records
4la_20110427_feiles	4272011	Susan Feiles	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Studio City should remain with the other cities in the 23rd district because they share common interests
4la_20110427_flores	4272011	Jose M. Flores	yes	chair of Central Neighborhood Advisory Committee and a member of Peace Garden	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Extend CD south to include Port of Long Beach and seashore area

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110427_bryant				no	no		
4la_20110427_cityofhermosabeach				no	yes	Coastal cities common goals, lifestyle, living standards, use of transportation system, concern for Santa Monica Bay as an economic, cultural and environmental resource	
4la_20110427_deocampo				no	no		
4la_20110427_feiles				no	no		
4la_20110427_flores				no	yes		working area where various cultures can work together

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110427_bryant	Does not want to see Santa Monica Mountains broken up into multiple legislative districts		no				
4la_20110427_cityofhermosabeach			no				
4la_20110427_deocampo			no				
4la_20110427_feiles			no				
4la_20110427_flores			no			Is of Hispanic origin and understands how much current representative has done for the area	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110427_haskell	4272011	Susan B. Haskell, MPH	no		Pacific Palisades, 24 years	Los Angeles	yes	areas south of the 101 Freeway linked to the Westside and the Las Virgenes and Malibu (parts of the San Fernando Valley and the Westside coastal communities)
4la_20110427_407_long_beach_residents	4272011	407 individual Form Letters for Long Beach	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together by ensuring that all of Long Beach remains in Los Angeles County and not in Orange County
4la_20110427_rogers	4282011	Taiwan Rogers (2nd submission)	no		Bixby Area of Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together (Bixby Area, California Heights, Bixby Knolls, Los Cerritos)
4la_20110427_elliot	4282011	Connie Elliot	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	communities between the 101 freeway and the Santa Monica Mountains, and communities just on the other side of the mounbtains linked by roads sucha s Lauren Canyon Blvd

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110427_haskell		Malibu, Las Virgenes, Calabasas, Topanga, Sherman Oaks, Encino, Studio City, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica and Westwood		no	yes	Linked through transportation corridors from the ocean to the Santa Monica Mountains; coastal communities; utilize transit corridors for work, education, recreation, entertainment, medical care; UCLA, Pepperdine, CSU, Pierce College, Univ of Judaism	the Getty Center, Santa Monica College and Santa Monica Museum of Art are examples of places that are frequented by both coastal, mountain and valley residents. Environmental impact, parklands, quality of life
4la_20110427_407_long_beach_residents				no	no		
4la_20110427_rogers		Keep apart from Palos Verdes and Carson		no	yes	Shop at the same stores along Atlantic Avenue and Long Beach Boulevard. We commune together in local coffee shops. Our children go to some of the same schools.	
4la_20110427_elliot				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110427_haskell			no				
4la_20110427_407_long_beach_residents			no				
4la_20110427_rogers			no				
4la_20110427_elliot	We have a lot in common		no			Wants to stay in Senate District 23	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110427_takaichi	4282011	Lynn M. Takaichi (2nd submission)	yes	Chairman, KennedyJenkins Consultants (consults for CLWA)		Los Angeles	yes	keep CLWA service area (about 270,000 Santa Clarity Valley residents and Venturay County agricultural interests) together
4la_20110428_masnada	4282011	Dan Masnada, P.E.	yes	General Manager, Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA)		Los Angeles	yes	keep CWLA service area in single AD (Santa Clarita Valley, communities in Ventura County along the Santa Clara River)
4la_20110428_cooper	4282011	William Cooper	yes	Vice President, Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) Board of Directors		Los Angeles	yes	Include CLWA service area (and Santa Clarita Valley SCV) in a single AD
4la_20110428_campbell	4282011	Thomas P. Campbell, P.E.	yes	President, Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) - provides water to Santa Clarita Valley		Los Angeles	yes	Align legislative boundaries with watershed areas; keep CLWA service area in a single AD (Santa Clarity Valley and northeastern Ventura County)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110427_takaichi				no	no	regional planning issues; water conservation water supply; coordianation of land use planning and water supply planning, Clean Water Act compliance	
4la_20110428_masnada				no	no	high growth area, many estimated new water projects; share same watershed; ensure coordination of local land use planning with water supply mgmt to ensure water supply meets demand	Enhance collaboration between upstream and downstream stakeholders to address water supply and quality issues; natural environment of watershed
4la_20110428_cooper				no	no	quality of life and environmental resources	SCV water supply planning and management coordination with local land use planning agencies; Clean Water Act compliance consistent with Basin Plan requirements; Newhall Rance project
4la_20110428_campbell				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110427_takaichi			no				
4la_20110428_masnada			no				
4la_20110428_cooper	coordinate water supply and land use planning; water resultion of regional (Santa Clara River watershed basin) water issues; Integrated Water Resources Management Planning for the Upper Santa Clara River watershed UWMP compliance		no				
4la_20110428_campbell	Would aid in water supply and quality issues; aid in regional coopertive efforts with other water authorities		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110428_dake	4282011	Glen Dake	yes	Director, Los Angeles Community Garden Council Director, Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust Member, Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission (2008-2010) (ttle provided for identification only)		Los Angeles	no	Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods letter is the same as the previous records
4la_20110428_dwyer	4282011	KarenMarie T. Dwyer	no		Bixby Knolls area of Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	keep Bixby Knolls, Signal Hill, and Lakewood with the greater part of the City of Long Beach; keep apart from Compton
4la_20110428_houg	4282011	Tony Houg	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110428_houston	4282011	Scott Houston	yes		El Segundo	Los Angeles	yes	El Segundo All communities surrounding LAX have a common interest and should be kept together (El Segundo, Playa del Rey, Westchester and Lennox); Beach cities along Santa Monica Bay

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110428_dake				no	no		
4la_20110428_dwyer				no	yes	Ethnic diversity, metropolis, similar issues facing areas, demographics	Socioeconomic commonalities, mostly middle class voters
4la_20110428_houg				no	no		
4la_20110428_houston		overlap if one were to keep the Beach Cities together from the north to the south (i.e., Santa Monica down to Redondo Beach), which would also include LAX in the middle		no	yes	Similar demographics	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110428_dake			no				
4la_20110428_dwyer			no				
4la_20110428_houg	SD 22 lumps middle- to upper-middle-class suburbs like San Marino and South Pasadena together with the poor inner-city neighborhoods of Los Angeles. This effectively marginalizes the suburban voters and gives them no voice. map of SD 22 submitted		no				
4la_20110428_houston			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110428_oviedo	4282011	Erik Oviedo-McGowan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long BeachSignal Hill in one district (include Port of Long Beach and most of Eastside in Laura Richardsons congressional district); keep apart from Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Rancho Palos Verdes
4la_20110428_palmer	4282011	Shelly Palmer	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Calabasas should remain within the district currently comprised of Malibu and Santa Monica; keep apart from San Fernando Valley
4la_20110428_rierson	4282011	Hadley Rierson	yes	Board Member, The Oaks and Bronson Canyon Improvement Fund		Los Angeles	no	Griffith Park and the surrounding neighborhoods letter is exactly the same as the previous records
4la_20110428_rogers	4282011	Taiwan Rogers	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110428_sibert	4282011	John Sibert	yes	Mayor, City of Malibu; Vice Chairman of the Las Virgenes-Malibu COG and on the Governing Board of the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Malibus districts the same

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110428_oviedo				no	no	Large city	
4la_20110428_palmer				no	no	Rural areas, fundamental core values, particularly of preservation of rural areas	Property values, small business
4la_20110428_rierson				no	no		
4la_20110428_rogers		Northwestern Long Beach should be grouped with Lakewood, Bixby Knolls, California Heights, and Carson Heights; keep apart from Carson, Compton and Willowbrook; Lynwood and South Gate should be with Compton and Willowbrook		yes	no	Share school district, Long Beach Airport; Compton and Willowbrook share demographics and community concerns	
4la_20110428_sibert		five member cities of the Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments (Malibu, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills and Westlake Village)		no	yes	have addressed and continue to face shared environmental, transportation and public safety issues. From wildfires to safe travel in the canyons and along Pacific Coast Highway	the coastal communities of the Santa Monica Bay region, as well as the neighboring areas that impact water quality in the Santa Monica Bay, public health, water safety, beaches, parks

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110428_oviedo			no				
4la_20110428_palmer			no				
4la_20110428_rierson			no				
4la_20110428_rogers			no				
4la_20110428_sibert			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110429_freeman	4292011	Suzanne Freeman	no		Westlake Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westlake Village, Thousand Oaks, Newbury Park, Camarillo, Moorpark, and Simi Valley under one district that serves the Conejo Valley and adjacent areas; dont separate and lump into a district under Los An
4la_20110429_sykes	4292011	Frederick Sykes	no			Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110429_butalia	4292011	Sonita Butalia	no			Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach school district boundaries
4la_20110430_stafford	4302011	Matthew Stafford	no		Downey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Downey and together with adjacent communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110429_freeman		Westlake Village, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes	share common interests and views with those cities	
4la_20110429_sykes		West Covina, Baldwin Par, La Puente, unincorporated L.A. County areas of La Puente and Valinda should be kept together in all districts		no	yes	Latino, similar economic status and vested interets	
4la_20110429_butalia				no	no		
4la_20110430_stafford	Los Angeles	Downey, Whittier, Lakewood, Cerritos, Artesia, Bellflower, Paramount, Norwalk, La Miranda, Hollydale (neighborhood of South Gate)		no	yes	Transportation network, socioeconomic trends, shopping, schools, history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110429_freeman			no				
4la_20110429_sykes			no				
4la_20110429_butalia			no			I went to the meeting tonight and i would like to tell you that people were paid to be there. It made me so upset and sick that i had to leave.	We need change in our communities, in the inner city of L.A.,and I welcome that with open arms More people should.
4la_20110430_stafford			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110430_sirota	4302011	Michael B. Sirota	yes	Woodland Printing Inc., serves on the board of the Canoga Park West Hills Chamber of Commerce	West San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Canoga Park West Hills Woodland Hills is West San Fernando Valley; The Valley extends from the 405 Freeway west, stops at the Ventura County line, and extends as far north as the Los Angeles city limits and as far south as Mulholland Drive.
4la_20110430_ross	4302011	Steve Ross	no		West San Fernando Valleys Granada Hills for 23 years	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110430_mcdonald	4302011	Mike McDonald	yes	President, Burbank Firefighters Local 778		Los Angeles	no	Griffith Park form letter
4la_20110430_kulukian	4302011	Nichan Kulukian (Speaker 57, April 30, 2011, San Fernando, Amended Presentation)	yes	City of San Fernando City Hall Council Chambers		Los Angeles	no	Keep West San Fernando Valley together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110430_sirota				no	yes	West Valley vs. East Valley; business and cultural connection	Westfield Topanga Shopping Center Complex largest shopping center complex west of the Mississippi. located along Topanga Boulevard, right on the border between Canoga Park and Woodland Hills, and very close to West Hills; share chamber of commerce
4la_20110430_ross				no	yes		
4la_20110430_mcdonald				no	no		
4la_20110430_kulukian		includes the incorporated cities of Calabasas and Hidden Hills.	Starts North of Granada Hills (border of natl forest, South to Encino along the western side of the 405, then west through the Valley to Agoura Hills. It then extends south to Mulholland Drive, and goes east to 405 and west to the Ventura County line.	no	yes	Diaspora Armenians (vs Soviet Armenians - different dialect, culture, customs); West Valley vs. East Valley Libraries, Police Stations, Time Warner Cable serviceadvertising areas, DPSS, Red Cross	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110430_sirota			no				
4la_20110430_ross			no			I think Long Beach needs two reps of different persuasion for our congressmen.	Ever since my district was represented by Steve Horn, weve had far left liberals who dont think as I do. Our district was redefined and is an embarrassment to 60 of Long Beach.
4la_20110430_mcdonald			no				
4la_20110430_kulukian			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110428_kirby	4282011	Patty Terry Kirby	no			Los Angeles	no	We prefer to keep Studio City in the State Senates 23rd District. Both sides of the Santa Monica Mountains should be included in this Valley and greater Westside District.
4la_20110429_carson	4292011	Richard and Karlyn Carson	no			Los Angeles	no	wish to have Studio City remain in the 23rd State Senate District; both sides of the Santa Monica Mountains should be included in this Valley and greater Westside District
4la_20110430_brammer	4302011	Jim Brammer (Speaker 18, April 30, 2011, San Fernando)	no	Valley Cultural Center		Los Angeles	no	keep West San Fernando Valley intact
4la_20110430_boberg	4302011	Dorothy Boberg (previous speaker, April 30, 2011, San Fernando, not given)	no			Los Angeles	no	existing 38th Assembly district, which is mostly in the Santa Clarita area, should not include part of the San Fernando Valley; mountains north of valley make it difficult to reach assembly person or be involved in politics
4la_20110430_greene	4302011	Leah Bazarian Greene	no		Northwest San Fernando Valley for over 45 years	Los Angeles	no	consider joining the Northwest San Fernando Valley with the Eastern Ventura County and the Santa Clarita Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110428_kirby		Sherman Oaks, Encino, Tarzana and Woodland Hills and west to the Ventura County line (Calabasas and Agoura Hills) are all primarily located along the busy 101 Ventura Freeway corridor and we share common interests with these communities.	Santa Monica Mountains (Studio City and West Hollywood to the Ventura County line at Malibu and Westlake Village)	no	yes	Valley communities are directly linked to the Westside through transportation corridors, (Laurel Canyon, Coldwater canyon, Beverly Glen, Sepulveda, the 405, etc.)	
4la_20110429_carson				no	no	The community shares common interests and geography with adjacent communities and the Westside	
4la_20110430_brammer				no	no		
4la_20110430_boberg				no	no		
4la_20110430_greene				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110428_kirby			no				
4la_20110429_carson			no				
4la_20110430_brammer			no				submitted his notes as attachment as requested by the Commission
4la_20110430_boberg			no				
4la_20110430_greene			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110430_bazarian	4302011	Alice Bazarian	no			Los Angeles	no	Please support in keeping our communities (Porter Ranch, Granada Hills, Northridge Chatsworth) in the same district as the Eastern Ventura County and the Santa Clarita Valley
4la_20110430_eisenhart	4302011	Nancy Eisenhart (Speaker 101, April 30, 2011, San Fernando, Supplemental Comments)	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	It is important for the West Valley to be kept intact
4la_20110509_land	592011	Abbe Land	yes	Councilmember. West Hollywood City Council for 30 yrs.		Los Angeles	yes	Keep communities of interest in one State Senate and 2 State Assembly districts; many commercial and regional transportation corridors such as Sunset Blvd, Santa Monica Blvd, Beverly Glen, 405, I10, 101 connect the region (look at letter for all routes)
4la_20110429_mccallion	4292011	Shirley Mccallion	no			Los Angeles	yes	do not change Keep roybaucher for long beach redistricting

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110430_bazarian				no	no		
4la_20110430_eisenhart		Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Encino, Reseda, part of Van Nuys, Winnetka, Canoga Park, West Hills, Chatsworth, Porter Ranch, Northridge,Granada Hills	Mulholland Hwy is geological border to South; Santa Susanna Ridge is geological border to North Newhall Pass, western tip of San Gabriel Mtns (behind city of san fernando and sylmar); County line to W; Verdugo Hills to E (behind Burbank)	no	no	West Valley should not be split; East Valley (using Sepulveda Blvd. as NS split, not the 405), could be split along Victory Blvd and expand beyond Sepulveda to Balboa; (Burbank is more associated with the East)	
4la_20110509_land		West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, Culver City make up one Council of Government; Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu make up another; W. Hollywood linked to Westside communities Bel-Air, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
4la_20110429_mccallion				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110430_bazarian			no			I am a senior who has seen many changes here in the Northwest San Fernando Valley over the last 60 years.	
4la_20110430_eisenhart	Nothing in common with Bel Air, Brentwood, Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, Malibu		no				submitted 2 maps
4la_20110509_land			no				
4la_20110429_mccallion			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110429_lamoreaux	4292011	Dennis LaMoreaux	yes	general managerengineer for public water district in High Desert area	Palmdale	Los Angeles	no	(includes map of High Desert area); create an Antelope ValleyEast Kern Assembly District and combine with a Victor ValleyMojave Desert Assembly District to create a High Desert Senate District.
4la_20110429_tanner	4292011	Ted Tanner	yes	Executive VP for AEG (Real Estate Development)		Los Angeles	yes	keep Downtown LA whole and fully contained in assembly, senate, congressional districts
4la_20110429_rogers	4292011	Karen Rogers	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Link West San Fernando Valley communities (SFV) together and preferably with eastern Ventura County communities of Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Thousand Oak; and not join with east communities, such as Pacoima, Sun Valley, Tujunga

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110429_lamoreaux				yes	yes	Victor and Antelope Valleys share common focus of regional management plans for water demands during shortages and future. Other areas of LA, Kern, and San Bernardino Counties have different climates that drive different water policy needs	
4la_20110429_tanner				yes	yes		As a developing and evolving area that services the entire region, needs stable and consistent political representation to manage traffic, planning, and economic development efforts.
4la_20110429_rogers		West SFV like communities such as Chatsworth, Porter Ranch, West Hills, Canoga Park		no	yes	West SFV areas have many overlapping interests shared lifestlye and mostly residential communities, rural living, and slow-growth mentality (similar to eastern Ventura County); unlike the East SFV communities that are more industrial	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110429_lamoreaux			no				High Desert area has unique and common climate which relates directly to the use and supply.
4la_20110429_tanner			no				
4la_20110429_rogers			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110429_tanaka	4292011	Paul K. Tanaka	yes	Mayor of the City of Gardena		Los Angeles	yes	No interest in changing cities currently in Congressional District No. 35
4la_20110429_wright	4292011	James Wright	no			Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110316_amon	3162011	Frank Amon	no		Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110429_smead	4292011	Craig Smead and Catherine Smead, each sent letter with the same suggested district	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	no	Keep the communities of the NW San Fernando Valley (Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Cnorthridge, Porter Ranch Granada Hills), the eastern part of Ventura County (Simi Valley, Moorpark Thousand Oaks) and the Santa Clarita Valley together in one district
4la_20110429_verdi	4292011	Patti Verdi	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	no	Keep northwest San Fernando Valley; Since its not big enough to be one district, join it with eastern Ventura County and the Santa Clarita Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110429_tanaka		Keep Gardena with adjoining neighbor cities of Hawthorne and Lawndale		no	no	Gardena shares many mutal interests and tasks and has a long-time, effectual relationship with Hawthorne and Lawndale	
4la_20110429_wright				no	no		
4la_20110316_amon		Keep the City of Ponoma entirely within one Assembly district and one Congressional district . Put Ontario and Upland in the same district.		no	yes	A north-south grouping unites more COI than th current east-west grouping. Current grouping only serves to keep Republicans in north separate from Democrats in the south	
4la_20110429_smead				no	yes	Share many things in common and representatives should reflect the values and principles of their constituents	
4la_20110429_verdi	LA and Ventura			no	yes	Share common interests and values	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110429_tanaka			no				
4la_20110429_wright			no				Summary of San Gabriel Meeting
4la_20110316_amon	Supports the One Ponoma letter; Claremont and Ponoma have similar interests; similarly for Ontario and Upland		no				
4la_20110429_smead			no				
4la_20110429_verdi			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110503_seligman	532011	Donald A. Seligman	yes	President, Los Feliz Improvement Association		Los Angeles	yes	Los Feliz Boundaries W - Canyon Drive to from Griffith Park to Frankling Av; N - Griffith Park; E LA River between Griffith Park Hyperion Ave, then Hyperion Ave btwn the LA River Fountain Ave; S - Franklin Ave btwn Canyon Drive Western Ave (cont.)
4la_20110505_lutness	552011	Carole Lutness	yes	Santa Clarita Valley Fair Elections Committee Chair, a non-partisan organization to open and transparent government and the control of Big Money and corruption in electrions and on every level of government, and campaign finance reform	Valencia	Los Angeles	yes	For boundaries to include all of Santa Clarita going out the 5, through Castaic and beyond; down the 126 through PiruFilmore because of our common issues about water and the environment and up to 14 to the edge of Acton or perhaps into Antelope Valley
4la_20110429_eftychiou	4292011	Chris Eftychoiu	yes	Director, Long Beach Unified School District		Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110503_seligman		Place the small neighborhood within a single assembly and senatorial district and place the entirety of Griffith Park within the district boundaries; (includes map of neighborhood boundaries as described by LA Times and their organization		yes	no	For the lat decade, it has been divided between districts, results in duplicate efforts in pursuing their goals and unique interests	
4la_20110505_lutness		Doesnt want Santa Clarita to be incorporated with the 210 or northern SFV or Simi Valley		no	yes	proposed district is a COI because of common issues about water and environment	
4la_20110429_eftychiou				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110503_seligman	Neighborhood has assumed the primary citizen responsibility for the parks stewardship for most of the parks existence		no				
4la_20110505_lutness	514 split really does separate Santa Clarita geographically and physically from SFV and no common issues with SFV; Same for Simi Valley, since their problems and focus are in Ventura County and geographically seperated.		no				
4la_20110429_eftychiou			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110506_mercer	562011	Georgia L. Mercer	yes	President, Board of Trustees for the LA Community College District	Berkeley Hills	Los Angeles	no	Maintain the current boundaries of State Senate district 23
4la_20110503_wexler	532011	Janice Wexler	no			Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110501_bigby	512011	Barbara Bigby	no	Immediate past president, Altadena Branch of the NAACP	Altadena	Los Angeles	no	Keep the foothill cities (communities south of the mtns and north and adjacent to the 210 freeway) together; imperative that communities of Altadena, Duarte, Monrovia, La Canada, and Claremont stay together
4la_20110420_yacovone	4202011	Joan Yacovone	yes	Treasurer, Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation on the Advisory County West Vector Control Disitrict	Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	For transportation, residents use 101 Freeway, Pacific Coast Highway, canyon roads of Kanan Road. Topanga, Las VirgenesMalibu Canyon Rd, Wilshire Blvd to connect to Woodland Hills, Encino, Santa Monica,, W. LA, etc for medical care, employment, education

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110506_mercer				no	no	The issues that affect their lifestyles involve work, education, recreation, religious and cultural boundaries are very similar throughout the current district boundaries.	Much of the population either lives in the valley and commutes into the city or vice versa.
4la_20110503_wexler				no	no		
4la_20110501_bigby		Most cities from Claremont to La Canada Flintridge are relatively the same size and are the most ethnically and racially diverse communities in the foothills		no	yes	Many residents care for the mtns and foothills along the northern border of the 210 corridor, and for air water quality, recreational use, forest protection; many non-profit and community based organizations have the foothill cities in coverage areas	Much of foothills patrolled by LA County Sheriff and Fire Departments; Organizations (NAACP, AYSO, Boy Girl Scouts) have common membership and affiliations throughout the foothills
4la_20110420_yacovone		Combine five cities Westlake Village, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu, Agoura Hills and unincorporated Topanga, Malibou Lake, Monte Nido		no	yes	Council of Government of the cities worked together on prblms such as transportation, wildfire protection, traffic issues, public safety, watersheds, and to protectpreserve significant ridgelines, wildlife corridors, National Parks of Santa Monica mtns	Most of areas listed served by common water district (Las Virgenes Municipal Water District) and school district (the Las Virgenes Unified School District)

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110506_mercer			no				
4la_20110503_wexler			no			Keep Studio Senate in the State Senates 23rd District	
4la_20110501_bigby			no			African Americans are spread across the foothills but largely absent from southern parts of San Gabriel Valley.	
4la_20110420_yacovone			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110427_gordon	4272011	Jon Gordon	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110501_jones	512011	Lynn Jones	no		Westlake Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the region near the Santa Monica Mtns. Including smaller communities including Topanga together in the same legislative district.
4la_20110514_schuck	5142011	Peter Schuck	no		West San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Mulholland Dr. demarcate new districts between the communities on either side of the Sta. Monicas
4la_20110513_taibi	5132011	Evelyn Taibi	yes	Real Estates Valencia		Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110514_quirin	5142011	Frtiz and Chris Quirin	no		Santa Clarita Valley	Los Angeles	no	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole
4la_20110514_martin	5142011	Anota Martin	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Altadena, Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank in one Congressional or state legislative district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110427_gordon				no	no		
4la_20110501_jones		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, and Hidden HillsWestlake Village (incorporated city)	Westlake Village shaes a border with Agoura Hills and the Ventura county line	yes	no	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, and Hidden Hills share the same school district, senior and recreational centers, churches and synagogues, and water district; and part of regional gov. council with Malibu	Region around Santa Moica Mts. All served by LA County Fire Dpt. And LA County Sheriffs Dpt.
4la_20110514_schuck				no	no	there are few issues involving the Westside, which directly affect my neck of the woods in Encino and vice versa	
4la_20110513_taibi		Sees no reason to cut the city of Santa Clarita up and putting it up with the San Fernando or Antelope Valleys. Wants to keep the city together		no	no		
4la_20110514_quirin				no	yes	cohesive community	
4la_20110514_martin				no	no	All share environmental and education issues, care deeply about the Angeles National Forest and all of their local open spaces in San Gabriel Mtns. and Verdugo Hills	Altadena shares school district with Pasadena (Pasadena Unified School Disitrct)

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110427_gordon			no			Keep Studio City in the 23rd State Senate District	
4la_20110501_jones			no				
4la_20110514_schuck			no				
4la_20110513_taibi	Areas are all distinct		no				
4la_20110514_quirin			no				
4la_20110514_martin	little boundary between these four cities, socially, economically, or geographically		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110514_cook	5142011	Lynda Cook	no			Los Angeles	yes	idea that the valley should be broken into two districts is absurd.
4la_20110514_adam	5142011	Adam	no			Los Angeles	yes	Southern border for the entire SFV Mulholland Drive; Northern border top of Los Angeles city; draw a West Valley district west of the 405 freeway to the Ventura County border; and an East Valley district east of the 405 to Burbank and maybe Glendale
4la_20110501_walter	512011	Brett Walter	yes	Field Representative for Buck McKeon (a Congressman)		Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110514_cook				no	no		
4la_20110514_adam				no	no	Virtually all organizations in the SFV serve either the West Valley or East Valley. Therefore, the two areas have developed into unique COIs within the valley	Instead of chopping up the Valley for sake of districts ouside the Valley, such as West L.A. and Santa Clarita, drawing districts that maximize population within th Valley with an East and West Valley congressional district will empower the communities
4la_20110501_walter				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110514_cook	Goals for this valley are united, whether we live in Castaic or Aqua Dulce. It would be poorly served if it was broken up.		no				With all the effort to try to make this valley a cohesive entity, this proposal shows that the panel has little or no consideration for the voters.
4la_20110514_adam	Valley is the largest entity in America, which is not a city or county. With more than 1.8 million people, you will need to divide the Valley to meet population goals for congressional districts.		no				
4la_20110501_walter			no				Lynn Haueter, who is married to Bob Haueter, work directly for Congressman, Buck McKeon, as his deputy Chief. She didnt officially disclose and that isnt proper protocol.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110501_seo	512011	Sarah Seo	no			Los Angeles	no	Make the Los Angeles Police Departments Olympic Community Police Station boundaries into one state assembly district.
4la_20110501_busselle	512011	Max Busselle	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Keep communities surrounding the Santa Monica Mtns. Together with eight unincorporated areas within this common area of interest include the westside and valley communities
4la_20110501_elliott	512011	Carol Elliott	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando valley (405 being a natural dividing line) together with cities of Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, all unincorporated areas within that geographical area together wthe Santa Monica Mtns., Malibu, and Pacific Palisades.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110501_seo		Koreatown		yes	yes	Olympic Station has 26 Korean-speaking officers, who allows more effective policing for the community which has more then 70 of Koreans win Olympic Station boundaries that arent English-fluent;	
4la_20110501_busselle		West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, Malibu, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills and Westlake Village, Bel Aire, Brentwood, Westwood, UCLA, Pacific Palisades, Studio City, Sherman Oaks, Encino, Tarzana, Woodland Hills and West Hills		no	yes	Protect open space, watersheds, wildlife corridors, and recreational oppurtunities	
4la_20110501_elliott		Also, if numbers are needed, to include Westlake Village and Thousand Oaks		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110501_seo	the greater Koreatown neighborhood, as defined by the LAPD Olympic Station patrol area, has specific needs and interests unique to the area, needs that have been recognized by L.A..		no				
4la_20110501_busselle			no				
4la_20110501_elliott			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110429_bogaard	4292011	Bill Bogaard	yes	Mayor of Pasadena		Los Angeles	yes	City of Pasadena continue to be in Congressional District with Burbank and Glendale, and that the State Senate and Assembly districts also take into account the same circumstances pertaining to COI
4la_20110501_hofbauer	512011	Steve Hofbauer	yes	Councilmember, Palmdale City Council		Los Angeles	yes	Population perfect for one assembly district Palmdale, Lancaster, Rosamond, Mojave, Ridgecrest, Tehachapi; another district High Desert communities of Apple Valley, Adelanto, Victorsville, Hesperia, and Barstow in San Bernardino and Inyo counties
4la_20110513_vaughan	5132011	Andrew Vaughan	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Most logical place is along the 101 Freeway, connecting Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, and the San Fernanda Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110429_bogaard		Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale		no	yes	many working relationships for operations and public service btwn the 3 cities, including Fire Police Services, Information Technology, Utility Operations, Coordination of Legislative Positions, Workers Compensations and promising service sharing ideas.	Since 1970s, three cities have owned and operated Bob Hope Airport -an economic engine for these cities and the region - and more significant transportation networks have developed and is developing to support this facility
4la_20110501_hofbauer		DesertMountain communities Palmdale, Lancaster, Rosamond, Mojave, Victorville, Hesperia, Apple Valley, Adelanto, and several of the San Bernardino communities including Arrowhead and Big Bear Lake		no	yes	High Desert area faces water similar water and resource challenges bc of separate water air basins	Unemployment in High Desert greater challenge than in surrounding communities (ex. Inland Empire San Fernando Valley); Also area is becoming Green Energy Capitol of US and needs to build on these technologies as a single legislative district
4la_20110513_vaughan		do not divide the city of Agoura Hills or connect them with West Los Angeles, such as Beverly Hills or Brentwood. (also contains cities in West Valley in email)		no	yes	most logical in terms of transporatation routes and common interests and activities; also have overlapping water districts, school districts, and transportation arteries	Also, many people in Agoura Hills also shop and work in the Valley

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110429_bogaard			no				
4la_20110501_hofbauer	Regional Board of Trade supports similar concept, for the same logical, geographic demographic, and economic reasons		no				
4la_20110513_vaughan	Do not share much in common with people in west Los Angeles		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110501_olson	512011	Eric Olson	no		Sierra Madre	Los Angeles	yes	District westerly boundaries of Pasadena and Altadena and ending at east Claremont, and dropping south if necessary wCovina W.Convina. But if district ending at or near E. Pasadena, then still retain rest of district along foothillsI-210 corridor
4la_20110430_brammer	4302011	Jim Brammer	yes	Valley Cultural Center	Tarzana	Los Angeles	no	Keep West San Fernando Valley (SFV) together in a single district; SFV runs from east to west and naturally divided by 405 freeway into East SFV and West SFV why many organizations serve either the East Valley or West Valley
4la_20110418_rogers	4182011	William H. Rogers	no		Castaic	Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110513_eisenberg	5132011	Lois Eisenberg	no		Valencia	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110513_fields	5132011	Valeria and Judge Jerry K. Fields	yes	L.A. Board of Education	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Link Valley and West L.A. in one district; BeverlyGlen, Benedict Canyon, 405 Freeway south of the 101 provide easy access to Valley ot West L.A.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110501_olson		district w Sierra Madres COI focus on N. boundary along foothills of Angeles San Bernardino National Forests I-210 transpotation corridor; have it within San Gabriel Valley and remain with fewest possible of districts; Altadena with Pasadena		no	yes	Sierra Madres COI in the remainder of the foothill commuities of San Gabriel Valley deal with the National Forests in recreation, water concerns, and physical dangers of fires and slides.	recognize substantial COI in San Gabriel Valley and keep politically together. For more info, go to www.valleyconnect.com (San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership)
4la_20110430_brammer		Valley Cultural Center programs attract people from Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Chatsworth, Agoura Hills, Chatsworth, Porter Ranch, Granada Hills, Northridge, Reseda, Winnetka, Lake Balboa, Encino, Tarzana		no	no		
4la_20110418_rogers				no	no		
4la_20110513_eisenberg				no	no		
4la_20110513_fields				no	yes	Common interests and geographic convenience	we do marketing and use marketing providers in the Valley and fo to Westside for doctors and shopping

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110501_olson	Current 59th AD district (Sierra Madre, Hesperia, nor most of communities) doesnt have much community of interest with one another; Tie Altadena with Pasadena bc Pasadena School District includes, Pasadena, Altadena, and Sierra Madre		no				
4la_20110430_brammer			no				
4la_20110418_rogers			no				
4la_20110513_eisenberg			no			Santa Clarita Valley ought to be kept whole	
4la_20110513_fields	Need representative involved with the assets and problems in the area and how they overlap		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110509_suter	592011	Karen Suter	no			Los Angeles	yes	Glendale is a transporation corridor for La Cresenta and La Canada; large section of La Cresenta has always been annexed part of Glendale, which includes schools utilities, and protective services
4la_20110515_88sclaritavalrcitz	5152011	same letter signed by 88 different people in this document; also 46 on 513, 15 on 514, 59 on 516, 45 on 518, 8 on 522 261 total sent same letter between 513 and 522; documents with other dates have own record	no		Mostly Santa Clarita Canyon County; Some from Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, CA	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley in a single Congressional and Assembly district; SCV is bordered by Ventura County to West, Aqua Dulce to East, Castaic to North, and San Fernando Valley to South

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110509_suter		La Crescenta, La Canda, and Glendale should be together		no	yes	the 3 cities share cultural ties which include income housing demographics; strong feeling of community btwn 3 cities including organizational religious affiliations;	Many in the foothills area work attend cultural events in Glendale; Glendale primary shopping district for all 3 areas; La Cresenta and Glendale comprise Glendale Unified School, which also includes a section of La Canada
4la_20110515_88sclaritavalrcitz				no	yes	Suburban communties share deep sense of family; Valley committed to preserving open space for recreational activities; Valley served by William S. Hart Union High School District and Santa Clarita Community College District	SCV has diversified economy local businesses enjoy benefits of an Enterprise Zone that span valley; recently community has formed SCV Economic Development Corp. to retain attract business;

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110509_suter			no			(Written follow-up as promised in remarks at San Fernando hearing)	
4la_20110515_88sclaritavalrcitz			no			LA County and Santa Clarita are developing One Valley, One Vision for regional planning	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110518_17smonicamtnres	5182011	same letter signed by 17 different people	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	no	A return to 1991 legislative boundaries, which bordered along county lines, to include communities along Santa Monica Mtns, which traverse inland regions to the coast, and include West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu
4la_20110518_14eisenhart	5182011	Nancy Eisenhart 14 copies each addressed to a member of commission	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley intact; Place Calabasas with Hidden Hills, Woodland Hils, and Tarzana and never with Malibu or any other coastal region. They are Valley, Malibu is coast.
4la_20110504_waldman	542011	Stuart Waldman	yes	President, Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA)		Los Angeles	yes	VICA staff provided links to electronically prepared shapefiles of Valley communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110518_17smonicamtnres		West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu		no	yes	For a shared legistlative voice to preserve the ecology of Santa Monica mtns region; Communities of listed 6 cities and unincorporated areas connected through collaboration and service, form the Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments (COG)	inland communities served by single Sheriffs station, 2 Fire stations; Las Virgenes Municipal Water Disitrct provides region with water sewer services; also united through Las Virgenese Unified School District
4la_20110518_14eisenhart		West Valley contains cities Woodland Hills, Calabasas, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Canoga Park, Tarzana; goes from North Hills to Chatsworth, from Encino to Calabasas	W. of 405 freeway, btwn Mulholland Hwy on S., Santa Susanna mtns on N., LA county line on far W., Verdugo San Gabriel Mtns on E.	no	yes	United by weather, utilities, traffic congestion, job markets, shopping, population, etc which need proper representation	
4la_20110504_waldman				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110518_17smonicamtnres			no			Attached maps of 1991 legislative district for Santa Monica Mtns area; The COG is core of LA Countys Disaster Management Area B.	
4la_20110518_14eisenhart			no				Lists horrors of 2000-2001 redistricting
4la_20110504_waldman			no				Diasppointed that Commission had neither obtained shapefiles or maps of Valley communities nor inquired with community groups about Valleys composition. Would appreciate downloading these maps and providing them to commission members.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110508_olhasso	582011	Laura Olhasso	yes	Councilmember and 2 time mayor of La Canada Flintridge, president of CA Contract Cities Association	La Canada Flintridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the foothill cities in the San Gabriel Valley between the northen boundary of the natl forests and southern boundary of 210 Freeway corridor
4la_20110515_baldonado	5152011	Sandra Baldonado	no			Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110515_davis	5152011	Troy Davis	no			Los Angeles	yes	Santa Clarita and the Santa Clarita valley should be kept whole within only one Congressional, State Senate Assembly, and Board of Equalization district and not divided among two or more districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110508_olhasso		foothill cities from La Canada Flintridge east to Claremont		no	yes	Share interests of natl forests; many are members of the CA Contract Cities Association	
4la_20110515_baldonado				no	no		
4la_20110515_davis		The City of Santa Clarita and Santa Clarita Valley should be placed with compact districts, which should include other communities of north Los Angeles County andor the northwest communities of the San Fernando Valley.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110508_olhasso	Whether public safety, forest preservation, mass transit, foothill communities have history of working together toward common goals		no			Foothills cities impacted by recent Station Fire recently	
4la_20110515_baldonado	Claremont, La Verne, San Dimas have absolutely nothing in common with Hesperia		no			Our Assembly district (Claremont) is an excellent example of poor planning - our old 62nd district in the l970s made much more sense and keeping 2 Assembly Districts within a Senate District is also desireable	Every effort must be made to keep districts contiguous and keep communities of interest together. wherever possible districts should be contained within one County and not cross county lines.
4la_20110515_davis			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110315_furatani	3152011	Warren T. Furatani	no	Assemblymember, Long Beach (AD 55)		Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110517_wilson	5172011	Glen Wilson	yes	VP of Administration for Northridge West Neighborhood Council	Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley (SFV) whole for AD, SD, CD; same for East SFV; use Mulholland Drive as the southern most boundary for West SFV so that SFV north of the 118 Freeway includes neighborhoods - Chartsworth, Granada Hills North and Porter Ranch
4la_20110516_palic	5162011	Deanna Palic	no			Los Angeles	yes	Brad Shermans 27th District The way the lines are now drawn too many parts of his district are not even in the San Fernando Valley. All of Woodland Hills and Calabasas should be in his territory
4la_20110517_gonzalezharper	5172011	Berta Gonzlez-Harper	no		Canyon Country community in the City of Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	keep Santa Clarita Valley whole and not pair with areas of the San Fernando Valley (SFV). Santa Clarita Valley does form a COI with Piru and Fillmore to our west because have similar interests and share watershed and the land grant.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110315_furatani				no	no		
4la_20110517_wilson				no	yes	Those three communities are within the City of Los Angeles and within the San Fernando Valley and served by Neighborhood Councils	
4la_20110516_palic		Woodland Hills and Calabasas		no	no		
4la_20110517_gonzalezharper				no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley shares many social and economic interest lists many examples	economy dependent on approved major expansion of the Disney Studios at Golden Oak Ranch, which will provide approximately 4000 new jobs. Splitting would create more red tape, delays and cost over runs

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110315_furatani			no				Given that 20 of CA is limited English proficient (LEP) 45 of Latinos 40 of Asians in So CA we would Ilke to know what work the Commission is doing to ensure that it is compliant with the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act.
4la_20110517_wilson			no				Look at Albert Abrams map for 2010 L. A. City Neighborhood Council Regional Area Map for San Fernando Valley.
4la_20110516_palic			no				
4la_20110517_gonzalezharper			no			response to comment well they are not one city Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) prevented one unified city within the Santa Clarita Valley in 1987 because it would produce too large a city, but that was our intent.	Attached a map of approved developments to give you a better idea of the planned and approved growth just within our valley.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110517_sullivan	5172011	Cheryl Sullivan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley intact and dont link with Malibu or Santa Clarita Valley. (STAY WITHIN THE MOUNTAIN(ACTUALLY HILLS) RANGES.); Start at the western edge of LA county and go east until desired population; then start from there and go east again.
4la_20110518_2herman	5182011	Marcia Herman (two emails from her on the same day)	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep District 23 lines
4la_20110518_amrhein	5182011	Alisan Amrhein	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Dont connect Santa Clarita Valley with San Fernando Valley or LA; instead connect with either eastern Ventura County or continue north and connect with northern parts of LA county
4la_20110518_abrams_c	5182011	Cheryl Abrams	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	(refer to 151)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110517_sullivan				no	no		
4la_20110518_2herman				no	yes	District 23 is predominately a progressive thinking community, concerned about the environment, the santa Monica mountains, the ocean,the quality of the air the joy of hiking and walking	
4la_20110518_amrhein				no	no		
4la_20110518_abrams_c				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110517_sullivan			no				
4la_20110518_2herman			no				
4la_20110518_amrhein			no				
4la_20110518_abrams_c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110518_abrams_a	5182011	Allan Abrams	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	use101 Freeway corridor region of western LA County as a COI that includes the 4 cities (Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Calabasas, hidden Hills) as well as areas in western San Fernando Valley; dont connect with West LA Beverly Hills
4la_20110516_newland	5162011	Paul Newland	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	re-draw the Santa Clarita Valley into two voting districts
4la_20110517_stanley	5172011	Michael Stanley	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110518_abrams_a		West Valley communities Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Granada Hills North, Granada Hills South, North Hills West, Northridge East, Northridge West, Porter Ranch, West Hills , Winnetka, Woodland hills Warner Center, Encino, Lake Balboa, Reseda and Tarzana.		no	yes	We have common School and Water Districts, and we have common economic interests. When we dine, shop and socialize we commonly do so in the aforementioned areas. Our residents frequently work in this areas as well and commute along the 101.	In order to travel to West Los Angeles, it is necessary to drive through the Sepulveda Pass, one of the most congested stretches of freeways in California.
4la_20110516_newland				no	yes	Re-districting Santa Clarita into 2 distinct voting districts is the only reasonable way to keep apace with our ever-changing populations and allow them to express their diverse perspectives, which makes us all stronger.	
4la_20110517_stanley				no	yes	The Santa Clarita Valley is increasingly one community with common interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110518_abrams_a			no				
4la_20110516_newland			no				
4la_20110517_stanley			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110517_ree	5172011	Mary Ree	no			Los Angeles	yes	Placing the entire Santa Clarita Valley within single districts to preserve important neighborhood connections
4la_20110517_hawkins	5172011	Cheryl Hawkins	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole
4la_20110517_godinez	5172011	Gabriel Godinez	no			Los Angeles	yes	put bellflower with lakewood, cerritos, downey,la mirada and up the L.A. county line

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110517_ree				no	yes	One of the most important ties is the joint planning between City of Santa Clarita and LA County known as One Valley, One Vision. - allows both jurisdictionsto update individual General Plans to strengthen the common goals shared in Santa Clarita Valley	
4la_20110517_hawkins				no	yes	Santa Clarita is unique because of large size, but actually works together as one unit, always going through the same L. A. County Supervisor (Michael D. Antonovich) for battles against development and depending on Santa Clarita City Hall	
4la_20110517_godinez				no	yes	Bellflower has a school district with Lakewood; Bellflowers multi ethnicities(anglo,hispanic, asian) would be equally represented with the previous mentioned cites;the 5 cities have a significant percentage of high school and college graduates	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110517_ree	The Santa Clarita Valley City Council voted to keep Santa Clarita as 1 district and if necessary, to team Santa Clarita with cities in which we share common interests and concerns.		no				
4la_20110517_hawkins			no				
4la_20110517_godinez	The 5 cities haves issues that are the opposite with the cities that are in the 50th assembly district issues that are the opposite with the cities that are in the 50th assembly district		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110517_benjamin	5172011	Diane Benjamin	no			Los Angeles	yes	Santa Clarita Valley is one community and should be one district for legislative purposes.
4la_20110516_seeley	5162011	Fred Seeley	no			Los Angeles	yes	keep the entire Santa Clarita Valley in the same Assembly District.
4la_20110516_schulman	5162011	Kyle Schulman	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	maximize the number of districts entirely within the Valley. With large populations on either side of the 405, draw districts that give both the West Valley East Valley COIs the representation they deserve;
4la_20110516_pregozen	5162011	Michele Pregozen	no		Saugus of Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Dont split the Santa Clarita Valley
4la_20110515_sholes	5152011	Joanne Sholes	no		Valencia	Los Angeles	yes	keep the Santa Clarita Valley - which includes Stevenson Ranch in one district to better serve our collective needs

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110517_benjamin				no	no		
4la_20110516_seeley				no	no		
4la_20110516_schulman		Mulholland Drive is the southern border of the East Valley --on the other side of the mountain are Bel Air, Westwood and Beverly Hills, which are not connected to the Valley; East Valley section of SFV that is east of the 405		no	no		
4la_20110516_pregozen				no	yes	Hart School district which is responsible for all the junior highs and high schools of the valley, splitting would create educational issues	
4la_20110515_sholes				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110517_benjamin			no				
4la_20110516_seeley			no				
4la_20110516_schulman			no				
4la_20110516_pregozen	The city has been campaigning for years to make this one vision; also splitting provide conflicts within our own city council regarding their loyalty to individual representatives		no				
4la_20110515_sholes	consider the fact that in 1968 we were unincorporated area with a small population. Now our city population nears 200,000.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110515_ploger	5152011	Elizabeth Ploger	no			Los Angeles	yes	The San Fernando Valley is a Valley between two ranges of mountains - from Mulholland Drive to the Angeles National ForestSan Gabriel Mts. areas.; DO NOT INCLUDE POINT SOUTH OF MULHOLLAND as being in the San Fernando Valley
4la_20110515_michaelson	5152011	Jason Michaelson	yes			Los Angeles	yes	Keep the Hollywoods together in one district - the areas that account for most of the film and television production and the areas where, concomitantly, as many of 15 of the citizens work in the industry.
4la_20110516_leyva	5162011	Brandon Leyva	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Connect Agoura Hills with areas east along the 101 Freeway into the West San Fernando Valley; CD 4 cities in LA county section of LA north of Mulholland Dr west of 405; and not with over the hill communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110515_ploger				no	no		
4la_20110515_michaelson		Hollywood (not just because symbolic) , Hollywood Hills (including Hollywood Knoll, the Oaks, etc.), North Hollywood(large number of post-production firms entertainment-dependent businesses), Burbank (home of many studios), Universial City, Studio City		no	yes		
4la_20110516_leyva		4 cities in western LA County (Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills and Westlake Village); over the hill West LA areas of Brentwood, Bel Air, Westwood, nor incorporated cities in that area such as Beverly Hills or West Hollywood		no	yes	Residents of areas along 405 and through the West Valley share more in common with us than do those in Beverly Hills;Santa Monica Mtnsare a natural barrier between us and those on the other side of over the hill areas; difficult to commute over mtns	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110515_ploger			no				
4la_20110515_michaelson	importance of the entertainment industry and industry workforce having a voice in state issues		no				
4la_20110516_leyva	Our concerns would be dwarfed by their influence and we would most likely be demoted to an afterthought by whoever is elected to serve the district.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110515_davis	5152011	Troy W. Davis	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Clarita City should be placed within only 1 CD, SD, AD, Board of Equalization district and not divided among 2 or more districts; same for the santa clarita valley; both should be placed with compact districts
4la_20110515_huff	5152011	barbara huff	no			Los Angeles	yes	keep districting of valley areas within the valley. Beverly Hills is not located near Agoura Hills.
4la_20110516_hoffman	5162011	Jaci Hoffman	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	do NOT split up the Santa Clarita Valley.
4la_20110516_karibyan	5162011	Steve Madison	yes	Pasadena City Councilmember	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	City of Pasadena should continue to be part of the CD, SD, AD that includes the Cities of Burbank and Glendale
4la_20110513_bank	5132011	Traci Bank	no		Studio CityEast San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	San Fernando Valley should be considered its own group. For a congressional district, split into East Valley and West Valley, divided by 405 freeway. Do not link with people over the hill in Beverly Hills or West Hollywood.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110515_davis		with communities of north Los Angeles County andor the northwest communities of the San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4la_20110515_huff				no	no		
4la_20110516_hoffman				no	no		
4la_20110516_karibyan		Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale		no	yes	(refer to for Bill Bogaard 57 for reasons)	
4la_20110513_bank		East Valley Studio City with Valley Village, Sun Valley (not a complete list)	crest of Santa Monica Mountains is essentially Mullholland Drive.	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110515_davis			no				
4la_20110515_huff			no				
4la_20110516_hoffman			no				
4la_20110516_karibyan			no				
4la_20110513_bank			no				Thanks for service and providing this opportunity for people to talk about their communities. Hope that when job is done that Californias districts will truly represent the people as they actually are, not how some politicans may find it convenient.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110518_becker	5192011	Lois Becker	yes	Bel Air Skycret Property Owners Association	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Existing SD 23 boundaries (as shown on 1991 map) work well for this community.Do NOT use Mulholland as a dividing line.
4la_20110406_jaffe	462011	Gale Jaffe	yes	Silver Lake Neighborhood Council	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together communities touching Griffith Park. Currently represented by 3 Assembly members, 2 state Senators, 4 Congress members. Preferably keep them together in one AD, as Assembly members are often more approachable and closer to represented people.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110518_becker				no	yes	Shared nvironmental preservation, public safety, quality of life. Waste time with two Council Districts. Public fire safety affects both sides of Mulholland. Mulholland itself offers the only access route to and from homesschoolsbusinesses	
4la_20110406_jaffe				no	yes	Communities continually seek state grant money and other appropriations. Share park entrancesexits, distinct traffic patterns, equestrian trailszoned properties, foothill elevationurban watershed pathwayscrime patternshistoryoutlook	strong entertainment-industry presence in area makes many area residents and local economy dependent on fortunes of Entertainment Industry, which is largely regulated by state. Similar socio-economic qualitiesemployment patterns

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110518_becker			no				
4la_20110406_jaffe			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110430_pinedo	4302011	Maria Pinedo	no		Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	Pomona should be placed with Pomona, Chino, Montclair, and Ontario. Keep Inland Empire together.
4la_20110513_baker	5132011	Brian Baker	no		Santa Clarita Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Put Santa Clarita Valley with Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, and Ventura--not with Antelope Valley nor with city of LA.
4la_20110509_RabbinicalCouncilofCalif	592011	Rabbi Avrohom Union	yes	Rabbinical Council of California			no	Keep Jewish communities of Los Angeles Basin together (Beverly-Fairfax, Hancock Park, Pico-RobertsonBeverlywood, South Robertson, MidCity-West and Greater Wilshire). Also see map. Currently divided into 4247 AD, 2326 SD and 3033 CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110430_pinedo				no	yes	Non-profit organizations like Habitat for Humanity, Boys Girls Clubs, Spirit of Manhood, LULAC National Educational Service Center, Soledad Enrichment Action Center, etc. offer programs in Pomona, Chino, Montclair, and Ontario	
4la_20110513_baker				no	yes	Conservative, trying to get away from Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, or more importantly, city of LA. Honor historical perspective and push boundaries westward.	Santa Clarita Valley is a far more potent economic and demographic driver than Antelope Valley.
4la_20110509_RabbinicalCouncilofCalif				no	yes	Has a distinct culture, follows strict religious observances. Shares own ambulance service. Attends 20 small private schools and 40 synagogues in the area.	Businesses locally owned and cater to needs of religiously observant.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110430_pinedo			no				Maria and friend Olga were given number 125, 126 at San Gabriel hearing on 429 even though they arrived on time, and were not heard since people who lived closer arrived in large groups and took up all time. Maybe should consider a lottery system.
4la_20110513_baker			no				
4la_20110509_RabbinicalCouncilofCalif			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110504_glickfeld	542011	Madelyn Glickfeld	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for State Senate District Malibu, Calabasas, Agoura, Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Bel Air, Westwood, West Hills, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Encino, area east of Calabasas, south of 101, continued in streetsrivers
4la_20110513_lindenheim	5132011	Victor Lindenheim	no		Valencia	Los Angeles	yes	Place Santa Clarita Valley within a single Congressional, State Senate Assembly, and Board of Equalization district and not divided among two or more districts.
4la_20110513_haber	5132011	Marni Haber	no				no	
4la_20110419_vendig	4192011	Stephanie Vendig, President	yes	Griffith Park Adult Community Club	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together communities that touch Griffith Park. It is currently represented by three state Assembly members, two state Senators, four U.S. Congress members.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110504_glickfeld			LA County unincorporated areas of the Santa Monic Mountains that surround and abut cities mentioned, area east of 405 freeway south of Santa Monica Mountains including Bel Air, Westwood, Beverly Hills, and West Hollywood	no	yes	Fires that affect Simi HillsSanta Monica Mountains also affect Malibu; federal and state agencies manage these areas. Traffic problems can cripple all three areas. UCLA students faculty, staff, alumni make up a significant percentage of residents in thes	
4la_20110513_lindenheim				no	yes	Unified, forward thinking community. One Valley, One Vision approach to planning and community development	
4la_20110513_haber				no	no	West Valley has its educational needs met by schools ni West Valley.	People in Valley do shopping, dining, business in Valley, not in Simi Valley nor in Santa Clarita.
4la_20110419_vendig				no	yes	Common concerns of traffic, protecting Griffith Parks animal and plant environment, managing water resources, managing crime associated with a large area of wilderness-type environment and preserving recreation opportunities for all ages within park	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110504_glickfeld			no				
4la_20110513_lindenheim			no				
4la_20110513_haber			no				
4la_20110419_vendig			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110522_adams	5222011	Carol Adams	yes		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Peninsula should be aligned shoreline residential community interests from South to North including Beach Cities.
4la_20110521_thomas	5212011	William Thomas	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Has revised suggestion since hearing. See attachment (though not available with this document)
4la_20110521_lejins	5212011	Diana Lejins	no				no	Is sending maps
4la_20110520_dimejian	5202011	Aida Dimejian	yes	Armenian National Committee of America Western Religion	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena, and Altadena together.
4la_20110520_delpozo	5202011	Vera del Pozo	yes	Aon Consulting			no	
4la_20110519_anderson	5192011	Bob Anderson	yes	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association (SOHA)			yes	Email Attachment
4la_20110519_petermann	5192011	Herbert Petermann	yes	VOICE			no	Email Attachment
4la_20110518_stratton	5182011	Mark Stratton	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep 23rd Senate District as is.
4la_20110522_bilson	5222011	email that says letter attached but letter not available	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110522_adams				no	yes	coastal areas should be kept together	
4la_20110521_thomas				no	no		
4la_20110521_lejins				no	no		
4la_20110520_dimejian				no	yes	All harbor strong Armenian communities that share common goals and interests. Deep social ties between communities, Armenian-Americans in each city worship at churches in another.	
4la_20110520_delpozo				no	no		
4la_20110519_anderson				no	no		
4la_20110519_petermann				no	no		
4la_20110518_stratton				no	yes	Shares much history, culture, infrastructure with neighbors in the district	
4la_20110522_bilson				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110522_adams			no				
4la_20110521_thomas			no				
4la_20110521_lejins			no				
4la_20110520_dimejian			no				Thank you for undertaking thankless task of drawing districts for our Congressional and states representation
4la_20110520_delpozo			no				
4la_20110519_anderson			no				
4la_20110519_petermann			no				
4la_20110518_stratton			no				
4la_20110522_bilson			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110521_lejins	5162011	Diana Lejins (May 16 letter attached to May 21 note)	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Make Long Beach whole again, but keep ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles split between two representative because both ports are so critically vital for the security, economy, and well-being of the entire nation
4la_20110518_puentes	4182011	Ramiro Puentes	no				yes	Keep 38th CD as is.
4la_20110520_umca	4202011	James Wright, President, Upper Mandeville Canyon Association	yes	Upper Mandeville Canyon Association	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Maintain current 1991 boundaries of the 213rd district.
4la_20110513_46sclaritavalcitz	5132011	same letter signed by 46 different people in this document	no		Mostly Santa Clarita Canyon County; Some from Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, CA	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley in a single Congressional and Assembly district; SCV is bordered by Ventura County to West, Aqua Dulce to East, Castaic to North, and San Fernando Valley to South

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110521_lejins		37CD Long Beach, Signal Hill, Avalon, Lakewood, Bellflower, Paramount, Hawaiian Gardens; AD Long Beach, Signal Hill, maybe Avalon; SD Proposed 37 CD Cerritos, Artesia, Norwalk, La Mirada, Santa Fe Springs		no	yes	Long Beach prides itself in rich diversity (many multi-cultural celebrations throughout the year). Connected through various modes of transportation and numerous media communications.	
4la_20110518_puentes				no	no		
4la_20110520_umca				no	yes	Santa Monica Mountain area is a unique and irreplaceable ecosystem and community asset for Los Angeles. Allow for more effective management issues such as transportation improvements, traffic management and development.	
4la_20110513_46sclaritavalcitz				no	yes	Suburban communties share deep sense of family; Valley committed to preserving open space for recreational activities; Valley served by William S. Hart Union High School District and Santa Clarita Community College District	SCV has diversified economy local businesses enjoy benefits of an Enterprise Zone that span valley; recently community has formed SCV Economic Development Corp. to retain attract business;

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110521_lejins			no				Thank you, Commissioners, for your time and consideration of this extremely important issue. Gerrymandering was rampant, esp. in Long Beach. Legitimate representation and publics trust were severely compromised.
4la_20110518_puentes			no				
4la_20110520_umca			no				
4la_20110513_46sclaritavalcitz			no			LA County and Santa Clarita are developing One Valley, One Vision for regional planning	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110514_15sclaritavalcitz	5142011	same letter signed by 15 different people in this document	no		Mostly Santa Clarita Canyon County; Some from Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, CA	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley in a single Congressional and Assembly district; SCV is bordered by Ventura County to West, Aqua Dulce to East, Castaic to North, and San Fernando Valley to South
4la_20110516_59sclaritavalcitz	5162011	same letter signed by 59 different people in this document	no		Mostly Santa Clarita Canyon County; Some from Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, CA	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley in a single Congressional and Assembly district; SCV is bordered by Ventura County to West, Aqua Dulce to East, Castaic to North, and San Fernando Valley to South
4la_20110518_45sclaritavalcitz	5182011	same letter signed by 45 different people in this document	no		Mostly Santa Clarita Canyon County; Some from Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, CA	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley in a single Congressional and Assembly district; SCV is bordered by Ventura County to West, Aqua Dulce to East, Castaic to North, and San Fernando Valley to South

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110514_15sclaritavalcitz				no	yes	Suburban communties share deep sense of family; Valley committed to preserving open space for recreational activities; Valley served by William S. Hart Union High School District and Santa Clarita Community College District	SCV has diversified economy local businesses enjoy benefits of an Enterprise Zone that span valley; recently community has formed SCV Economic Development Corp. to retain attract business;
4la_20110516_59sclaritavalcitz				no	yes	Suburban communties share deep sense of family; Valley committed to preserving open space for recreational activities; Valley served by William S. Hart Union High School District and Santa Clarita Community College District	SCV has diversified economy local businesses enjoy benefits of an Enterprise Zone that span valley; recently community has formed SCV Economic Development Corp. to retain attract business;
4la_20110518_45sclaritavalcitz				no	yes	Suburban communties share deep sense of family; Valley committed to preserving open space for recreational activities; Valley served by William S. Hart Union High School District and Santa Clarita Community College District	SCV has diversified economy local businesses enjoy benefits of an Enterprise Zone that span valley; recently community has formed SCV Economic Development Corp. to retain attract business;

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110514_15sclaritavalcitz			no			LA County and Santa Clarita are developing One Valley, One Vision for regional planning	
4la_20110516_59sclaritavalcitz			no			LA County and Santa Clarita are developing One Valley, One Vision for regional planning	
4la_20110518_45sclaritavalcitz			no			LA County and Santa Clarita are developing One Valley, One Vision for regional planning	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110522_8sclaritavalcitz	5222011	same letter signed by 8 different people in this document	no		Mostly Santa Clarita Canyon County; Some from Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, CA	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley in a single Congressional and Assembly district; SCV is bordered by Ventura County to West, Aqua Dulce to East, Castaic to North, and San Fernando Valley to South
4la_20110522_toda	5222011	Stacey Toda	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	keep the South Bay area (including the Beach Cities and Torrance) together
4la_20110522_dato	5222011	Eduardo and Laurie Dato	no		La Miranda	Los Angeles	yes	Put La Miranda with Whittier, Unincorporated Whittier, La Habra Heights,and Hacienda Heights (unincorporated) for an Assembly District. Then add in Norwalk and Santa Fe Springs

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110522_8sclaritavalcitz				no	yes	Suburban communties share deep sense of family; Valley committed to preserving open space for recreational activities; Valley served by William S. Hart Union High School District and Santa Clarita Community College District	SCV has diversified economy local businesses enjoy benefits of an Enterprise Zone that span valley; recently community has formed SCV Economic Development Corp. to retain attract business;
4la_20110522_toda				no	yes	Share similar issues maintaining our high quality of education, improving the environment keeping our beaches pollution free, improving our highways, espec 405 freeway as it touches all of our South Bay cities, even get our news as one community.	
4la_20110522_dato		If you need a larger population for an Assembly District, then it would make sense to add in the City of Downey as the City of La Habra is in Orange County		no	yes	There are 5 High Schools serving Santa Fe Springs, Whittier, Unincorporated Whittier and La Mirada. These cities share School Districts, Transportation Services and Water Districts.	Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, La Miranda, Whittier, Unincorporated Whittier, La Habra Heights, and Hacienda Heights are covered by the Whittier Daily Newspaper

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110522_8sclaritavalcitz			no			LA County and Santa Clarita are developing One Valley, One Vision for regional planning	
4la_20110522_toda	Its surrounded by the City of Los Angeles and is unique and different from all the communities around it.		no				
4la_20110522_dato			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110522_dixon	5222011	Patricia Dixon	no			Los Angeles	yes	Boundary lines for the San Fernando Valley 42nd AD East - City of Burbank to 405 Fwy West - 405 Fwy. to Fallbrook South- Mulholland Dr. to Burbank Blvd North- Burbank Blvd. to Sherman Way.
4la_20110522_estin	5222011	Susan and Melvin Estin	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep current 23rd Senate district lines
4la_20110522_gable	5222011	Derek J Gable	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	no	district boundariesSouth and West Pacific coast; North Jefferson Blvd; East proceeds southeast along 405 Freeway to the north and east boundaries of Lennox and then to north boundary of Hawthorne (detailed eastern boundaries continued)
4la_20110522_gutierrez	5222011	Lydia Gutierrez	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	no	Combine Peninsula (Palos Verdes) and San Pedro with Wilmington, Lomita, Harbor City, Carson, Torrance, Gardena, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, Marina del Rey, up to Westchester
4la_20110522_kassir	5222011	John Kassir	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	refer to 116

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110522_dixon				no	no		
4la_20110522_estin				no	yes	share many interests such at the Santa Monica mountains and the LA River. We also live and work in the same areas.	
4la_20110522_gable		proposed district cities of current 36th Congressional District, excluding Venice, Hawthorne, Lawndale, the western half of Gardena, Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills, Palos Verdes Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, Catalina, San Pedro		no	yes	community is bonded by a beach lifestyle	numerous synergistic businesses and industries - peninsula cities should be combined with cities to north where businesses are generally located and with Wilmington and San Pedro because jobs predominately associated with the port
4la_20110522_gutierrez		Palos Verdes,San Pedro, Wilmington, Lomita, Harbor City, Carson, Torrance, Gardena, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, Marina del Rey, Westchester		no	no		
4la_20110522_kassir				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110522_dixon			no				
4la_20110522_estin			no				
4la_20110522_gable	The population of these combined cities is on the order of 712,000, almost exactly the population needed per district per the recent census. (For Congressional District)		no				
4la_20110522_gutierrez	cities combined make up a balance of minority and middle class		no				
4la_20110522_kassir			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110522_matthew	5222011	Matthew A.	no		(Wilshire District)	Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110522_mellinger	5222011	Lee Bonnie Mellinger	no			Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110522_mitchell_b	5222011	Beverly Mitchell	no			Los Angeles	yes	(agrees strongly with the editorial which appeared in todays Daily News); keep the San Fernando Valley whole - SFV should not be chopped by various other cities and thereby lose representation of politicians
4la_20110522_mitchell_m	5222011	Mel Mitchell	yes	President, Porter Ranch Neighborhood Council	Porter Ranch	Los Angeles	yes	Put Porter Ranch with the other communities north of the 118 Freeway as part of the San Fernando Valley; and keep the northern part of the San Fernando Valley together; and please do not change the shape of the San Fernando Valley.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110522_matthew				no	no		
4la_20110522_mellinger				no	no		
4la_20110522_mitchell_b				no	no		
4la_20110522_mitchell_m		Porter Ranch, Northridge, Chatsworth and Granada Hills		no	yes	We share the same issues, problems and concerns and are important contributors to the San Fernando Valley community as a whole	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110522_matthew			no			vital to have mixed demographics in voting areas to insure moderate views and competitive races for officeholders.	Draw the City of Los Angeles districts in mostly regular geometric round, or square shapes and make them as politically mixed as possible to further the competition of candidates from different political parties
4la_20110522_mellinger			no				When the new districts are drawn, the Valley must have proportionate representation to represent the interests of this GEOGRAPHIC ares.
4la_20110522_mitchell_b			no				shameful that the San Fernando Valley has only three live-in representatives in the state Legislature.
4la_20110522_mitchell_m			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110522_murphy	5222011	Edna Murphy	yes	Board of Pulmonary Education Program of Little Company of Mary Hospital, Manhattan Beach Property Owners Association, and The Beach Cities Health District		Los Angeles	yes	Keep the Beach Cities, Torrance and South Bay whole
4la_20110522_perla	5222011	Miguel Perla	no			Los Angeles	yes	Attached some documents in which I try to define the East San Fernando Valley as a community of interest which should be kept together when redrawing districts
4la_20110522_runnerstrum	5222011	Frederick Runnerstrum	no			Los Angeles	yes	Comment to San Fernando Valley is demarcated the 101 freeway to the south and the 118 to the north Doesnt make sense since much of communities would be omitted
4la_20110522_solomon	5222011	Dr. James Solomon	no			Los Angeles	no	refer to 116
4la_20110522_studiocityneibrhdcncl	5222011	John T. Walker	yes	President, Studio City Neighborhood Council		Los Angeles	yes	opposes splitting of Neighborhood Council areas for any districts congressional, assembly, senate, board of equalization, House of Reps, supervisor, city council districts
4la_20110522_sykes	5222011	Fredrick Sykes (2nd submission)	no		West Covina	Los Angeles	yes	forgot to mention in previous letter 61; failed to mention City of Industry, CA. 91744 which is bordered at the south edge of West Covina, and stretches between 605 Fwy. to the 57 Fwy and attached a map depicting my community and connected areas.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110522_murphy		South Bay Cities of Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach Venice, El Segundo and Torrance		no	yes	all make up a community of interest, from the shoreline, to the bike baths, to their involvement with Cool Cities and other regional organizations; share traffic problems, especially with 405; share high schools	
4la_20110522_perla				no	no		
4la_20110522_runnerstrum		communities mentioned Sherman Oaks,Encino,Tarzana, Woodland Hills,Northridge,Granada Hills		no	no		
4la_20110522_solomon				no	no		
4la_20110522_studiocityneibrhdcncl				no	no		
4la_20110522_sykes				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110522_murphy			no				
4la_20110522_perla			no				
4la_20110522_runnerstrum			no				It is not right that currently 34 of the State senators Assembly members representing the Valley dont live in the Valley
4la_20110522_solomon			no				
4la_20110522_studiocityneibrhdcncl			no				
4la_20110522_sykes			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110518_lombardo	5182011	Charlie Lombardo	no		Burbank	Los Angeles	yes	Merge cities of burbank, Glendale, and Padadena (BGP) into 1 Congressional District
4la_20110518_olch	5182011	Ben Olch	no			Los Angeles	yes	Dont split Neighborhood Council districts and try to maximize districts that are predominantly Valley; the 405 Freeway up north to the 5 Freeway is a good dividing point to create multiple districts within the Valley
4la_20110518_perinpanathan	5182011	Kandiah Perinpanathan	no		Reseda	Los Angeles	no	keep the West San Fernando Valley together west of the 405 Freeway and out to the 101 Freeway to Calabasas area half a mile south of Calabasas City and Agoura Hills City

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110518_lombardo				no	yes	cities of BGP shares many interests airport, power, policing,firefighting dispatch and now transit infrastructure; BGP all have well-respected studios and post-production facilities, and educational facilities	
4la_20110518_olch				no	yes	Every neighborhood council district is either west or east of the 405 Freeway. The importance of the 405 Freeway is illustrated by the Neighborhood Councils established in the North Hills area	
4la_20110518_perinpanathan		from Granada Hills down to Encino, from Chatsworth to Woodland Hills to Calabasas		no	no	A lot of the South Asian community lives in West SFV. Also home to people of many backgrounds	Largest Hindu temple in SoCal is just south of Calabasas City large Hindu temples in Northridge, Agoura Hills, Chatsworth; Sikh temple in Canoga Park Islam temples in Reseda, Northridge, Granada Hills

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110518_lombardo			no				
4la_20110518_olch			no				
4la_20110518_perinpanathan			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110518_seybert	5182011	Barry Seybert	yes	West Hills Neighborhood Council, Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Council, former SFV City Council, West Valley Planning Committee		Los Angeles	yes	Have district lines remain within the entire San Fernando Valley (SFV) area, not combining with LA city on other side of hills; border of SFV ridgelines of surrounding hills Mulholland Dr.
4la_20110518_spaziano	5182011	Eleanor Spaziano	no			Los Angeles	no	(same as Karen Suters 113)
4la_20110518_winters	5182011	Nicholas Winters	no		La Crescenta	Los Angeles	no	Combine La Crescenta with Glendale, Montrose, La Canada and Tujunga, and not with Walnut, Lancaster, Santa Clarita, Hesperia
4la_20110509_may	592011	Rabbi Meyer H. May	yes	Simon Wiesenthal Center		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Jewish communities of Los Angeles Basin together (Beverly-Fairfax, Hancock Park, Pico-RobertsonBeverlywood, South Robertson, MidCity-West and Greater Wilshire). Also see map. Currently divided into 4247 AD, 2326 SD and 3033 CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110518_seybert		If West SFV not enough for complete district, add cities Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Bell Canyon area or Simi Valley	Existing LA Neighborhood Councils boundaries are a good map to use for the West San Fernando Valley COI.	no	no	Environmental, Political, Traffic flow, and ways of life differ between the two sides of the hills (San Fernando Valley vs. West Los Angeles)	
4la_20110518_spaziano				no	no		
4la_20110518_winters		Hesperia and Lancaster are separated from La Crescenta by the LA National Forest with Hesperia more than an hour and a half drive from La Crescenta at a distance of nearly 80 miles, while Santa Clarita is over 30 miles from La Crescenta		no	no		
4la_20110509_may				no	yes	Has a distinct culture, follows strict religious observances. Shares own ambulance service. Attends 20 small private schools and 40 synagogues in the area.	Businesses locally owned and cater to needs of religiously observant.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110518_seybert			no				
4la_20110518_spaziano			no				
4la_20110518_winters			no				
4la_20110509_may			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110510_corridori	5102011	Former Mayor Edward Corridori	yes	City of Agoura Hills	Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110513_barcenas	5132011	Fabiana Barcenas	no		Canoga ParkSan Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	E De Soto Avenue, W Topanga Canyon, N Nordhoff, S Victory.
4la_20110506_monsen	562011	John Monsen	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	no	See attached maps

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110510_corridori		Hidden Hills, Casabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, Santa Monica Mountain communities, Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Santa Monica, Bel Air, UCLA, Beverly Hills, Fairfax, Studio City, Sherman Oaks, Encino, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, West Hills		no	yes	Residents use same raods, same freeways, share same cultural, educational, and recreation centers, share watersheds that impact Bay, frequent same national and local parks, frequent same entertainment and shopping venues	similar economic interests
4la_20110513_barcenas				no	yes	75 speak Spanish, most speak both English and Spanish. 95 send children to public school. There are two small but important parks for people to participate in sports, but need more activities to keep pop (esp youth) engaged in healthy activities.	Maybe 85 are low income (30,000yr). The other 15 earn90,000yr.
4la_20110506_monsen		E San Fernando Valley Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima, Sunland, Tujunga; W San Gabriel Valley La Canada, Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena, Sierra Madre, Arcadia, Monrovia; continued in streetsrivers col.	Central San Gabriel Valley El Monte, South El Monte, Irwindale, Baldwin Park, Duarte, Glendora, Azusa, Glendora, La Verne, Claremont	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110510_corridori			no				
4la_20110513_barcenas			no				
4la_20110506_monsen			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110513_gutzeit	5132011	Maria Gutziet, Board Vice President	yes	Newhall County Water District	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	no	As a local elected official, have not found a problem working with multiple elected representatives.
4la_20110517_anonymous	5172011	Anonymous	yes	SCHOA		Los Angeles	no	Please see Attached Letter from SCHOA
4la_20110517_gramatky	5172011	Mimi Gramatky	no		Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Supports current lines for 23rd Senate district
4la_20110521_stoddard	5212011	Glenn Stoddard	no		Winnetka, City of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	eliminate over-the-hill districts, which take part SFV and combine it with parts of large suburban areas on the other side of the hills; AD 42 links two major populations with a sparsely populated center; residents prefer to be near center of districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110513_gutzeit				no	no		
4la_20110517_anonymous				no	no		
4la_20110517_gramatky				no	yes	Hill dwellers share certain values and demographic characteristics who are best served by a single Senate district	One district allows for providing resources and representation for common needs fire sfety, recreational trail acces, open space preservation, flood and landslide protection, transporation corridors through the mountains
4la_20110521_stoddard				no	yes	areas separate by sparsely populated area have no sense of community between them; community is w adj pop areas where shopping, dining, schools	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110513_gutzeit			no				By making offices more competitive, Commission broadens pool of candidates that seek and achieve local and statewide office. Redistricting will achieve more balance in both local and statewide elections, and likely attract more open-minded candidates.
4la_20110517_anonymous			no				
4la_20110517_gramatky			no				
4la_20110521_stoddard	two communities with sparse pop inbetween should not be together as rep will focus on one sides issues and not the other; nearby populated areas should be together so that most people are near the center of their districts		no			general concept about not having over-the-hills districts and instead having districts centered around population centers	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110331_blessing	3312011	Dale Blessing	no			Los Angeles	yes	Dont lump Long Beach with other area in Dana Rohrabachers 46s district
4la_20110303_andre	332011	Larry Andre, former nominee Republican CD39	yes			Los Angeles	no	
4la_20110309_onepomona	392011	signed The One Pomona Delegation	yes	The One Pomona Delegation	Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	
4la_20110322_stone	3222011	Dr. Barbara Stone, Emerita Professor of Political Science at CSU Fullerton	no		Whittier, lifelong residence	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Whittier (Whittier, unincorporated Whittier, La Mirada, La Habra Heights, Santa Fe Springs) and larger eastern Los Angeles Community together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110331_blessing				no	no		
4la_20110303_andre				no	no		
4la_20110309_onepomona		Keep the entire city of Pomona within one assembly, one state senate, and one congressional district		no	no		Pomona has suffered from lack of federal resources to repair and modernize infrastructure, buildings, roads because historically, has been portioned and defragmented in many districts, which reduces collective voice in Sacramento or Washington, DC
4la_20110322_stone				no	yes	Etnicity (Latino), common educational institutions, public safety orgs, regional governmental units, shared local media; part of larger community in eastern Los Angeles County that should be kept together	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110331_blessing			no				
4la_20110303_andre			no			Disagrees with the way CD 39 is drawn western area is Hispanic and African American; easater area is middle and upper middle class, higher educated, white, asian, hispanic; two halves have few common bonds	Concern about drawing safe democratic districts
4la_20110309_onepomona			no			Pomona is a mixed and vibrant city; 70 Latino, 10 African-American, 7 Asian, 1 Native American. Within these groups, a majority of residents recently experienced 1st political election fair political representation	
4la_20110322_stone	City of 85,000 is divided among 3 CD and 3 AD		no			Look to North to Puente Hills, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights and Diamond Bar to get more population wildlife corridor, many common interests	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4la_20110316_mcgill	3152011	Natalie McGill	no		Elysian Valley	Los Angeles	yes	submitted map between 5 Fwy on W and Los Angeles River on E
4la_20110310_juniperhillstc1	3102011	Vance Pomeroy and Lori Weatherbie	yes	Pomeroy (President), Weatherbie (Vice President) of Juniper Hills Town Council		Los Angeles	yes	Revise southern boundary of SD 29 using the Angeles Crest Highway (Hwy 2); this would also affect Wrightwood (suggests you ask them about this boundary) letter says map was submitted, but was not attached. Map is on www.juniperhills-ca.org
9dnorte_20110329_botts	3292011	Susan Botts	no				yes	keep Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino in one district
9dnorte_20110408_broner	482011	Debra Broner	yes	President of the Del Norte County Senior Center Board of Directors		Del Norte	yes	keep Del Norte in district with other coastal counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4la_20110316_mcgill				yes	no	8,000 residents, Elysian Valley Riverside Neighborhood Council district, town nicknamed frog town due to frog population; waslk, bike path, bird watchers, fishing enthusiasts, natural heron habitat, urban neighborhood, flat terrain, artist community	Demographics reflective of median household in Los Angleles; residents travel outside for employment and shopping but stay in for socializing, religious activities and recreation; parks, rec center is a hub for the community
4la_20110310_juniperhillstc1				no	yes	rural community in the foothills along north slope of San Gabriel Mountains; population 700, 400 homes, Angeles National Forest is backyard	
9dnorte_20110329_botts	Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino	NA	NA	no	yes	college of Redwoods, tsunami preparedness and response agencies and workgroups, regional health care faciltiies and agencies, redwood-related parks, preservation and historical associations, Coastal Commission	commercial fisherman associations, tourism and business associations
9dnorte_20110408_broner	Del Norte			no	yes	energy assistance programs for seniors and low-income families, agency funding nutrition program	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4la_20110316_mcgill	contiguous area		no				
4la_20110310_juniperhillstc1			no			Has to drive 85 miles to see Sen Bob Huff who represents 25 of the community	
9dnorte_20110329_botts	coastal counties share more than Del Norte does with other inland counties in SD 4		no			NA	NA
9dnorte_20110408_broner	coastal counties work together to ensure low-income and senior pop get services		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110411_nieboer	4112011	Nancy Nieboer	no			Humboldt	yes	keep Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino in one district; divided from counties to east by coastal range which may be impassible in winter
9humboldt_20110411_salaverry	4112011	David Salaverry	yes	California Conservative Redistricting Coalition (CCRC)			yes	East-West District is bad idea, continue North-South districts
9yolo_20110409_pratt	492011	David Pratt	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	favors redistricting far north of state from west to east
9dnorte_20110414_cooper	4142011	Eileen Cooper	yes	Friends of Del Norte		Del Norte	yes	keep Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino in one district
9humboldt_20110404_newman	442011	Mike L. Newman	yes	Eureka City Councilmember		Humboldt	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110411_nieboer	Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino			no	yes		tourism,fishing, ag (trees, dairy, beef, vineyards, flowers, grains, vegetables, milled lumber)
9humboldt_20110411_salaverry				no	yes	coast liberal and rest (valley, border) conservative - let coast liberals keep political interests intact	economies of three areas (coast, valley, border counties) are organized along natural N-S axis where goods and services flow along existing arteries
9yolo_20110409_pratt	Yolo			no	no		
9dnorte_20110414_cooper	Del Norte			no	yes	northern coastal counties are geographically and socially unified area, hard to travel inland, also share Coastal Commission, College of the Redwoods, Caltrans District 1, Redwood Parks Assoc, etc (lists four more)	health of rivers and fisheries, providing adequate water for fish, rather than overallocating water to inland farmers (i.e. coast at odds with inland)
9humboldt_20110404_newman				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110411_nieboer	coastal counties more in common with each other than they have with inland counties of North CA		no				
9humboldt_20110411_salaverry	coastal counties stay together because liberal, N-S corridors together because of economies and flow of goods and services		no				
9yolo_20110409_pratt			no				
9dnorte_20110414_cooper	need coastal Rep and Senator who will defend fisheries and protect rivers from inland interests		no				
9humboldt_20110404_newman			no				need to hold hearing in Humboldt Co because access by road is difficult from rural counties OR set up video sites so rural counties residents can give input

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110409_brooks	492011	Karen Brooks	no		Eureka	Humboldt	no	
9humboldt_20110414_kennedy	4142011	Barbara Kennedy	no		Eureka	Humboldt	no	
9humboldt_20110414_cahill	4142011	Pamela Cahill	no			North Coast	no	
9humboldt_20110414_timmons	4142011	Julie Timmons	no			North Coast (Humboldt or Del Norte)	no	
9humboldt_20110415_caldwell	4152011	Jean Caldwell	no			Humboldt	yes	dont include coastal counties with other counties that have different economic and environmental issues

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110409_brooks				no	no		
9humboldt_20110414_kennedy				no	no		
9humboldt_20110414_cahill				no	yes	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocinto share same resources, community ideals, culture. We are environmentalists, Native American, have a progressive University and enjoy small town environs	we are fisherman, small nitch business owners, organic farmers, dairymen
9humboldt_20110414_timmons				no	no		
9humboldt_20110415_caldwell	Del Norte, Humboldt			no	yes	environmental issues of coastal counties	economic issues of coastal counties

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110409_brooks			no				no meetings in rural areas, Redding is urban. Suggests Quincy, Eureka, Big Bear; 2-3 rural hearing locations, 3-4 hours from urban hearing site, or county seat of rural county. Great job in Redding on April 9
9humboldt_20110414_kennedy			no				disenfranchising those in Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte and Trinity by not having a meeting in Eureka
9humboldt_20110414_cahill	not like valley to the east, closer to Sonoma County but still unique and have own opinions		no				have meeting in Eureka, as we feel left out in Northcoast
9humboldt_20110414_timmons			no				have hearing in Eureka, so dont have to drive 4 hours from Humboldt or Del Norte
9humboldt_20110415_caldwell	coastal counties have economic and environmental interests different from other counties that might be put into same districts		no				have meeting in Humboldt, preferrably county seat of Eureka which is accessible to Del Norte Co as well.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110409_poole	492011	Jennifer Poole	no			Mendocino	no	
9humboldt_20110418_kreb	4182011	Melvin Kreb	no				no	
9humboldt_20110422_boyd	4222011	Milton J. Boyd	yes	Chair, Humboldt County Democratic Central Committee		Humboldt	yes	three north coast counties form a community of interest
9shasta_20110409_wright	492011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
9yuba_20110411_wright	4112011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110409_poole				no	no		
9humboldt_20110418_kreb				no	no		
9humboldt_20110422_boyd	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino			no	yes	long recognized as united by Highway 101 corridor	dependent on coastal resources, share strong economic ties, united by Highway 101 corridor
9shasta_20110409_wright				no	no		
9yuba_20110411_wright				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110409_poole			no				people of Mendo Co not informed about the hearings for their region (Redding, Marysville), not in local papers, Auburn May19 too close to June 10 map rel; send press rels to Mendo Co news outlets in timely fashion, includ how submit comments via email
9humboldt_20110418_kreb			no				hold meeting in Eureka or Arcata, travel distance too far and terrain too difficult to get to scheduled meetings
9humboldt_20110422_boyd	Mendocine, Humboldt, Del Norte form a cohesive Community of Interest		no				North Coast residents at serious disadvantage relative to other CA residents in terms of access to mtgs; hold meeting in Eureka or Arcata on May 18, before Auburn on May 19 and Santa Rosa on May 20
9shasta_20110409_wright			no				summary of meeting in Redding and comments on mtg process
9yuba_20110411_wright			no				summary of meeting in Marysville

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110419_pratt	4192011	David Pratt	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	dont split Davis from rest of Yolo County (as suggested at Marysville hearing), if have to split Yolo, split at Yolo Bypass so West Sac is with Sac metro area; combine Yolo first with counties to north and south, then to west, and lastly to Sac area
9humboldt_20110416_harvey	4162011	Chuck Harvey	no				yes	North Coast region different from Valley and Bay Area and needs its own representation
9humboldt_20110416_perricelli	4162011	Claire Perricelli	no			North Coast	no	
9dnorte_20110329_berkowitz	3292011	Bob Berkowitz	yes	Executive Director, Del Norte County Visitors Bureau		Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110323_berkowitz	3232011	Bob Berkowitz	yes	Executive Director, Del Norte County Visitors Bureau		Del Norte	no	
9shasta_20110420_smith	4202011	Nancy Smith	yes	NS districts, do not join I-5 corridor with coast		Shasta	no	
9shasta_20110420_adamson	4202011	Betsy Adamson	yes	NS districts, EW district makes no sense	Anderson	Shasta	no	
9shasta_20110421_albo	4212011	Pam Albo	yes	NS districts, do not join I-5 corridor with coast		Shasta	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110419_pratt	Yolo, Sacramento	Davis, West Sacramento, Woodland, Sacramento	Yolo Bypass	no	yes	Woodland and Yolo	Woodland Yolo share WoodlandDavis Clean Water Agency (municpal water system), many UCD employ live in Woodland, Davis resid go to Woodland for big box shop, Davis Woodland surrounded by same ag UCD started as U Farm and is ag school for UC System
9humboldt_20110416_harvey	Humboldt			no	no		
9humboldt_20110416_perricelli				no	no		
9dnorte_20110329_berkowitz				no	no		
9dnorte_20110323_berkowitz				no	no		
9shasta_20110420_smith				no	no		
9shasta_20110420_adamson				no	no		
9shasta_20110421_albo				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110419_pratt	Woodland Davis tightly joined economically; West Sac has economic connection to Sac; if have to split, split at uninhabited strip of Yolo bypass		no				
9humboldt_20110416_harvey			no				hold meeting in Humboldt County as others have said
9humboldt_20110416_perricelli			no				hold hearing in Eureka so north coast can have input and be included
9dnorte_20110329_berkowitz			no				hold hearing in Crescent City - the real Northern CA
9dnorte_20110323_berkowitz			no				hold hearing in Crescent City
9shasta_20110420_smith			no				
9shasta_20110420_adamson			no				
9shasta_20110421_albo			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110425_haynes	4252011	Brenda Haynes	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not throw the coastal counties in with the agricultural valley counties or throw the fertile agricultural valley counties with the high elevation dry counties of Modoc and Lassen
9shasta_20110426_anonymous	4262011	Anonymous	no				yes	Dont lump coastal communities with valley counties or in high desert counties of Northern CA
9shasta_20110427_lingo	4272011	Linda J. Lingo	yes	represent Anderson Chamber of Commerce, Salvation Army, Neighborhood Church of Anderson Cottonwood, Cottonwood Library		Shasta	yes	Communities along the I-5 corridor should be kept together, rather than joined with coastal areas, because of the severe geopraphic divide created by the coastal mountains
9shasta_20110429_moffat	4292011	Mike Moffat	no			Shasta	no	
9shasta_20110503_shrader	532011	Clifford E. Schrader	no			Shasta	yes	(Same as Lingo 28)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110425_haynes				no	no		
9shasta_20110426_anonymous				no	yes	Valley people have nothing in commong with coastal beaches, or with dry high desert plains of counties against Nevada border	
9shasta_20110427_lingo				no	yes	Share interests as rural area, with an agriculture-centered economy, with water, timber and related interests	share water resources; main transportation links are I-5 and Hwy 99
9shasta_20110429_moffat				no	no		
9shasta_20110503_shrader				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110425_haynes			no			To account for increased population, simply adjust southerly borders of existing districts rather than drastically changing the entire north end of the state	
9shasta_20110426_anonymous	North-south highway system lends itself to north-south travel, which means elected representatives more inclined to visit their district if they could drive their in one day		no				
9shasta_20110427_lingo			no			lines should be similar to those in 1990 done by judges, not in 2000	
9shasta_20110429_moffat			no				new State Assembly lines should be drawn by honoring County boundaries whenever possible
9shasta_20110503_shrader			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110506_dorsey	562011	Dan Dorsey	no				no	
9siskiyou_20110518_rickard	5182011	Tom Rickard Sr.	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to proposal to put Siskiyou with Del Norte and Humboldt
9siskiyou_20110430_peterson	4302011	Todd M. and Patricia Mae Peterson	no		Etna	Siskiyou	no	
9siskiyou_20110430_peterson 2	4302011	Todd M. Peterson (2nd submission)	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	(Same letter as Lindo J. Lingo 28)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110506_dorsey				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110518_rickard	Siskiyou			no	yes	Nothing in common and direct advisories fos issues like Dam Removal; residents in Del Norte and Humbolt counties including the North Coast Water Control Board would like to see our DAMS taken out, while Siskiyou residents want the dam	
9siskiyou_20110430_peterson				no	yes	Siskiyou doesnt share interests with coastal or desert communities but with agricultural areas along the I5 corridor (such as Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Yuba Counties)	
9siskiyou_20110430_peterson 2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110506_dorsey			no				You need to rethink about having a hearing in Siskiyou, so we can be heard; the meeting in Redding was given a short notice
9siskiyou_20110518_rickard			no				
9siskiyou_20110430_peterson			no				
9siskiyou_20110430_peterson 2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110510_ollmann	5102011	Sharon Ollmann	no			Siskiyou	yes	Leave Siskiyou County in its current Legislative District; make district lines similar to those drawn by judges in 1990 rather than the lines drawn in 2000 by the politicians.
9siskiyou_20110501_stapleton	512011	Betsy Stapleton	no			Siskiyou	yes	(Same as Sharon Ollman 35)
9siskiyou_20110502_clyde	522011	Anthony S. Clyde	no				yes	Keep rural communities together
9siskiyou_20110504_harris	542011	Dean Harris	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep rural counties together Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter Counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110510_ollmann	Siskiyou			no	yes	Siskiyou County is well served by being in a Legislative District that shares its political, social, and economic features. Siskiyou County is a rural, primarily agriculturally based county like the central valley area	
9siskiyou_20110501_stapleton				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110502_clyde	Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Siskiyou, and Butte			no	yes	cohesive community; Siskiyou is largely rural and shares the same interests of other rural counties like Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, and Butte like water, timber, agriculture; also have few major interests with delta and coastal communities	
9siskiyou_20110504_harris	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter			no	yes		Share water resources; I-5 and Highway 99 are major economic and social connections that link northern counties; all agriculture-centered economies with water, timber-related interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110510_ollmann			no				
9siskiyou_20110501_stapleton			no				
9siskiyou_20110502_clyde	Siskiyou County would be excluded from any effective representation of our interests if we are combined with the Costal Counties		no				
9siskiyou_20110504_harris	Communities along the I-5 corridor should be kept together, rather than joined with coastal areas, because of the severe geographic divide created by the coastal mountains.		no			lines should be similar to those drawn by judges on 1990 rather than politicians of 2000;	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110430_houg	4302011	Susan Houg	no			Siskiyou	yes	Dont throw Siskiyou county with coastal counties but with counties along I-5 corridor between Sacramento and Oregon
9siskiyou_20110505_inghram	552011	Phyllis Inghram	no				yes	Siskiyou County should be aligned with nearby agricultural areas
9siskiyou_20110428_gliatto	4282011	Gliatto - memo to 8 county residents - talking points for emails to Commission	no				yes	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter Counties should be kept together
9siskiyou_20110508_gaulden	582011	Julie Gaulden	no			Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9siskiyou_20110509_gliatto	592011	Louise Gliatto	yes	member of Yreka Chamber of Commerce	Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Siskiyou county has nothing in common with coastal or eastern counties
9siskiyou_20110513_neptune	5132011	James H. Neptune	no		Mount Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110430_houg				yes	yes		Siskiyou County has an agricultural and renewable resource-based economy, and as such is a natural companion to other such counties along the I-5 corridor
9siskiyou_20110505_inghram				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110428_gliatto	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter			no	yes	I-5 and Highway 99 are major economic and social connections that link northern counties; different from coast because of geographic divide	All rural towns and share agriculture-centered economy and water, timber and related issues; Water resources are a critical common interest of these communities and any redistricting plan should respect the watersheds representation.
9siskiyou_20110508_gaulden				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110509_gliatto				no	yes	northern counties linked together by I-5 and Highway 99	
9siskiyou_20110513_neptune				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110430_houg	Regular communitcation between mtn. range and coastal counties difficult; almost no east-west highways in CA		no			please look to the 1990 judge-forged representational map, which makes much more sense than the 2000 politician-forged one	
9siskiyou_20110505_inghram			no				
9siskiyou_20110428_gliatto	These jurisdictions constitute cohesive COI as well as political subdivisions that shouldnt be divided. If you cluster in the north we move from 3 Congressional members and 3 State Senate members to 1, which limits representation of rural areas.		no			support Prop 11 20 obj to obtain fair impartial redist wout taking partisan politics into consideration, and that should be achieved by representation of cities, counties, and communities of common interest that arent political subdivisions.	The lines should be similar to those drawn by judges on 1990 rather than politicians of 2000. As an independent commission please look at the plan drawn by independent judges in 1990.
9siskiyou_20110508_gaulden			no				
9siskiyou_20110509_gliatto			no			The lines should be similar to those drawn by judges on 1990 rather than politicians of 2000	
9siskiyou_20110513_neptune			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110515_bell	5152011	Lawrence A. Bell	no		Mount Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	Siskiyou has more in common with Sacramento Valley, than coastal area; if you do redistrict Siskiyou, put it with Modoc and Lassen Counties
9siskiyou_20110515_mccoy	5152011	Mason Mccoy	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter Counties should be kept together because same economic interests
9mendocino_20110426_lwvmendocino	4262011	Jane Person	yes	President, League of Women Voters of Mendocino County		Mendocino	yes	draw district lines north-south; keep Del Norte, Trinity, Sonoma, Humboldt and Mendocino in one assembly district and readjusting senate district to include Del Norte; have them remain in same congressional district as Lake, Napa, Yolo
9siskiyou_20110517_hartman	5172011	Ruth and Marcus Hartman	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Place Siskiyou in the I-5 district, not coastal regions

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110515_bell				no	yes		Siskiyou, Sacramento Valley, Modoc, Lassen Counties have similar economies based on Agriculture, Timber, and Mining Industries , while coastal areas focus on tourism
9siskiyou_20110515_mccoy				no	yes	linked by I-5 corridor	Timber mining industries in Siskiyou already been destroyed because of environmentalists from the coastal region. Now fighting for our water rights and to keep dams on Klamath Rvr. If we lose this fight,
9mendocino_20110426_lwvmendocino	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino			no	yes	Difficult to travel from west to east; north-south corridor have agriculture watersheds, salmon fishing, wineries, redwood trees, bird, wildlife, marine protected areas, CA Coastal Natl Monument;	congressional districtpasture-based agriculture and wineries work well together and have created a brand for the region
9siskiyou_20110517_hartman				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110515_bell			no				
9siskiyou_20110515_mccoy	If we lose battle over dams and water rights, our agricultureranching will be destroyed. Our very survival may depend on where you draw the lines		no				
9mendocino_20110426_lwvmendocino			no				
9siskiyou_20110517_hartman	Nothing in common with coastal region, since Siskiyou contains farmers and ranchers		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110517_neptune	5172011	James H. Neptune	no		Mount Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	Communities along the I-5 corridor should be kept together, rather than joined with coastal areas, because of the severe geographic divide created by the coastal mountains.
9siskiyou_20110505_armstrong	552011	Hon. Marcia H. Armstrong	yes	Fifth District Supervisor of Siskiyou County (western)		Siskiyou	yes	Dont keep Siskiyou with coastal counties
9siskiyou_20110511_mackintosh	5122011	Judy Mackintosh	no			Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9shasta_20110512_rapoza	5122011	Terry and Sally Rapoza	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Communities along the I-5 corridor should be kept together
9shasta_20110516_michalak	5162011	Mike Michalak	no		Redding	Shasta	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110517_neptune				no	yes	local shared values and interests as a rural area, with an agriculture-centered economy, with water, timber and related interests	local shared values and interests as a rural area, with an agriculture-centered economy, with water, timber and related interests
9siskiyou_20110505_armstrong				no	yes	Common interests with counties south	Coastal counties have consistently introduced legislation to canabalize Siskiyous natural resource industries (logging, farming and mining) to benefit their own economy (fishing.)
9siskiyou_20110511_mackintosh				no	no		
9shasta_20110512_rapoza	Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Colusa and Yuba, Sutter			no	no		
9shasta_20110516_michalak	Shasta,Siskiyou,Modoc, Tehama, Trinity, and Humboldt, Lassen, Del Norte, and most of Mendocino andor Plumas counties			no	yes	Political and economic issues of Shasta and Siskiyou have little relevance to those in Yuba, Yolo, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Sutter.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110517_neptune			no				
9siskiyou_20110505_armstrong	Does not want same representatives from coastal regions which dont support interests of Siskiyou		no				
9siskiyou_20110511_mackintosh			no				
9shasta_20110512_rapoza			no			the lines that were in place in 1990 seem to be more conducive for cohesiveness than those lines that were drawn later.	
9shasta_20110516_michalak			no			Currently those areas are separated and represented by three different Congressmen whose population and influence bases are far south of those constituents.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110424_mecham	4242011	Alice Mecham	no			Shasta	yes	Keep coastal cities of Humboldt and Mendocino separate from valley counties of Shasta, Tehama, and Glenn and keep those valley counties from mtn desert counties of Modoc and Lassen; Keep Siskiyou with valley counties
9siskiyou_20110426_joling	4262011	Earl E. Joling, Sr.	no		Grenada	Siskiyou	no	
9siskiyou_20110426_mcnames	4262011	Tim and Judy Mcnames	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9siskiyou_20110426_scala	4262011	Caralee Scala	no		Montgue	Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9siskiyou_20110426_stapleton	4262011	Betsy Stapleton	no			Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9siskiyou_20110430_jenner	4302011	Gail L. Jenner	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9siskiyou_20110511_johnson	5112011	Peggy Johnson	no		Etna	Siskiyou	no	
9siskiyou_20110516_meamber	5162011	Don and Sheila Meamber	yes	Meamber Ranch	Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Dont place Siskiyou with coastal regions, but with similar agricultural areas
9siskiyou_20110512_scott	5122011	F. Scott	yes	Combat Veteran	Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Maintain I-5 corridor district as is and not include areas West or East as they dont represent local interests
9siskiyou_20110513_still	5132011	Nita Still and son Keith Irving	no			Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to 41); Dont redistrict Siskiyou County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110424_mecham	Humboldt, Mendocino, Shasta, Tehama, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, and Glenn			no	yes	Siskiyou has nothing in common with coastal or mountaindesert group	
9siskiyou_20110426_joling				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110426_mcnames				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110426_scala				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110426_stapleton				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110430_jenner				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110511_johnson				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110516_meamber				no	yes		Water, timber, and economic interests will be severely underrepresented fi placed with coastal counties
9siskiyou_20110512_scott				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110513_still				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110424_mecham			no				Please draw lines around entire counties when possible.
9siskiyou_20110426_joling			no				Support Props 11 20 for fair and impartial redistricting
9siskiyou_20110426_mcnames			no				
9siskiyou_20110426_scala			no				
9siskiyou_20110426_stapleton			no				
9siskiyou_20110430_jenner			no				
9siskiyou_20110511_johnson			no			The lines should be similar to those drawn by judges on 1990 rather than politicians of 2000.	Supports Props 19 and 20
9siskiyou_20110516_meamber			no				
9siskiyou_20110512_scott			no				
9siskiyou_20110513_still			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110511_bennett	5112011	Grace Bennett	yes	Supervisor, District 4 Siskiyou County		Siskiyou	yes	Let Siskiyou County stay in mountain area of Northern CA along I-5 corridor
9siskiyou_20110511_menke	5112011	John and Jennifer Menke	yes	Ranchers		Siskiyou	yes	Dont Put Siskiyou County with counties to the west, but with Modoc, Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Pluma; do not make I-5 the dividing line and pool western Siskiyou County with Trinity, Humboldt, and Del Norte
9siskiyou_20110511_walcott	5112011	Pauline Walcott	no		Weed	Siskiyou	yes	For Siskiyou county to be in a district that includes the I-5 corridor
9siskiyou_20110511_berryman	5112011	Ron Berryman	yes	Registered Profressional Forestor	McCloud	Siskiyou	yes	Boundaries should also include areas connected by infrastructure where possible like the Interstate 5 corridor.
9siskiyou_20110428_baird	4282011	Mike Baird	no			Siskiyou	yes	Dont form an East-west district linking Siskiyou County with the coast

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110511_bennett	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110511_menke	Trinity, Humboldt,Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Shasta, Tehama, Plumas			no	yes	Given the collusion that has been taking place among Federal and state regulatory agencies and coastal communities including Indian tribes to the west of Siskiyou County, bad for Siskiyou to be placed with coastal areas	
9siskiyou_20110511_walcott				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110511_berryman				no	yes	separate agriculturaltimber interests from fishing interests because of the inherent conflicts involved and separate urban environments from rural	
9siskiyou_20110428_baird				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110511_bennett	Nothing in common with coastal areas, would effect rights to representation that understands our county		no				
9siskiyou_20110511_menke			no				
9siskiyou_20110511_walcott			no				
9siskiyou_20110511_berryman			no				
9siskiyou_20110428_baird	The District make up along the Highway 101, Highway 5 and Highway 99 corridor links populations tied by culture and enonomic interest and is the most logical and just method of districting.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110510_mcroberts	5102011	Travis and Julie McRoberts	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9humboldt_20110516_abrams	5162011	Nan Abrams	no			Humboldt	yes	maintain district lines that encompass the coastal areas
9humboldt_20110516_benedict	5162011	Laura Benedict	no			Humboldt	yes	Stop lateral line drawing and put Humboldt with Sonoma and Mendocino, and not with Redding and the Central Valley
9humboldt_20110516_williams	5162011	Lawrence Williams	no		Trinidad	Humboldt	yes	Opposed to any proposed redistricting involving Humboldt County.
9humboldt_20110516_bryant	5162011	Ellen Bryant	no			Humboldt	yes	Opposed to any proposed redistricting involving Humboldt County.
9humboldt_20110516_lahman	5162011	Jim Lahman	no			Humboldt	yes	keep coastal counties together and dont put Humboldt in district with central valley counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110510_mcroberts				no	no		
9humboldt_20110516_abrams				no	yes	unique interests like protection of rivers unlike Central Valleys farming economy	Central Valley interests conflict with those of the coast, particurly with water rights
9humboldt_20110516_benedict	Humboldt, Sonoma, Mendocino			no	yes	Humboldt interests totally different than Central Valley concerns; more in common with Sonoma and Mendocino	
9humboldt_20110516_williams				no	no		
9humboldt_20110516_bryant				no	yes	Coastal interests different from inland concerns, especially with water rights	
9humboldt_20110516_lahman	Humboldt and coastal counties south of us			no	yes		humboldt has many national parks, lots of summer tourism, fishing - lots in common with coastal counties to south and nothing in common with central valley counties which have agri-biz, big box stores, sprawling subdivisions, no H2O polluted air.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110510_mcroberts			no				
9humboldt_20110516_abrams			no				
9humboldt_20110516_benedict			no				
9humboldt_20110516_williams			no				
9humboldt_20110516_bryant			no				
9humboldt_20110516_lahman			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110518_berliner	5182011	Diana Berliner	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Put Eureka within a district made up of coastal counties north of San Francisco
9humboldt_20110517_blomstrom	5172011	Greg Blomstrom	no				yes	maintain district with coastal counties north of San Francisco and west of I-5
9siskiyou_20110515_bowen	5152011	Liz Bowen	no			Siskiyou	yes	(Refer to Gliatto 41)
9placer_20110516_jicha	5162011	Barbara Jicha	no		Auburn	Placer	yes	Dont move Auburn from District 3 to District 5
9humboldt_20110517_barnes	5172011	Lowell Barnes	no		Anderson	Humboldt	yes	Supports the redistricting plan for the North State by Casey Scott 83 84 (link in email)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110518_berliner	Humboldt, Del Norte, Sonoma and Mendocino			no	yes	Highway 101 allows easy access to coastal counties; travel from east to west is difficult	Common economic factors of fishing, tourism, wine-making for coastal areas; Humboldt county has few economic interests with eastern areas like Shasta and Siskiyou
9humboldt_20110517_blomstrom	Napa, Sonoma, Humboldt, Del Norte, Mendocino			no	yes	coastal counties all support wild undammed rivers, and there is consensus over removing dams	five coastal counties share timber fish and wine as opposed to central valley counties where farming, feedlots and canals are the main issues
9siskiyou_20110515_bowen				no	no		
9placer_20110516_jicha	Placer			no	yes	Diverse communities with different physical environments	
9humboldt_20110517_barnes				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110518_berliner			no				please schedule another hearing within our area so more of us can participate before you make final decisions.
9humboldt_20110517_blomstrom			no				
9siskiyou_20110515_bowen			no				
9placer_20110516_jicha	Placers issues are quite different from those of Tahoe, Donner and Truckee; Present supervisors for Tahoe and Auburn well connected with respectivel community, but hard to represent two		no				
9humboldt_20110517_barnes			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110517_doran	5172011	none listed	no			Humboldt	yes	Common interests of the Far NorthCountieswork well together and counteract the domination of the southrn counties
9humboldt_20110506_salzman	562011	Richard Salzman	no			Humboldt	yes	Keep coastal districts coastal
9humboldt_20110508_scott2	582011	Casey Scott (2nd submission)	no			Humboldt	yes	attaches map for 3 proposed senate district; keep coastal, mountain, and valley populations together
9humboldt_20110508_scott	582011		no			Humboldt	yes	Combine northernmost counties in one CD; another CD of valley counties Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yolo, and northwestern Placer (Lincoln area) counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110517_doran	Humboldt, Del Norte. Mendocino and Trinity			no	yes	District will contain 4 state dish hatcheries and 1 federal fish hatchery with fish common to inland and coastal waters and combines federally funded highways s in Caltrans Districts 1 and 2	Northern California counties share timber resources, high percentages of federal lands, similar economic activities; 2nd district option combines the 7 counties with rice production and processing so representatives can work on federal rice subsidies
9humboldt_20110506_salzman				no	yes		
9humboldt_20110508_scott2	counties of Northern CA			no	yes		
9humboldt_20110508_scott	Lake, northern Sonoma, Del Norte, Trinity, Modoc, Lassen, Tehama,Humboldt, Mendocino, Shasta, Siskiyou, and Plumas			no	yes		Northernmost counties have timber resources, lots of federal lands, similar economies; valley counties economies involve rice processing and production

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110517_doran			no				
9humboldt_20110506_salzman	Humboldt County has nothing in common with Redding and everything in common with the rest of the North Coast.		no				
9humboldt_20110508_scott2	counties with timber and large percentages of public lands have much more in common with each other than those counties with economies that rely heavily on irrigated crops on privately held farms		no				
9humboldt_20110508_scott			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110426_cityoffortbragg	4262011	Dave Turner, Meg Courtney, Dan Gjerde, Doug Hammerstrom, Jere Melo	yes	City Council of Fort Bragg	Fort Bragg	Del Norte	yes	(refer to Stewart 97)
9humboldt_20110512_salzman	5122011	Richard Salzman	no			Humboldt	yes	Keep Humboldt Coastal
9humboldt_20110430_lwvhumboldt_matsumoto	4302011	Beth Matsumoto	yes	President, LWV (League of Women Voters) Humboldt County	Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Keep North Coast counties (Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, Sonoma) in the assembly district
9humboldt_20110418_humboldtdemocrats_boyd	4182011	Milton J. Boyd	yes	Chair, Humboldt County Democratic Central Committee		Humboldt	no	
9humboldt_20110418_county_of_humboldt	4182011	Mark Lovelace	yes	Chair, Humboldt County Board of Supervisors		Humboldt	no	
9placer_20110518_spalding	5182011	Margaret Spalding	no		Auburn	Placer	yes	attached Placer County Governance Chart showing the number of voters in Assembly and Senate districts, County Supervisor areas, cities, school districts and special districts in Placer County in relation to communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110426_cityoffortbragg				no	no		
9humboldt_20110512_salzman				no	yes		
9humboldt_20110430_lwvhumboldt_matsumoto	Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino			no	yes	share bird, wildlife and marine protected areas, watersheds and wineries; transporation along I-5 easier from N-S	shared economic base in tourism, recreation, fishing, and agriculture
9humboldt_20110418_humboldtdemocrats_boyd				no	no		
9humboldt_20110418_county_of_humboldt				no	no		
9placer_20110518_spalding				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110426_cityoffortbragg			no				
9humboldt_20110512_salzman	Differs in opinion from Central Valley regarding water rights		no				
9humboldt_20110430_lwvhumboldt_matsumoto			no				
9humboldt_20110418_humboldtdemocrats_boyd			no				o schedule a hearing in the northwestern part of the state to hear redistricting concerns of the citizens of Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte counties.
9humboldt_20110418_county_of_humboldt			no				Hold a public input hearing on the North Coast
9placer_20110518_spalding			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110516_bailey	5162011	Linda H Bailey	no			Humboldt	yes	retain as closely as possible the current Assembly and Senate districts of the North Coast
9lake_20110323_cox	3232011	Kelly F. Fox	yes	Clerk, Lake County Board of Supervisors		Lake	yes	Lake County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2011-39 Keep Lake County, Napa County, Sonoma County, Mendocino, Yolo County in same congressional district
9humboldt_20110506_bird	562011	Andrew Bird	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110516_bailey	Humboldt, Mendocino, Lake, Sonoma			no	yes	North Coast is a historic and continuing community of interests, bound together by the 101 corridor, resources (fish, redwoods, coastal scenery), wine production, educational facilities (College of the Redwoods)	
9lake_20110323_cox	Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Yolo			no	yes	Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Yolo share many interests and similarities	Geothermal industry, winegrape industry; tourism, regional watersheds and water rights provide strong ties and long-term relationships shared by the counties
9humboldt_20110506_bird				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110516_bailey			no				
9lake_20110323_cox	Most logical and appropriate configuration for their unique geographic region		no				
9humboldt_20110506_bird			no				Most of Northern population feels disenfranchised from the redistricting process since there is not a single member of the commission from a county north of Bay Area; and the two meetings in Redding and Santa Rosa requires hours of driving

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9calaveras_20110426_sanchez	4262011	Glen Sanchez	no		Arnold	Calaveras	yes	Keep Calaveras County and neighboring mtn. cities of Tuolumne and Mariposa together as much as possible with Amador to north and Madera in south, and not with communities along Highway 99; Stanislaus and Merced counties should be together in 1 district
9dnorte_20110411_toreson	4112011	Rick Toreson, teacher	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Returning Del Norte County to 2nd Senate District and keeping coastal communities intact in a North to South district; do not make a district from West to East
9humboldt_20110413_stewart	4132011	Connie Stewart	yes	Executive Director, CA Center for Rural Policy		Humboldt	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9calaveras_20110426_sanchez	Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, Merced, Stanislaus			no	yes	Calaveras shares more with mtn. area neighbors, like tourism recreation, from Bear Valley Ski Resort to the north to Calaveras Big Trees State Park and Stanislaus Natl Forest in the south	Calaveras and mtn. area are small communities and work in yourism or recreation fields or service jobs in immediate areas, shop in neaby communities and dont go to the valley floor often
9dnorte_20110411_toreson	Del Norte			no	yes	Hardship for the representatives along fellow teachers to wrk with state and federal legislators to bring resources to community if we dont have contact and representatives physically present in communities	Highway 101 Corridor is route from North to South for coastal communities;
9humboldt_20110413_stewart				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9calaveras_20110426_sanchez			no				
9dnorte_20110411_toreson			no			Currently Del Norte County has had an inland representative with no presence in the county; to visit their rep, we must drive through another district because no direct route to majority of the senate district	
9humboldt_20110413_stewart			no				Request to hold a punlic input hearing in Redwood Coast region -- Humboldt, Del Norte, Mendocino, or Trinity Counties

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110415_stewart	4152011	Connie Stewart (2nd submission)	yes	Executive Director, CA Center for Rural Policy		Humboldt	yes	Leave four North Coast counties (Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino) in the assembly district; Pasture-based agriculture on North Coast and wine industries in Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Yolo should remain in same Congressional District
9humboldt_20110418_lovelace	4182011	Mark Lovelace	yes	Chair, Humboldt County Board of Supervisors		Humboldt	no	
9dnorte_20110512_bruce	5122011	Doreen Bruce	no			Del Norte	yes	Return Del Norte to District 2 in the Senate and remain in the same Assembly and Congressional district with Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, and Sonoma Counties.
9mendocino_20110510_sizemore	5122011	Helen Sizemore	yes	PHR, Society for Human Resources Management, Human Resources Programs Administrator, North Coast Oppurtunities, Inc	Ukiah	Mendocino	yes	Districts should be drawn along 101 corridor for the North Coast counties, and not link with inland areas

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110415_stewart				no	yes	Congressional district good cultural match	Easier to travel North-South; commerce, especially fisheries, pasture-based agricultural health care delivery servces, have developed networks, partnerships, and coalitions along North-South Hwy 101
9humboldt_20110418_lovelace				no	no		
9dnorte_20110512_bruce	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, and Sonoma			no	yes		
9mendocino_20110510_sizemore				no	yes	Different interests than inland counties; North Coast cares about their environmental natural features	Wine industry in Mendocino works with Lake and Sonoma Counties

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110415_stewart			no			East-West transportation challenging due to geographic and public land ownership patterns	
9humboldt_20110418_lovelace			no				Request to hold a public input hearing on the North Coast, in either Arcata or Eureka, on May 18th
9dnorte_20110512_bruce	North Coast counties share geographic, demographic and economic similarities.		no				
9mendocino_20110510_sizemore			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110510_bertrand	5102011	Wendy Bertrand	no			Del Norte	yes	keep Del Norte in district with other coastal counties, and not tied to inland areas
9mendocino_20110501_stavely	512011	James Stavely	no		Fort Bragg	Mendocino	yes	leave the North Coast counties in the same Senate, Assembly and Congressional districts; do not change district boundaries from historical north-south to east-west
9lake_20110506_bayles	562011	Philip and Chelnesa Bayles	no		Hidden Hills	Lake	no	
9mendocino_20110506_oberweiser	562011	Edward M. Oberweiser	no		Fort Bragg	Mendocino	yes	(refer to Stavely 102); No direct roads to inland suburban areas and seperated by coastal mtn. range
9mendocino_20110506_charkowski	562011	Elaine Charkowski	no			Mendocino	yes	(refer to Stavely 102)
9mendocino_20110505_dobbins	552011	Peter Y. Dobbins	no			Mendocino	yes	(refer to Stavely 102)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110510_bertrand	Del Norte and Humboldt			no	yes	Different interests than inland cos; Del Norte Humboldt are smaller population centers but concerned with stewardship of their environmental natural features which are valuable to the whole state.	social interests continued Coastal population centers are linked via Highway 101 which helps create understanding and problem solving
9mendocino_20110501_stavely				no	yes	Nothing in common with eastern areas	Traditional north-south networks have developed over many years
9lake_20110506_bayles				no	no		
9mendocino_20110506_oberweiser				no	no		
9mendocino_20110506_charkowski				no	no		
9mendocino_20110505_dobbins				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110510_bertrand			no				
9mendocino_20110501_stavely			no			largely due to a campaign mounted by a candidate who lost a congressional election in the existing 1st U.S. cong. District.	
9lake_20110506_bayles			no				hope consideration is being given to the size in miles and availability of access in roads in determining how the people are equally represented
9mendocino_20110506_oberweiser			no				
9mendocino_20110506_charkowski			no				
9mendocino_20110505_dobbins			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9amador_20110502_putnam-smith	522011	Dorothy Putnam-Smith	no			Amador	yes	consider moving the boundaries to include Amador County with El Dorado or Sacramento
9tehama_20110503_Tehama TeaParty	532011	Coger	no			Tehama	no	
9sacramento_20110517_waste	5172011	Bob Waste	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	dont divide up the City of Sacramento when drawing lines for California Congressional and state Senate districts.
9tehama_20110517_young2	5172011	Sharon Young	no			Tehama	yes	Put Tehama county with coastal regions, and not with Sacramento
9yolo_20110516_wicker	5162011	Kerry Wicker	no			Yolo	yes	Put Yolo County in a single district -- the one currently occupied by Mike Thompson

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9amador_20110502_putnam-smith				no	yes		Travels to El Dorado or Sacramento for business meetings and to collaborate with local school districts and large businesses
9tehama_20110503_Tehama TeaParty				no	no		
9sacramento_20110517_waste				no	yes	nationally prominent example of both ethnic and racial diversity, and successful ethnic and racial integration.	
9tehama_20110517_young2	Tehama, Sacramento			no	yes	Tehama has major water rights interest, timber resource interest, maintaining highways (federally funded in Districts 1 and 2) and we are a very rural area; Nothing in common with Sacramento suburbs or small group of rice farmers	
9yolo_20110516_wicker				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9amador_20110502_putnam-smith	The smaller counties need the larger counties support, not to be connected to another smaller county.		no				
9tehama_20110503_Tehama TeaParty			no			The lines should be similar to those drawn by judges on 1990 rather than politicians of 2000.	
9sacramento_20110517_waste			no				
9tehama_20110517_young2			no				
9yolo_20110516_wicker			no			it was crazy to live in one part of Yolo county to another, and then be surprised to learn I was no longer in Thompsons district, but in a very conservative one.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yuba_20110428_charles	4282011	Charles	no			Yuba	yes	Unification of the three northern-most regions of California is most certainly NOT what is in their best interests, under Cal. Const. Art. XXI, 2
9dnorte_20110516_lochtie	5162011	Byrd A. Lochtie	no			Del Norte	yes	consider the North Coast of California from the Oregon border south, to include Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino counties, as a COI; for more people look to adjacent counties that hold the watersheds of the rivers that flow through these 3 coastal counties
9mendocino_20110516_ross	5162011	Robert Ross	no			Mendocino	yes	preserve the current north coastal districts as they are now
9dnorte_20110518_mcallister	5182011	Charlene McAllister	no			Del Norte	yes	leave the north coastal counties in the same Senate, Assembly and Congressional district; for AD, move the district line further into Sonoma County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yuba_20110428_charles				no	no		
9dnorte_20110516_lochtie				no	yes		
9mendocino_20110516_ross				no	yes	Current coastal districts reflect our coastal consciousness and our community stewardship of coastal resources	
9dnorte_20110518_mcallister	Del Norte, Trinity, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Lake, and Napa			no	yes	natural transportation and industry patterns of the coastal counties	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yuba_20110428_charles			no				
9dnorte_20110516_lochtie	The Governors recent appointment of a Del Norte County resident as the regions representative to the CA Coastal Commission makes it clear that Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino counties are all part of the same COI		no				
9mendocino_20110516_ross			no				
9dnorte_20110518_mcallister			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110509_deVall	592011	Norman de Vall	yes	Mendocino County Board of Supervisors		Mendocino	yes	Suggests that the telephone company designation of their area code boundaries be used as a template
9mendocino_20110515_welty	5152011	Sally Welty	no			Mendocino	yes	Have configurations of the current Congressional and Assembly districts remain as they have been since the early seventies -- through both Republican and Democratic administrations; if more population is needed for Senate D, extend to include Del Norte
9sacramento_20110513_prestwich	5132011	William H. Edgar	yes	Interim City Manager of Sacramento	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	City should continue to be in one Congressional district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110509_deVall	Mendocino, Lake, Napa, Sonoma			no	yes	helpful for local government organization to be able to approach elected officials that come from similar communities with similar values and understand their problems and conerns	North-South COI is interested in resource protection, not resource extraction like Eastern neighbors; coastal areas boud by economic value of fishing, tourism, regional agricultural products such as wine from Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake, Humboldt
9mendocino_20110515_welty				no	yes	Lateral redistricting would separate natural COI and change tenor of our districts from resource protection to resource extraction	wants to make sure that there is no offshore oil development here and that the whale migration patterns are respected since we have been actively involved in those particular aspects of ocean protection issues.
9sacramento_20110513_prestwich	Sacramento			no	yes	Population can equal one district; collection of cohesive neighborhoods and associations; well known for rich ethnic diversity celebrated through local festivals	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110509_deVall			no				
9mendocino_20110515_welty			no				
9sacramento_20110513_prestwich			no				City faces challenges with flood protection and the need to contruct a multi-modal transportation facility topping the list of complex projects involving federal participation

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9placer_20110426_CityofAuburn	4262011	William Kirby and more	yes	Mayor, City of Auburn	Auburn	Placer	yes	Keep Placer County whole for Assembly, Senate, Congress, Board of Equalization maps; Have the Cities of Auburn, Lincoln, Roseville, Rocklin, Loomis town, northern communities of Lake Tahoe be in one AD
9mendocino_20110514_wilson	5142011	Linda Wilson	no			Mendocino	yes	keep Coastal communities intact, and not with Redding, Williams, or Red Bluff
9mendocino_20110513_Muchowski	5132011	Val Muchowski	yes	President, National Womens Political Caucus of Mendocino County		Mendocino	yes	Districts should be drawn along 101 corridor for the North Coast counties, and not link with inland areas (same as Sizemore 100)
9mendocino_20110513_Laybourn	5132011	H. Michael Laybourn	no			Mendocino	yes	Leave North Coast counties in same Assembly, senate, congressional districts
9mendocino_20110512_deTreville_Palecek	5122011	Gerry deTreville and Kathleen Palecek	yes	League of Women Voters of Mendocino County		Mendocino	yes	(refer to Matsumoto 87)
9mendocino_20110427_chinn_gleeson	4272011	Nancy Chinn and Harriet Gleeson	no		Little River	Mendocino	yes	Keep coastal areas intact

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9placer_20110426_CityofAuburn	Placer			no	yes		Developed important infrastructure networks and service delivery systems in Placer county
9mendocino_20110514_wilson	Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake, Humboldt			no	no		
9mendocino_20110513_Muchowski				no	yes	Different interests than inland counties; North Coast cares about their environmental natural features	Wine industry in Mendocino works with Lake and Sonoma Counties
9mendocino_20110513_Laybourn				no	yes	Do not share same issues as central areas and more in common with coastal communities	
9mendocino_20110512_deTreville_Palecek				no	no		
9mendocino_20110427_chinn_gleeson				no	yes	Much of the coast doesnt have adequate internet service; relies on internet, tv, one public radio station for information; transporation to east difficult and effects heath care availibility	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9placer_20110426_CityofAuburn	Elected officials, business owners, residents in Placer County have developed strong ties in identifying and coming together to solve public policy problems		no				
9mendocino_20110514_wilson			no				
9mendocino_20110513_Muchowski			no				
9mendocino_20110513_Laybourn			no				
9mendocino_20110512_deTreville_Palecek			no				
9mendocino_20110427_chinn_gleeson	Coastal areas share many similarities and problems		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110426_saylor	4262011	Don Saylor	yes	Yolo County Supervisor		Yolo	yes	Draw district lines for Yolo County along the I-80 with Napa, Solano, Sonoma counties and include Cache Creek, Putah Creek, Berryessa and Delta watersheds
9dnorte_20110516_kennedy	5162011	Barbara Kennedy	no			Del Norte	yes	Leave four North Coast counties (Del Norte, Lake, Humboldt, Mendocino) in the same district
9dnorte_20110516_mueller	5162011	Mark E. Mueller	no			Del Norte	yes	keep the north coast of California in a separate district from other parts (Central Valley or Sierras)
9dnorte_20110519_fenton	5192011	Kate Fenton	no			Del Norte	yes	Keep the coastal counties north of San Francisco together in SD and CD; coastal SD Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma and part of Marin. Or it could include Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Lake, Napa and Trinity Counties
9dnorte_20110519_strom-martin	5192011	Virginia Strom-Martin	yes	former Assembly Member		Del Norte	yes	Keep northcoast counties together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110426_saylor	Yolo, Napa, Solano, Sonoma			no	yes		Yolo is an agricultural region united by UC Davis, comon crop patterns, agri-tourism common in the other counties
9dnorte_20110516_kennedy	Del Norte, Lake, Humboldt, Mendocino			no	yes		East-west plan makes no sense; north-south reflects economic interests
9dnorte_20110516_mueller	Del Norte, Lake, Humboldt, Mendocino			no	yes	different interests from central valley or sierras - fisheries and geographically more isolated	
9dnorte_20110519_fenton	Del Norte, Lake, Humboldt, Mendocino, Trinity, Marin			no	yes	Counties north of San Francisco are connected by agriculture, including wine regions, redwood forests, transportation and interest in coastal issues.	
9dnorte_20110519_strom-martin	Del Norte, Humboldt,Mendocino, Lake and Sonoma			no	yes	share two major watersheds the Eel River and Russian River. All five counties are linked economically, socially and geographically; Native American tribes in this area are also closely connected and participate in inter-tribal councils	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110426_saylor			no			Yolo county voters were disenfranchised by state senate ping-pong effect for 2 periods twice in a 12- yr period (92-94 and 02-04)	
9dnorte_20110516_kennedy			no				
9dnorte_20110516_mueller			no				
9dnorte_20110519_fenton			no				
9dnorte_20110519_strom-martin			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110520_brinton	5202011	Shane Brinton	yes	member, Arcata City Council	Arcata	Humboldt	yes	recognize North Coast counties as a COI, separate and distinct from inland counties and consider including Del Norte County in Senate District 2.
9dnorte_20110521_rohde	5212011	Gisela Rohde	no			Del Norte	no	
9humboldt_20110519_spooner	5192011	Sierra Spooner	no		Arcata	Humboldt	yes	keep Humboldt County tied to Mendocino and and Sonoma, and not with Shasta

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110520_brinton				no	yes		Environmentally and economically, Arcata has far more in common with Del Norte, Mendocino,and Sonoma; Humboldt County residents share a strongbond with our neighbors in Del Norte
9dnorte_20110521_rohde				no	yes	Culturally, geographically, and economically, coastal NW CA is a COI with geographic integrity and a common set of infrastructure and economic challenges that are distinct from those of the northern Sacramento Valley.	
9humboldt_20110519_spooner	Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma			no	yes	Humboldt is extremely isolated from the population centers, but culturally there is continuity up the coast from San Francisco to Humboldt.	To achieve representation by politicians who share our concern regarding fisheries, marine resources, coastal logging industries, and social and environmental concerns

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110520_brinton	the fact that the North Coast has been underrepresented in this process could have negative impacts on our community for years to come		no				Please hold a hearing somewhere on the North Coast.
9dnorte_20110521_rohde	An east-west arrangement violates the following criterion of Section 2 Article XXI of the CA Constitution		no				Why have there been no discussion meetings scheduled here on the North Coast?
9humboldt_20110519_spooner	Virtually no ties between Shasta and Humboldt		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110520_motto	5202011	Nick Motto	no		Carlotta	Humboldt	yes	Geography dictates the boundaries of Congressional District 1 and therefore strongly opposes changes
9humboldt_20110520_nolen	5202011	Lance Nolen	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Dont combine Humboldt County with the Redding area
9humboldt_20110521_naef	5212011	Lisa Naef	no			Humboldt	yes	Place Humboldt with Del Norte and Mendocino rather than with eastern regions

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110520_motto				no	yes	communities along the Hwy 101 corridor have a long and fruitful history of cooperation towards common interests and goals;East-west lines would require years to forge new relationships among entities serving the public.	Counties in the present District have common interests in forestry, tourism, agriculture, and fishing. Anything east of the present boundaries does not have these interests
9humboldt_20110520_nolen	Humboldt, Shasta			no	yes	The Redding area is very conservative, while the Humboldt area is liberal; dont share common beliefs. If combined with Redding area, Humboldt will be overpowered by larger population centers	
9humboldt_20110521_naef	Humbolt, Del Norte, Mendocino			no	yes	Sierras are a natural barrier that makes transportation, electronic communication and other interaction between counties in Northern California that run east to west more difficult than interacting with counties north and south of Humboldt	drawing electoral districts lines east to west lumps many poor rural counties together, where a mix of rural and wealthier is better

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110520_motto	Present boundaries reflect the actual needs and interests of the communities it encompasses		no				
9humboldt_20110520_nolen			no				
9humboldt_20110521_naef	Less in common with Shasta and Siskiyou other than being rural and poor		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110519_blackstone	5192011	Joan Blackstone	no		Little River	Mendocino	yes	affirms and expands 47 (9mendocino_20110426_lwvmendocino); keep Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Trinity, Lake, Napa, and Yolo in same AD, SD, CD
9mendocino_20110519_poole	5192011	Jennifer Poole	no		Willits	Mendocino	yes	(refer to Matsumoto 87)
9mendocino_20110519_tucker	5192011	Fran Tucker	no		Little River	Mendocino	yes	attached confidential letter of comments
9mendocino_20110520_kellyhousemuseum	5202011	Kelley House	yes	Board of the Kelley House Museum, Inc		Mendocino	yes	leave our coastal districts as they were drawn for the past several decade

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110519_blackstone	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Trinity, Lake, Napa, and Yolo			no	yes	Most citizens elderly and driving at night along the narrow, curving highways and secondary roads that connect these citizens with major North - South corridors east of Highway 101 is challenging; E-W travel also limited in winter	primary commercial interests that sustain north coast counties are the tourist industry and specialty agriculture; As older, traditional commercial activities have declined, these counties have become significant retirement destinations
9mendocino_20110519_poole				no	no		
9mendocino_20110519_tucker				no	no		
9mendocino_20110520_kellyhousemuseum				no	yes	NS orientation dictated by topography, transportation networks, similar interests and to preserve environmental protection coalitions, fire protection districts, law enforcement, school interactions	common COI tourism; recreation (state parks beaches); environmental protection coastal planning, redwood harvesting, Marine Life Protection Areas, watersheds

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110519_blackstone			no				
9mendocino_20110519_poole			no				There was no publicity sent to any of our North Coast news outlets about the District 9 hearings in April in Redding or Marysville; Wrap-up by consultant is done before the hearing that Mendocino and other north coast counties take place
9mendocino_20110519_tucker			no				
9mendocino_20110520_kellyhousemuseum			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110521_beck	5212011	Diane Beck	no		Kneeland	Mendocino	yes	Humboldt, Mendocino, Del Norte, Trinity, and western Siskiyou counties have a great deal more in common than they do with most of the cities and towns of the I-5 corridor east of us
9placer_20110518_bonner	5182011	Edward N. Bonner	yes	Placer County Sheriff		Placer	yes	Hard copy to follow via US mail.
9placer_20110519_hawkins	5192011	Evan Hawkins	no		Auburn	Placer	yes	new districts with Auburn should include Roseville, Rocklin and other Placer County areas in between. If the district were to stretch into Sacramento County, for example, I think it should stay along the foothills and take Folsom and Granite Bay
9placer_20110519_ockey	5192011	Alexandra C. Ockey	no		Roseville	Placer	yes	Keep Placer County whole for congressional and assembly district; dont include Placer with Sacramento or Delta
9placer_20110519_pohle	5192011	Karen Pohle	no		Olympic Valley	Placer	yes	consider redrawing the district lines that include the Eastern Nevada and Placer Counties into a single district, and not with the western part of our counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110521_beck	Humboldt, Mendocino, Del Norte, Trinity, and western Siskiyou			no	yes	CA Coastal Commisions North District representative chosen from Mendocino, Humboldt, or Del Norte. The 3 counties also have Native Americans population and a lot of federal land.; Trinity similar to Del Norte; geographically, western Siskiyou also rural	coastal areas share similar concerns over fisheries, coastal streams, public and private timber management, national forests, and national and state wildlife areas, parks, and conservation areas
9placer_20110518_bonner				no	no		
9placer_20110519_hawkins	Placer			no	yes	As a citizen of Auburn for many years, frequently visits these places	
9placer_20110519_ockey	Placer			no	no		
9placer_20110519_pohle	Placer			no	yes		common financial, geographic and environmental issues that cross county lines and that our areas of concern Lake Tahoe, snow removal, forest fires, ski industry, etc., unlike with western parts of CA

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110521_beck			no				
9placer_20110518_bonner			no				
9placer_20110519_hawkins			no				
9placer_20110519_ockey			no				strongly oppose allowing 5 population variation among districts.
9placer_20110519_pohle			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9placer_20110519_rosevillecoc	5192011	Al Johnson	yes	Roseville Chamber President	Roseville	Placer	yes	(refer to CityofAuburn 119)
9placer_20110519_smith	5192011	Ted Smith	no			Placer	yes	keep Placer and El dorado counties whole either by themself or as one unit
9placer_20110519_spalding	5192011	Margie Spalding	no			Placer	yes	Please find the Excel spreadsheet as the source document to the LWV Placer county Governance Chart sent to you yesterday.
9placer_20110520_brost	5202011	Nancy Brost	no			Placer	yes	Attached a letter to the commissioners with comments from the meeting in Auburn, CA, on May 19th
9placer_20110520_naugle	5202011	Joy Naugle	no		Roseville	Placer	yes	Roseville shares a community of interest with the metropolitan Sacramento area, and should be with that area in any redistricting jurisdiction(s)
9placer_20110520_ulery	5202011	Richard R. Ulery	no		Grass Valley	Placer	yes	Attached a summary of my comments at last evenings CRC public hearing in Auburn. (speaker 19)
9placer_20110521_jarabek	5212011	Janice J. Jerabek	no		Foresthill	Placer	yes	favor keeping Placer County intact with a North-South county alignment; keeping the counties of Nevada, Placer, and El Dorado together around Lake Tahoe
9sacramento_20110519_eaton	5192011	Jim and Geri Eaton	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Have Citrus Heights remain in the same voting precinct of Sacramento County, not Placer county
9sacramento_20110519_hendrix	5192011	Alice Hendrix	no		Orangeville	Sacramento	yes	Keep Orangeville in Sacramento County for AD, SD, CD, and not with Placer, Lassen, or Modoc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9placer_20110519_rosevillecoc				no	no		
9placer_20110519_smith	Placer and El dorado			no	yes		
9placer_20110519_spalding				no	no		
9placer_20110520_brost				no	no		
9placer_20110520_naugle				no	no		
9placer_20110520_ulery				no	no		
9placer_20110521_jarabek	Nevada, Placer, and El Dorado			no	yes	Transportation corridors must be kept in mind for the citizens and our representatives.	
9sacramento_20110519_eaton				no	no		
9sacramento_20110519_hendrix	Sacramento			no	yes	entire political and social life is directed into Sacramento County	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9placer_20110519_rosevillecoc			no				
9placer_20110519_smith	makes it easier for our representative to represent		no				
9placer_20110519_spalding			no				
9placer_20110520_brost			no				
9placer_20110520_naugle			no				
9placer_20110520_ulery			no				
9placer_20110521_jarabek	the 3 counties have similar issues to deal with history and culture, schools, tourism, economic and social interests, and geographical features.		no				redistricting must ensure that every person has equal representation by drawing districts with an equal number of people -- ONE PERSON, ONE VOTE -- no exceptions for any portion of the state; no gerrymandering
9sacramento_20110519_eaton			no				
9sacramento_20110519_hendrix			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110519_holloway	5192011	Brian Holloway	yes	elected member of the American River Flood Control District (ARFCD) and Board member of the regional Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	the City of Sacramento should remain in one Congressional District
9sacramento_20110519_surette	5192011	Del Surette	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	do not include Citrus and Antelope in Placer County, but with Sacramento
9yolo_20110522_moyle	5222011	Peter Moyle	yes	UC Davis Professor, Wildlife, Fish, and Conservation Biology, Center for Watershed Sciences		Yolo	yes	consider setting the boundaries of new political districts based on watersheds rather then arbitrary political boundaries.
9siskiyou_20110513_higgs	5132011	Tom Higgs	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	It is not right to put siskiyou county in the same district as coastal counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110519_hollo way	Sacramento			no	yes	Receiving federal authorizations and appropriations for flood protection are difficult enough, but creating two Congressional districts would make our tasks significantly more difficult and complex.	
9sacramento_20110519_suret te	Sacramento			no	yes	I have lived in Sacramento, pay taxes in Sacramento County and participate in Sacramento elections. I know very little about Placer	
9yolo_20110522_moyle				no	yes	Here (Yolo County) watershed boundaries would create natural links along a east-west axis, through the Putah and Cache creek watersheds, which would link Yolo to Solano County; no similar interests with north counties (ex. Colusa)	it would create possibilities for improving the management of water (a critical issue everywhere) because users throughout the watershed would be obliged to work together to solve problems, through their common political representatives.
9siskiyou_20110513_higgs	Siskiyou			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110519_hollo way			no				
9sacramento_20110519_suret te			no				
9yolo_20110522_moyle	Watersheds make sense because they naturally link people over diverse areas because of concern over water and conservation issues.		no				
9siskiyou_20110513_higgs	different demograghics and obvious representation differences		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110519_hugo	5192011	Donald F. Hugo	no			Siskiyou	yes	keep Siskiyou county connected with Shasta and Tehama counties, not the coast or eastern California.
9siskiyou_20110520_bergeron	5202011	Leo and Kathleen Bergeron	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Rural counties like Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter Counties and the cities and towns within their boundaries should be kept whole in any redistricting plan
9siskiyou_20110520_burke	5202011	Jon Jennifer Burke	yes	ranch owners	Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Siskiyous history and culture are more aligned with Shasta and Tehama, and other counties in the areas South and not with coastal, or Humboldt and Del Norte Counties to our West.
9siskiyou_20110520_frink	5202011	Daniel Frink	no			Siskiyou	yes	Have Siskiyou County be in the same Congressional District as Shasta, Tehama, Glean, Butte, Calusa, Yuba, and Sutter Counties
9siskiyou_20110520_tallerico	5202011	Frank Tallerico	no			Siskiyou	yes	keep rural counties located in North-Central California together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110519_hugo	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama			no	yes	The 3 counties are all part of the I-5 corridor and share mutual concerns, industry and culture; nothing in common with coastal or eastern CA	The economies in these counties are struggling and where the lines are drawn will definitely have an impact on how rapidly they recover.
9siskiyou_20110520_bergeron	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter			no	yes	I-5 and Highway 99 are major economic and social connections that link northern counties	share interests as a rural area, with an agriculture-centered economy, with water, timber and related interests
9siskiyou_20110520_burke	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama			no	yes	linked by the I-5 Corridor and Highway 99 by our mutual agricultural, timber, and ranching history.	
9siskiyou_20110520_frink	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, Glean, Butte, Calusa, Yuba, and Sutter			no	yes	Highways I-5 and S.R. 99, plus Union Pacific Railroad and other smaller rail lines create important economic, political, and social connections that should not be broken up.	have agriculture, ranching, water rights, water use issues, mining and timber economic interests in common;
9siskiyou_20110520_tallerico				no	yes	north-south connectivity of Interstate Highway 5 and Old Highway 99, that combined, run the entirety of the district is what keeps commerce and pleasure intact	share interests as a rural area, with an agriculture-centered economy, with water, timber and related interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110519_hugo			no			lines drawn in 1990 would give us fair and equal representation in the Congress and the Senate as well as help us address and solve the problems we face.	
9siskiyou_20110520_bergeron			no				
9siskiyou_20110520_burke			no				
9siskiyou_20110520_frink			no				
9siskiyou_20110520_tallerico	little shared interest with coastal neighbbors		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110521_boos	5212011	Paul and Margaret Boo	yes	ranch owners, Cold Creek Ranch	Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Have Siskiyou County be in the same Congressional District as Shasta, Tehama, Glean, Butte, Calusa, Yuba, and Sutter Counties; not with Del Norte and Humboldt
9siskiyou_20110521_criss	5212011	Brandon A. Criss	no			Siskiyou	yes	place Siskiyou County in legislative districts along I-5 with our rural neighbors with similar concerns and issues. Mainly and importantly Water Issues.
9humboldt_20110522_cahill	5222011	Pam Cahill	no		Bayside	Humboldt	yes	do not put the North Coast with the North Valley; put humboldt with Del Norte, Mendocino and Marin or Sonoma and Napa
9humboldt_20110522_kier	5222011	Bill Kier	no		Blue Lake	Humboldt	yes	the legitimate needs and goals of the coastal communities are far, far more common with one another than with the Valley-mountain communities.
9humboldt_20110522_luckens	5222011	Ben Luckens	no			Humboldt	yes	keep the congressional district that comprise the Redwood counties intact

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110521_boos	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, Glean, Butte, Calusa, Yuba, and Sutter			no	yes		have agriculture, ranching, water rights, water use issues, mining and timber economic interests in common; concerns over dams different than with coastal regions
9siskiyou_20110521_criss				no	yes		
9humboldt_20110522_cahill	Humboldt, Del Norte, Mendocino and Marin or Sonoma and Napa			no	yes	Hwy 101 is easier than traveling across the coastal range, especially during the winter months	Humboldts young, but important wine and beer industries matches Napa and Sonoma
9humboldt_20110522_kier				no	no		
9humboldt_20110522_luckens				no	yes		these counties are linked by a common landscape, economy and culture

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110521_boos			no				
9siskiyou_20110521_criss	If Siskiyou County were added to a coastal strip of counties in redistricting, this would dilute and negatively impact Siskiyou Countys voice in the California state legislature.		no				
9humboldt_20110522_cahill			no				
9humboldt_20110522_kier			no				schedule a public meeting in Eureka
9humboldt_20110522_luckens			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110517_auerbach	5172011	Barbara E. Auerbach	yes	member of the Area 1 Board for Developmental Disabilities		Mendocino	yes	leave the North Coast counties in the same Senate, Assembly and Congressional districts.
9mendocino_20110517_graw	5172011	Debra De Graw	yes	Chief Executive Officer, Mendocino Coast Chamber of Commerce		Mendocino	yes	(refer to Kelley House 139) strongly supports maintaining the historical integrity of our coastal area by keeping the present districts intact
9mendocino_20110522_coursey	5222011	Lynda and Don Coursey	no			Mendocino	yes	against redistricting to change northern California to an eastwest orientation; keep the 7 coastal counties intact
9mendocino_20110522_joint	5222011	Mel Susan McKinney and Cally Marc Dym	yes	Owners and operators of Little River Inn, a major tourist destination on the Mendocino Coast.		Mendocino	yes	oppose any redistricting of our Congressional and state legislator districts for Mendocino County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110517_auerbach				no	yes	similar weather, and environmental issues; not large cities with large population	Changing the district boundaries from the historical north-south to east-west will break down relationships that have taken years to build.
9mendocino_20110517_graw				no	no		
9mendocino_20110522_courses y	Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte			no	yes	In our current district we share bird, wildlife and marine protected areas	Mendocinos pasture-based agriculture and wine industries have inherent interests with Lake, Napa, and Yolo
9mendocino_20110522_joint				no	yes	eastwest travel to and from the I-5 corridor is horrendous any time of year, particular in winter; the 7 counties share geographical, commercial and environmental interests	These common interests, including a major sector of Californias Wine Industry,share the major highway corridor linking us to our neighboring counties of Lake, Napa and Yolo; this is the main corridor for commerce for the two industries.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110517_auerbach			no				
9mendocino_20110517_graw			no				
9mendocino_20110522_courses y	Our COIs, regional partnerships and coalitions encompass north-south transportation routes of Hwy 101 and 1 in the areas of tourism, recreation, fishing, and agriculture		no				
9mendocino_20110522_joint			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110522_martin	5222011	Shelley Martin	no		Albion	Mendocino	yes	keep the north south orientation on the 101 corridor rather than even thinking about and east west redistricting
9mendocino_20110522_mcconnell	5222011	Sallie McConnell	no			Mendocino	yes	(refer to De Graw 169)
9mendocino_20110522_rodin	5222011	Mari Rodin	yes	Mayor of Ukiah	Ukiah	Mendocino	yes	strongly opposed to changing northern Californias districts to an east-west orientation; continue to keep Mendocino and its neighboring counties of Lake, Napa and Yolo in the same Congressional District
9placer_20110520_freedle	5202011	Fran Freedle	no		Grass Valley	Nevada	yes	speaker 22 at the hearing in Auburn on May 19
9placer_20110522_mlakar	5222011	Joseph L. Mlakar	no		Roseville	Placer	yes	detach the southwestern end of Placer and El Dorado Counties from the largely rural AD, SD, CD that those cities are situated in presently; and place in Greater Sacramento Region
9sacramento_20110521_nakamura	5212011	J. Nakamura	no			Sacramento	yes	Please place part of Sacramento in another CD so that Vineyard CDP, which borders both Elk Grove and Florin CDP, can join Elk Grove, Florin CDP, Fruitridge Pocket CDP, Lemon Hill CDP, Parkway CDP, and the majority of Sacramento in one CD
9sacramento_20110522_aguilera	5222011	Neptaly Taty Aguilera	no			Sacramento	yes	supports the redistricting plan maps submitted by Latino Democratic Club from Sacramento.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110522_martin				no	yes	We have common interests, agriculture, geography and issues.	
9mendocino_20110522_mcconnell				no	no		
9mendocino_20110522_rodin				no	yes	current district bound by many mutual interests and yet encompass views from across the political spectrumtravel to I-5 corridor is difficult, especially during winter	Because of our geographic affinities, we have a long history of cross-county collaboration on a variety of issues of common interest
9placer_20110520_freedle				no	no		
9placer_20110522_mlakar		includes Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville and Granite Bay in Placer County and El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park and Shingle Springs in El Dorado County		no	yes		Commuting transportation and other typical urban and suburban issues are the order of the day in these districts
9sacramento_20110521_nakamura				no	yes		
9sacramento_20110522_aguilera				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110522_martin			no				
9mendocino_20110522_mcconnell			no				
9mendocino_20110522_rodin			no				
9placer_20110520_freedle			no				
9placer_20110522_mlakar	afore mentioned cities are rapidly growing suburban areas which should not be located within their present mostly rural districts		no				
9sacramento_20110521_nakamura	Vineyard CDP and Elk Grove should be in the same congressional district due to their demographic similarities		no				
9sacramento_20110522_aguilera			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110522_beach	5222011	Richard Beach	no			Sacramento	yes	keep Natomas a part of the city of Sacramento. It is a part of Sacramento not Citrus Hts or Folsom.
9sacramento_20110522_wong	5222011	Bill Wong	yes	Executive Director, Asian American Education Institute	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	take into consideration the interests of the communities in the finger when drawing lines and dont separate the finger from the larger South Sacramento community south of the American River
9shasta_20110521_meyer	5212011	Fred Ann Meyer	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Coastal, central corridor, and Sierra districts share within their boundaries, common resources, interests, mobility issues, economies, and cultural histories
9siskiyou_20110522_criss	5222011	Kerry Criss	no			Siskiyou	yes	leave our district intact in its current boundries; dont extend the upper tip of the state to include the coast

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110522_beach				no	yes	We work, shop and do business in Sacramento. We share the same needs as South Natomas and Sacramento.	
9sacramento_20110522_wong		Sacramento, unincorporated areas of f Fruitridge, Lemon Hill, Parkway and Florin		no	yes	These communities exist along Highway 99 and share the same local transportation routes, stores, restaurants and places of worship	
9shasta_20110521_meyer				no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110522_criss				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110522_beach			no				
9sacramento_20110522_wong	residents here are a minority urban community of interest and in this case the neighborhoods and region need to be united across oddly shaped city boundary line		no				Attached maps of our communities and density of Latino, African Americans and Asian American and Pacific Islanders in the South Sacramento area AND editorial from Sacramento Bee
9shasta_20110521_meyer	If these areas are represented by a horizontal delineation into 1 district, rather than the 3 districts, there will be no cohesive voice representing each of these unique and diverse areas in CA		no				
9siskiyou_20110522_criss			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110522_bell2	5222011	Marlene Bell	no		Winters	Yolo	yes	legislative district lines should follow along the I-80 corridor
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pm	5232011	Eric Parfrey	no		Stockton	San Joaquin County	yes	keep the major population centers of San Joaquin County in only one Assembly, Senate and Congressional district
9siskiyou_20110523_5pm	5232011	Michael N. Kobseff	yes	Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, District 3	Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Siskiyou County has the most in common with Shasta, and Tehama Counties
9shasta_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jan Hanks	no			Shasta	yes	The coummunities along I-5 and Highway 99 should be kept together rather than joined with the coastal areas.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110522_bell2				no	yes	These community conditions are more alike with their combined rural and urban characteristics than much of the rest of the state that is more rural in nature.	the student needs and financial conditions of the school districts in Solano and Yolo counties are more similar and almost completely dissimilar to the rural school districts of neighboring counties.
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pm		Stockton, Manteca, Lathrop, and Tracy would form a good Assembly district with about the right number of voters.		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110523_5pm	Siskiyou, Shasta, and Tehama			no	yes	Watersheds, Natural Resource usage, USFS lands and transportation highways share our common interests	
9shasta_20110523_5pm	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, Yuba and Sutter Counties should remain together as one district.			no	yes		Water resources are also a critical common interest.

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110522_bell2	none of the counties west of Sacramento and east of the Bay Area, compare to the traffictransportation concerns of the I-80 corridor.		no				
9sjoaquin_20110523_5pm			no				During the last redistricting of the city and county almost ten years ago, the entrenched powers shamelessly carved the city up like a Halloween pumpkin Attached 2002 column by Sacramento Bee columnist Dan Walters
9siskiyou_20110523_5pm	Coastal Counties and eastern Counties have different issues for decision making polices. While the counties to the east and west of Siskiyou are rural, that is all that we have in common		no				The 1 parity must not vary to 5. It will provide a negative election result scheme.
9shasta_20110523_5pm	The coastal mountains create a geographic divide.		no				As an independent commission please look at the plan drawn by independent judges in1990

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humbolt_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kevin Collins	yes	Vice President, Humboldt Fishermens Marketing Association		Humboldt	no	
9yolo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Mark Wilson	yes	COB, Wilson Farms and Vineyards	Clarksburg	Yolo	yes	Congressional District 1 should keep Yolo, Solano, Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte Counties within its borders
9yolo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Don Morrill	no			Yolo	yes	Link Napa, Lake and Yolo counties in one district both at the state and federal level
9yolo_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ann Brice	yes	former member of Yolo County Flood Control and Water Preservation District Board		Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County with current neighboring counties to its west, such as Lake and Napa
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	none	yes	Antelope Valley Board of Trade		Sacramento	no	
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	Alissa Ko	no			Sacramento	no	
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	Adolfo Mercado	no			Sacramento	no	
9sacramento_20110523_5pm	5232011	Kevin P. Nguyen	no			Sacramento	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humbolt_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9yolo_20110523_5pm	Yolo, Solano, Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte			no	yes	overlapping regional watershed issues that need consistent and coordinated attention and representation	general agricultural and natural resources centered economy of this region; wine grape growing, wine productionm marketing and support industries, and wine industry education and research (UC Davis)
9yolo_20110523_5pm	Napa, Lake and Yolo			no	yes	Growing and vital Viticulture Department at UCD facilitates an intellectural and scientific link	The mutual agricultural economic base of the 3 counties is dependent on the watersheds of Putah and Cache Creek they share
9yolo_20110523_5pm	Napa, Lake and Yolo			no	yes		
9sacramento_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9sacramento_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9sacramento_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9sacramento_20110523_5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humbolt_20110523_5pm			no				
9yolo_20110523_5pm			no				
9yolo_20110523_5pm			no				
9yolo_20110523_5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm			no				
9sacramento_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9placer_20110523_5pm	5232011	Claudia Taylor	no		Lake of the Pines	Placer	no	
9placer_20110523_5pm	5232011	Sheila McConnachie	no			Placer	no	
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Johnnie Hathcock	no			Lake	no	
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Lynette Matthews	no		Lucerne	Lake	no	
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Adckinjo Esutoki	no			Lake	no	
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Marta William	no		Middleton	Lake	no	
9lake_20110523_5pm	5232011	Denise Rushing	yes	District 3 Supervisor		Lake	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Donald McArthur	yes	Member, Board of Trustees for Del Norte County Unified School District		Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ralph Johansen	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Patricia McCleary	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Cindy Fox	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Jerry Cochran	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Ralph Johansen	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Martha McClure	yes	Supervisor of Del Norte County		Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Dean Wilson	yes	Sheriff of Del Norte County		Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Barry Wendell	no			Del Norte	no	
9dnorte_20110523_5pm	5232011	Joseph Aliott	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9placer_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9placer_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9lake_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9lake_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9lake_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9lake_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9lake_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		
9dnorte_20110523_5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9placer_20110523_5pm			no				
9placer_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9lake_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				
9dnorte_20110523_5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110222_scar	2222011	Suzanne Scar	yes	Chair, Chambers of Commerce Alliance of Ventura Santa Barbara Counties	-	Ventura	yes	do not split up cities in Ventura Santa Barbara Co.s
5ventura_20110322_nixon	3222011	Leigh Nixon	yes	President CEO, Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce - letter on behalf 800 member businesses	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep Ventura County, especially Simi Valley, in one AD, keep all Ventura Co cities in one SD; if need more pop for the second AD or for the SD, then go to Santa Barbara Co and NOT to LA County
5ventura_20110401_cushing	412011	Gary Cushing	no	-	Camarillo, school in Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura County together
5ventura_20110407_risolio	472011	Regina Risolio	yes	member of church based in Thousand Oaks	Westlake Village	Ventura	yes	keep Ventura County together
5ventura_20110413_thomson	4132011	Dick Thomson	yes	President, Ventura County Taxpayers Association	Ventura	Ventura	yes	make SD centered on Ventura County - pop is very close; make 2 AD out of this SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110222_scar	Santa Barbara, Ventura	cities in Ventura Santa Barbara Counties	-	no	yes	cities are communities in which residents share common concerns and policy objectives	-
5ventura_20110322_nixon	Ventura	Simi Valley	-	no	yes	cooperation between Ventura Co cities, share small city concerns, does NOT share metropolitan concerns of LA City County;	numerous councils and alliances working to improve quality of life and productivity of businesses
5ventura_20110401_cushing	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo	-	no	yes	thriving community groups across East County working together to make our cities better places to live, students at our 2 four-yr universities (CSU Channel Islands and California Lutheran University (CLU)) live throughout east County	-
5ventura_20110407_risolio	Ventura	Westlake Village, Newbury Park, Thousand Oaks, Conejo Valley	-	no	yes	cities in Ventura Co work together on faith-bases issues and disaster preparedness.	-
5ventura_20110413_thomson	Ventura	-	-	no	no	-	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110222_scar	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110322_nixon	Ventura Co. cities are aligned thru govt, commerce and social networks including county agencies, council of city governments, economic development collaborative, chamber of commerce alliance	-	no				
5ventura_20110401_cushing	Community of Interest is East County	-	no				
5ventura_20110407_risolio	splitting up Ventura would be like tearing apart a family	-	no				
5ventura_20110413_thomson	-	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110415_carrillo	4152011	Richard Carrillo	no	-	Port Hueneme	Ventura	yes	keep Port Hueneme, Oxnard, Ventura, and Santa Clara Valley togher
5sbarbara_20110406_voorhis	462011	Karen Voorhis	no	-	Santa Ynez Valley	Santa Barbara	yes	include all of Santa Barbara in one AD
5sbarbara_20110406_stimson	462011	Charles Stimson	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	keep Santa Barbara whole
5sbarbara_20110406_kuskey	462011	Garvan F. Kuskey	no	-	-	-	yes	keep Santa Barbara whole
5sbarbara_20110406_kopeikin	462011	Brian N Kopeikin, MD	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110406_engles	462011	Steven Engles	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara whole
5sbarbara_20110406_slaught	462011	K.Slaught	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110406_dillon	462011	Haddon Dillon	no	-	-	-	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110406_lynn	462011	Robert Lynn	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district, dont include Ventura
5sbarbara_20110407_leslie	472011	Lana Collins-Leslie	no	-	-	-	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110408_clark	482011	Dallas Clark	no	-	-	-	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110410_ezal	4102011	Kenan Ezal	no	-	-	-	yes	do not use copy 23rd district
5sbarbara_20110409_blois	492011	Jean Blois	no	-	-	-	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110415_carrillo	Ventura	Port Hueneme, Oxnard, Ventura, and Santa Clara Valley (Santa Paula, Fillmore, Piru, Saticoy), Nyeland Acres, El Rio	Highway 126	no	yes	residents of farm land go to bigger cities to shop, obtain services; colleges and universities all around, share county govt, hospitals, market placeshopping center	farming, beach cities Ox, PH, Ventura
5sbarbara_20110406_voorhis	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	yes	-	-
5sbarbara_20110406_stimson	Santa Barbara	Ventura, Oxnard	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110406_kuskey	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110406_kopeikin	Santa Barbara, North County	-	-	no	yes	balanced populace for future elections	-
5sbarbara_20110406_engles	Santa Barbara	Ventura, Oxnard	-	no	yes	beter self-governance	-
5sbarbara_20110406_slaught	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110406_dillon	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110406_lynn	Santa Barbara, Ventura	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110407_leslie	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110408_clark	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110410_ezal	-	-	-	no	yes	prevents one-party protection	-
5sbarbara_20110409_blois	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110415_carrillo	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_voorhis	currently split down the middle and neighboring communities at odds with one another	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_stimson	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_kuskey	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_kopeikin	closer community in Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_engles	closer community in Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_slaught	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_dillon	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_lynn	closer community in Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110407_leslie	closer community in Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110408_clark	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110410_ezal	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110409_blois	closer community in Santa Barbara	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110412_nelson	4122011	Mary Nelson	no	-	-	-	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110412_lloyd	4122011	James Lloyd-Butler	no	-	-	-	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110413_westby	4132011	James Westby	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110413_livingston	4132011	Joan Livingston	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110413_geyling	4132011	Rolf Geyling	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110413_burke	4132011	Bruce Jasmine Burke	no	-	-	-	yes	make Santa Barbara one district
5sbarbara_20110406_milligan	462011	Alice Milligan	no	-	-	-	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district, add southern San Luis Obispo County if necessary
5slo_20110407_carroll	472011	Sandra Carroll	no	-	Paso Robles	San Luis Obispo	yes	include Paso Robles in 23rd district
5slo_20110412_mullennix	4122011	Ted Mullennix	no	-	-	-	yes	prevent gerrymandering in Lois Capps Congressional District
5slo_20110414_ernst	4142011	Don Ernst	no	-	-	San Luis Obispo	yes	divide San Luis Obispo county at the Cuesta Grade, or combine with Monterey or Santa Barbara counties
5slo_20110414_clark	4142011	Julianna Clark	no	-	Atascadero	San Luis Obispo	yes	keep San Luis Obispo whole, if not, combine with Monterey not Kern County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110412_nelson	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110412_lloyd	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110413_westby	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110413_livingston	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110413_geyling	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110413_burke	-	-	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110406_milligan	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	no	-	-
5slo_20110407_carroll	San Luis Obispo, North County	Paso Robles, Bakersfield	-	no	no	closer association with Lois Capps than with Kevin McCarthy, events, friends, work in county	-
5slo_20110412_mullennix	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Monterey	-	-	no	yes	reform from safe district for Democrats	-
5slo_20110414_ernst	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura, Kern	-	Cuesta Grade	no	yes	-	similar agricultural, tourism, environmental interests
5slo_20110414_clark	San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Kern	Atascadero, Paso Robles, Edna Valley	Salinas River, Santa Margarita Lake, Nacimiento Lake	no	yes	Mothers for Peace organization, South County shopping, education, healthcare	shared water resources, shared employers (Cal Poly State University, PGE), family vineyard shared collaboration, tourism dollars

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110412_nelson	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110412_lloyd	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110413_westby	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110413_livingston	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110413_geyling	better representation in Assembly	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110413_burke	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110406_milligan	-	-	no				
5slo_20110407_carroll	Kevin McCarthy does not represent our views	-	no				
5slo_20110412_mullennix	current district doesnt reflect majority political views	-	no				
5slo_20110414_ernst	shared community interests	-	no				
5slo_20110414_clark	shared community interests	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5slo_20110411_ishkanian	4112011	Neighborhood Defense League of California (8 names)	yes	Neighborhood Defense League of California	-	-	yes	keep counties whole
5slo_20110413_stockdale	4132011	Dave Stockdale	no	-	-	San Luis Obispo	no	listen to the people
5sbarbara_20110413_thorn	4132011	Diana Thorn	no	-	-	San Luis Obispo	yes	correct gerrymandered 23rd district
5slo_20110413_wright	4132011	James Wright	no	-	San Jose	Santa Clara Co	yes	keep San Luis Obispo whole, add from Monterey and Santa Barbara for Senate and Congressional districts, add from Moterey for Assembly districts
5slo_20110411_whitaker	4112011	Charlotte Whitaker	no	-	Los Osos	San Luis Obispo	yes	include San Luis Obsipo in 23rd district
5slo_20110419_munak	4192011	Pearl Munak	no	-	Paso Robles	San Luis Obispo	yes	keep Bakersfield and San Luis Obispo in separate districts
5ventura_20110420_Oneal	4202011	Jenn ONeal	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110420_gonzales	4202011	Daniel Gonzales	no	-	-	-	yes	keep Simi Valley part of Ventura AND not with LA County
5ventura_20110420_goldstein	4202011	Clell Goldstein	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	keep Simi Valley part of Ventura AND not with LA County
5ventura_20110420_crosse	4202011	Douglas C. Crosse	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together AND not with LA County or West Ventura County
5ventura_20110422_snowflake	4222011	Misty Snowflake	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together (cities listed) and NOT with LA County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5slo_20110411_ishkanian	-	-	-	no	yes	accountability to the people, not special interests	-
5slo_20110413_stockdale	-	-	-	no	yes	accountability to the people	-
5sbarbara_20110413_thorn	-	-	-	no	no	-	-
5slo_20110413_wright	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Monterey, Ventura	-	Cuesta Grade, Conejo Grade	no	no	-	-
5slo_20110411_whitaker	San Luis Obispo	Los Osos	-	no	yes	-	shared coast and agriculture help commerce
5slo_20110419_munak	San Luis Obispo	Paso Robles, Bakersfield, San Luis Obispo	Highway 101, Highway 4146	no	yes	-	opposition to Big Farming interests
5ventura_20110420_Oneal	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	Highway 101, 118, 23, 24	no	yes	shared school, shopping locales	common business community
5ventura_20110420_gonzales	Ventura, NOT Los Angeles	-	-	no	yes	shared common facilities	-
5ventura_20110420_goldstein	Ventura, NOT Los Angeles	Simi Valley	-	no	yes	shared values	-
5ventura_20110420_crosse	Ventura, NOT Los Angeles	Moorpark, Simi Valley, Conejo Valley, Santa Rosa Valley	-	no	yes	common open space habitat areas, water suppliers, landfill	common business community
5ventura_20110422_snowflake	Ventura, and NOT Los Angeles	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley	-	no	yes	common community	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5slo_20110411_ishkanian	-	-	no				
5slo_20110413_stockdale	-	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110413_thorn	-	-	no				
5slo_20110413_wright	-	-	no				summary of SLO meeting
5slo_20110411_whitaker	shared community interests	-	no				
5slo_20110419_munak	shared agricultural interests	-	no				
5ventura_20110420_Oneal	shared community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110420_gonzales	shared community interests with Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110420_goldstein	shared values with Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110420_crosse	shared geography and economic interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110422_snowflake	shared geography and economic interests within East Ventura	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110422_martinez	4222011	Sue Martinez	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110422_little	4222011	Bill Little	no	-	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	keep Ventura whole
5ventura_20110424_gooch	4242011	Herbert Gooch	yes	Political Science Professor, Cal Lutheran University	-	Ventura	yes	keep Ventura County together, do not sever into east and west County
5ventura_20110425_haggerty	4252011	Greta Haggerty	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5sbarbara_20110414_fox	4142011	Randall Fox	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5ventura_20110403_turpel	432011	Pete Turpel	yes	Phone on Hold Marketing Systems	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110411_carlson	4112011	Steve Carlson	no	-	Moorpark	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110425_adams	4252011	Jan Adams	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5slo_20110426_carr	4262011	Roxanne Carr	yes	member, Cuesta College Foundation Board	Shell Beach	San Luis Obispo	yes	align Ventura with Santa Barbara, Monterey, Santa Cruz
5ventura_20110426_zeller	4262011	Beverly Zeller	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110426_zeller2	4262011	Don Zeller	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110422_martinez	Ventura	Simi Valley others cities of eastern Ventura County	-	no	yes	common community	-
5ventura_20110422_little	Ventura	Camarillo	-	no	yes	opposition to safe Hispanic district	-
5ventura_20110424_gooch	Ventura	-	-	no	yes	history, geography	business ties, agricultural industry
5ventura_20110425_haggerty	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	common community	-
5sbarbara_20110414_fox	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5ventura_20110403_turpel	Ventura	Conejo Valley, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	common land use, open space	-
5ventura_20110411_carlson	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo, Oak Park	-	no	yes	common publications	-
5ventura_20110425_adams	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	common shopping, entertainment, schools, police, fire and water districts	common business clientele
5slo_20110426_carr	Ventura, Monterey, Santa Cruz	Shell Beach	-	no	yes	common community colleges and four year universities	-
5ventura_20110426_zeller	Ventura	Simi Valley others cities of eastern Ventura County	-	no	yes	common governement representation	common roadways
5ventura_20110426_zeller2	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	common political views	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110422_martinez	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110422_little	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110424_gooch	common idenity and interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110425_haggerty	common idenity and interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110414_fox	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110403_turpel	similar land use and open space habits	-	no				
5ventura_20110411_carlson	shared media outlets	-	no				
5ventura_20110425_adams	common idenity and interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5slo_20110426_carr	shared educational interests	-	no				
5ventura_20110426_zeller	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110426_zeller2	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110426_burton	4262011	Pat and Vic Burton	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110426_howard	4262011	Tamara Howard	no	-	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110427_rumbley	4272011	Sally A Rumbley-Woodin	no	-	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	keep district within Ventura, instead of skinny corridor that crosses three county lines
5ventura_20110427_moriarty	4272011	Louise Moriarty	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep Moorpark and Simi Valley together
5ventura_20110427_speakman	4272011	Ron D. Speakman	yes	member, board of trustees for Pleasant Valley School District	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	keep Camarillo with Eastern Ventura Co
5ventura_20110428_ziegler	4282011	R.W. Ziegler Jr.	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	combine northern Ventura and Santa Barbara
5ventura_20110428_cordia	4282011	Joann Cordia	no	-	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep Thousand Oaks and Camarillo together
5ventura_20110428_frields	4282011	Forrest Frields	no	-	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110426_burton	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley	-	no	yes	common shopping and social circles	-
5ventura_20110426_howard	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	common social network	common business
5ventura_20110427_rumbley	Ventura	Oxnard	-	no	no	-	-
5ventura_20110427_moriarty	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark	-	no	yes	similar geography	-
5ventura_20110427_speakman	Ventura	Camarillo, Oxnard	-	no	yes	common school system, but want to sever Pleasant Valley School District from Oxnard School System	-
5ventura_20110428_ziegler	Ventura, Santa Barbara	Oxnard, Ventura, Santa Barbara, Santa Maria	Highway 101	no	yes	geographic, lifestyle, public facilities	business clientele
5ventura_20110428_cordia	Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Camarillo	Conejo Grade is travel corridor between 2 communities(for commuting and shopping)	no	yes	shopping facilities	public roads
5ventura_20110428_frields	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	similar views, values, needs	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110426_burton	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110426_howard	shared geography and economic interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110427_rumbley	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110427_moriarty	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110427_speakman	shared educational interests in East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110428_ziegler	shared professional and economic interests within Ventura and Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110428_cordia	shared transportation within Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110428_frields	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110430_lacayo	4302011	Henry L. Lacayo	yes	state president, Congress of California Seniors	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	For CD combine San Luis Obispo with Santa Barbara, not Monterey; make CD out of Ventura County except Oak Park potentially Thousand Oaks (those can go with LA County); CD of Conejo ValleyWest San Fernando Valley
5ventura_20110502_jelloian	522011	Paul Jelloian	no	-	Porter Ranch	Los Angeles	yes	keep Porter Ranch, Granada Hills, Northridge, and Chatsworth in same district as East Ventura Santa Clarita Valley
5ventura_20110502_jelloian2	522011	Carol Jelloian	no	-	Porter Ranch	Los Angeles	yes	combine northern San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita Valley and eastern Ventura county
5sbarbara_20110503_lynn	532011	Robert Lynn	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together, dont combine with Ventura
5sbarbara_20110503_pelt	532011	Doug Van Pelt	yes	realtor, Prudential California Realty	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_duncan	532011	Robert Duncan	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_malmo	532011	John R. Malmo	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110430_lacayo	Ventura, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey	Ventura, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, El Rio in one CD (Ventura Co wout Conejo Valley); Conejo Valley (Thousand Oaks, Oak Park) in another CD with West San Fernando Valley	ConejoWest SF Valley CD Highway 101 from Thousand Oaks to Woodland Hills, to Encino and up the west side of 405	no	yes	common ethnic community in Monterey, Santa Barbara, also in Ventura Co w out Conejo Valley	#NAME?
5ventura_20110502_jelloian	Ventura, Los Angeles	Porter Ranch, Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Eastern Ventura County (no cities names), Santa Clarita	-	no	yes	interests, suburban make-up, major transportation corridors	-
5ventura_20110502_jelloian2	Ventura, Los Angeles	Porter Ranch	-	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110503_lynn	Ventura, Santa Barbara	-	Highway 101	no	no	-	-
5sbarbara_20110503_pelt	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_duncan	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_malmo	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110430_lacayo	shared community interests	Monterey should be included with other counties with high Latino populations	yes	Montere y	Monterey with other large Latino populations, not SLO County		
5ventura_20110502_jelloian	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura and Porter Ranch	-	no				
5ventura_20110502_jelloian2	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura and Porter Ranch	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_lynn	shared geography and community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_pelt	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_duncan	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_malmo	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110503_hadley	532011	Mike Hadley	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_bleecker	532011	Alan Bleecker	yes	President, Capitol Hardware, Inc.	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_hansen	532011	Arne Hansen	no	-	Solvang	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_burke	532011	Bruce Burke	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_evans	532011	Janice Evans	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_mender	532011	Mari Mender	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_wilczak	532011	John Wilczak	no	-	Santa Ynez	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_freudenstein	532011	William Freudenstein	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110503_hadley	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_bleecker	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_hansen	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_burke	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_evans	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_mender	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_wilczak	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_freudenstein	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110503_hadley	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_bleecker	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_hansen	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_burke	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_evans	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_mender	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_wilczak	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_freudenstein	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110503_naylor	532011	Peter Naylor	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_byrne	532011	Sharon Byrne	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5ventura_20110503_hicks	532011	William Hicks	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5sbarbara_20110503_mccene y	532011	Kevin McCeney	yes	commerical fisherman	Goleta	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5ventura_20110503_tash	532011	Debra Tash	yes	vice president, GT Water Products	-	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5sbarbara_20110503_stclair	532011	Richard Patricia St. Clair	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	include entire Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110503_wilson	532011	Michael Wilson	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_watson	532011	Tom Watson	no	-	Summerland	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110503_gallivan	532011	William and Karen Gallivan	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110503_naylor	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_byrne	Santa Barbara, Ventura	Oxnard, Santa Maria	-	no	yes	current constituencies do not represent local voice	-
5ventura_20110503_hicks	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	geography, social, political views	-
5sbarbara_20110503_mccene y	Santa Barbara	Goleta	-	no	no	-	commerical business
5ventura_20110503_tash	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	geography, social, political views	-
5sbarbara_20110503_stclair	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	history	-
5sbarbara_20110503_wilson	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_watson	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Summerland	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110503_gallivan	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110503_naylor	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_byrne	shared geography and community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110503_hicks	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_mccene y	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110503_tash	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_stclair	shared geography and community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_wilson	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_watson	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_gallivan	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110503_matoesian	532011	Audrey Matoesian	no	-	Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	combine northwest San Fernando Valley with East Ventura and Santa Clarita Valley
5ventura_20110503_hilborn	532011	Paul Hilborn	no	-	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep together Thousand Oaks, West Hills, Westlake Village, Chatsworth, and Simi Valley
5sbarbara_20110504_oliverio	542011	Catherine and Paul Oliverio	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110504_havlik	542011	Jeff Havlik	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110504_chrisitianson	542011	Eric Chrisitianson	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110504_hyslop	542011	Steve Hyslop	yes	Owner, Chucks Waterfront Grill and The Endless Summer bar-caf	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110505_serena	552011	Frank A. Serena	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110503_matoesian	Ventura	Chatsworth	-	no	no	-	-
5ventura_20110503_hilborn	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, West Hills, Westlake Village, Chatsworth, and Simi Valley	-	no	yes	feel of close-knit community great places to raise families	-
5sbarbara_20110504_oliverio	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110504_havlik	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110504_chrisitianson	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110504_hyslop	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110505_serena	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110503_matoesian	shared geography and community interests within Ventura, Santa Clarita Valley, northwestern San Fernando Valley	-	no				
5ventura_20110503_hilborn	better political representation through one district with West Hills, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Chatsworth, Simi Valley	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_oliverio	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_havlik	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_chrisitianson	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_hyslop	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110505_serena	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110505_nelson	552011	Mary Nelson	no	-	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	keep Santa Barbara together in one AD
5ventura_20110505_hirsch	552011	Josie Hirsch	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5sbarbara_20110503_lynn	552011	John Wrench	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110505_grange	552011	Clinton La Grange	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110505_clair	552011	Marsha St Clair	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110505_hassebrock	552011	Robert Hassebrock	yes	Pacific Area Manager, QHSSE	Santa Paula	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110504_gandrud	542011	Gregory Gandrud	no	-	Carpinteria	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5ventura_20110504_golden	542011	Carrie Golden	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5sbarbara_20110504_clark	542011	Dallas Clark	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110505_nelson	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Camarillo	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5ventura_20110505_hirsch	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	shopping, entertainment, lifestyle	unified business culture
5sbarbara_20110503_lynn	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110505_grange	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110505_clair	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110505_hassebrock	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Maria	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110504_gandrud	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Carpinteria	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5ventura_20110504_golden	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	rural communities, public facilities, community organizations, non-profits	-
5sbarbara_20110504_clark	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110505_nelson	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110505_hirsch	shared geographic and economic interests in East Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_lynn	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110505_grange	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110505_clair	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110505_hassebrock	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_gandrud	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110504_golden	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_clark	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110504_kopeikin	542011	Robin Kopeikin	yes	Managing Director, First Republic Investment Management	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	include Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5sbarbara_20110504_kopeikin2	542011	Brian N. Kopeikin	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	include Santa Barbara in 35th assembly district
5ventura_20110504_golden2	542011	Ronald Golden	yes	previous board of director, United Way of Ventury County	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Ventura Co in 1 CD; East Ventura Co together in 1 AD if need pop for that AD go to NW SF ValleyChatsworth Porter Ranch (most in common w E Ventura Co); for SD East Ventura Co, NW SF Valley, Santa Clarita Valley; diff AD,SD for coastW Vent Co
5sbarbara_20110503_secord	532011	Dan B. Secord	yes	retired city councilmember, Santa Barbara	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together, add from Nipomo or Ojai
5ventura_20110504_green	542011	Kari Green	no	-	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5sbarbara_20110504_oliver	542011	Robert Oliver	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110504_todd	542011	Sheralia J. Todd	no	--	Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110504_mars	542011	Melinda and Dean Mars	no	-	Montecito	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110504_kopeikin	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110504_kopeikin2	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5ventura_20110504_golden2	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo, and Santa Rosa Valley; also Chatsworth and Porter Ranch	-	no	yes	geography, rural lifestyle	business community, transportation
5sbarbara_20110503_secord	Santa Barbara	-	-	no	no	-	-
5ventura_20110504_green	Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, West Hills, Canoga Park, Chatsworth	cities that border Topanga Canyon Blvd and Highways 118, 23, 101	no	yes	shopping, entertainment, dining	-
5sbarbara_20110504_oliver	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110504_todd	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Maria	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110504_mars	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Montecito	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110504_kopeikin	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_kopeikin2	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110504_golden2	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110503_secord	increased political cohesion within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110504_green	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_oliver	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_todd	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110504_mars	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110506_mourad	562011	A. George and Leona Mourad	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5ventura_20110509_coutts	592011	Robert F. Coutts	no	-	Oak Park	Ventura	yes	keep communites near Santa Monica mountains together (see list) and do not put with San Fernando Valley
5sbarbara_20110509_large	592011	Douglas B. Large	yes	Archbald Spray LLP	-	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110508_hodges	582011	David Alan Hodges	no	-	-	Santa Barbara	yes	combine Santa Barbara and Ventura counties
5sbarbara_20110508_vierra	582011	David J. Vierra	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5sbarbara_20110506_taylor	562011	James A. Taylor	no	--	Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	keep Santa Barbara together in one AD (same wording as nelson 96)
5ventura_20110509_mccombs	592011	Nell McCombs	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	keep Ventura city and county together in districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110506_mourad	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5ventura_20110509_coutts	Ventura	Oak Park, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabassas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, and Malibu	-	no	yes	Santa Monica Mountains (stewardship of ecology, wildlife corridor, watersheds); Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments - disaster management fire safety;share sherriff, fire stations, water and sewer services; united through Las Virgenes USD	-
5sbarbara_20110509_large	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110508_hodges	Santa Barbara, Ventura	Oxnard, Ventura	Highway 101	no	yes	shared history, cultural community	-
5sbarbara_20110508_vierra	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5sbarbara_20110506_taylor	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Cerritos	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5ventura_20110509_mccombs	Ventura	-	-	no	no	-	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110506_mourad	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110509_coutts	shared geography and community interests within communities of West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110509_large	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110508_hodges	shared geography and cultural interests within coastal Santa Barbara and coastal Ventura	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110508_vierra	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5sbarbara_20110506_taylor	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110509_mccombs	shared geography within Ventura	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110509_brudnicki	592011	Cathy Brudnicki	no	-	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	combine East Ventura and Los Angeles, West Ventura and Santa Barbara
5ventura_20110508_richardson	582011	Jacquie Richardson	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together, and NOT w LA County
5ventura_20110506_fowble	562011	Dave Fowble	no	-	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	keep Camarillo and Oxnard in separate AD, SD
5ventura_20110511_sarian	5112011	Ann Sarian	no	-	Oak Park	Ventura	yes	combine Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Newbury Park, Agoura Hills, and Camarillo into one district, and for more pop add Chatsworth
5ventura_20110511_kunicki	5112011	Dean Kunicki	yes	retired Simi Valley Planning Commissioner, member of Ventura Co Board of Ed	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110511_ellis	5112011	Kathy Ellis	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110511_daily	5112011	Stanley J. Daily	no	-	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Camarillo with Thousand Oaks and NOT with Oxnard
5ventura_20110510_lin	5102011	Elaine Lin	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	combine Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Oak Park, Agoura Hills, and Camarillo into one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110509_brudnicki	Ventura, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara	Thousand Oaks	Conejo Grade is natural divider and psychological divider	no	no	East Ventura goes to LA for services, West Ventura goes to Santa Barbara	-
5ventura_20110508_richardson	Ventura, and NOT LA Co	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	values, community	economic interests
5ventura_20110506_fowble	Ventura	Camarillo, not w Oxnard	-	no	yes	want different school district from Oxnard	-
5ventura_20110511_sarian	Ventura, Los Angeles	Oak Park, Wood Ranch, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Newbury Park, Agoura Hills, Camarillo, Chatsworth	Highway 118, 23	no	yes	geography, easily accessible by freeway, want same things, enjoy safety	-
5ventura_20110511_kunicki	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	values, ideals	business interests
5ventura_20110511_ellis	Ventura	Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Camarillo	-	no	yes	geography, vaules	freeways
5ventura_20110511_daily	Ventura	Camarillo w Thousand Oaks, not w Oxnard	-	no	yes	different interests from Oxnard - Oxnard exclude Camarillo from use of Port	-
5ventura_20110510_lin	Ventura	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Oak Park, Agoura Hills, Camarillo	Highways 118, 23, 101 connect these cities	no	yes	community	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110509_brudnicki		-	no				
5ventura_20110508_richardson	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110506_fowble	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110511_sarian	shared geography and community interests within Newbury Park, Agoura Hills, Camarillo	-	no				
5ventura_20110511_kunicki	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110511_ellis	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110511_daily	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110510_lin	shared geography and community interests within Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Oak Park, Agoura Hills, Camarillo	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110509_hernandez	592011	Michael Hernandez	no	-	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep Simi Valley and Moorpark in one district
5ventura_20110512_collins	5122011	Allyne Collins	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	combine Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Camarillo, Moorpark and Newbury Park into one district
5ventura_20110512_buol	5122011	W. Buol	no	-	Moorpark	Ventura	no	rarely go into LA, go to Santa Barbara Co first
5ventura_20110512_lindeen	5122011	Gordon R. Lindeen	yes	attorney, Gordon R. Lindeen	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	keep Ventura County together
5ventura_20110512_ziegler	5122011	Elaine McKearn	no	-	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	How to divide Ventura Co into 5 districts (supervisoral presumably)
5ventura_20110506_cityofthousandoaks	562011	Andrew P. Fox	yes	mayor, City of Thousand Oaks	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	keep Thousand Oaks part of Ventura and NOT with LA County; keep Ventura County whole in one district; if have to split Ventura County split into west and east
5ventura_20110427_genstil	4272011	Mary C. Genstil	no	-	Thousand OaksNewbury Park	Ventura	yes	keep Ventura County together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110509_hernandez	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark	-	no	yes	school, shopping districts	working community
5ventura_20110512_collins	Ventura	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Camarillo, Moorpark, Newbury Park	Highway 101, 118, 23	no	yes	geography	-
5ventura_20110512_buol	Ventura, Santa Barbara, NOT Los Angeles	Moorpark connected in the following order with Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Ventura, Carpenteria, Santa Barbara, Westlake	-	no	no	-	-
5ventura_20110512_lindeen	Ventura	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, etc	-	no	yes	government services, non-profits, fire and police districts	business interests
5ventura_20110512_ziegler	Ventura	Thousand Oaks	-	no	yes	public facilites, government services, environmnet	-
5ventura_20110506_cityofthousandoaks	Ventura, NOT Los Angeles	Conejo Valley cities in LA County (Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Hidden Hills, Calabasas); West Ventura Co (Ventura, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Ojai, Santa Paula, Fillmore); East Ventura Co Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark and Camarillo)	West Ventura Co connected by hwy 126; east ventura Co connected by hwy 23 which connects 118 on north (at Simi Valley) and 101 on south (at Thousand Oaks)	no	yes	Ventura Co cities share public facilities, cultural background, common fire, police departments; West Ventura Co tourism, coastal and agr areas, military installations; East Ventura Co bedroom, commuter area, biotech, science, tech industries.	Ventura Co same socio-economic levels; West vs East Ventura Co (see previous column for economic differences); SF Valley is suburb vs Thousand Oaks which is surrounded by recreational open space
5ventura_20110427_genstil	Ventura	Newbury ParkThousand Oaks	-	no	yes	better political representation	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110509_hernandez	shared geography and community interests within Moorpark and Simi Valley	-	no				
5ventura_20110512_collins	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110512_buol	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110512_lindeen	shared geography and community interests within Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110512_ziegler	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110506_cityofthousandoaks	shared geography and community interests within Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110427_genstil	shared geography and community interests within Ventura	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110508_mccormack	582011	Michael McCormack	no	-	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	yes	keep Santa Barbara together
5ventura_20110503_vandeman	532011	Gary Vandermann	no	-	Goleta	Santa Barbara	no	listen to the people and not special interests
5ventura_20110513_cowley	5132011	Jeri Cowley	no	-	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110515_cruz	5152011	Raymond Cruz	yes	member, Central Committee District 4	-	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5ventura_20110514_faulkner	5142011	Pamela_Faulkner	no	-	-	Ventura	yes	keep East Ventura together
5slo_20110419_ashbaugh	4192011	John Ashbaugh	yes	San Luis Obispo City Council, Vice Mayor, but speaking for self not city	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	no	city and county should be kept whole unite with others dependent on Nacimiento Water Project; if split county dont use Cuesta Grade; for CD align NS with Monterey andor Santa Barbara
6kern_20110322_greenlining	3222011	Greenlining Institute, Dolores Huerta Foundation, Clean Water and Air Matter	yes	Greenlining Institute, Dolores Huerta Foundation, Clean Water and Air Matter			no	
6stanislaus_20110404_lefevre	442011	Bob and Mary LeFevre	no				no	use county lines, then natural borders like rivers, then large highways, dont use residential streets like Rose Ave in Modesto currently separates CD 18 and CD 19, and dont break up towns and cities unless above a certain pop

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110508_mccormack	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	-	no	yes	minority voice is heard	-
5ventura_20110503_vandeman	-	-	-	no	no	-	-
5ventura_20110513_cowley	Ventura	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Moorpark	-	no	yes	shopping, entertainment, social views	-
5ventura_20110515_cruz	Ventura	-	-	no	yes	shared community interests, educational goals	-
5ventura_20110514_faulkner	Ventura	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Moorpark	-	no	yes	common interests	-
5slo_20110419_ashbaugh	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo		no	yes	share Salinas Watershed, media markets	
6kern_20110322_greenlining				no	no		
6stanislaus_20110404_lefevre	Stanislaus	Modesto	Rose Ave - bad divider	yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110508_mccormack	prevent dilution of minority vote; similar community interests within Santa Barbara	-	no				
5ventura_20110503_vandeman	-	-	no				
5ventura_20110513_cowley	shared geography and community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110515_cruz	shared community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5ventura_20110514_faulkner	shared community interests within East Ventura	-	no				
5slo_20110419_ashbaugh			no				
6kern_20110322_greenlining			no				hold meeting in Bakersfield because it has had huge growth and will allow residents in around to provide input, and activity community there who wants to provide input
6stanislaus_20110404_lefevre			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6stanislaus_20110411_gardner	4112011	Cathy Gardner	no			Stanislaus	yes	use county lines, keep valley, coast, and Bay Area counties separate
6stanislaus_20110415_miller	4152011	Donna Miller	no		Patterson (West Side of Modesto)	Stanislaus	yes	keep Modesto area together
6sjoaquin_20110404_trezza	442011	William Trezza	yes	CEO, Bank of Agriculture Commerce	Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	keep Stockton and SJ County whole; currently split between districts to northeast and south and biggest city and county in those districts is underrepresented, and no current reps live in Stockton
6sjoaquin_20110415_aliferis	4152011	Alex Aliferis	yes	One San Joaquin County, also Greek Orthodox community	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	keep SJ County whole, 1 CD, 1 SD, and 2 AD, SJ Co is a community of interest

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6stanislaus_20110411_gardner	Stanislaus, Monterey, Contra Costa, Santa Cruz	Riverbank		no	yes	central valley issue is water, Central Coast issue is Environment, Contra Costa Co issue is transportation	
6stanislaus_20110415_miller	Stanislaus	Modesto area		no	yes	despite economic downturn have vibrant community that has taken back the schools, streets and parks, spruced up homes, has local festivals, play, music	18.1 unemployment in Modesto area, really closer to 25
6sjoaquin_20110404_trezza	SJ County	Stockton		no	no		
6sjoaquin_20110415_aliferis	SJ County	Stockton, Lodi, Tracy, Manteca, and surrounding farms; community does NOT include Dublin or Pleasanton		no	yes	Greek Orthodox community based at church in Stockton - members all live in SJ Co	many SJ Co residents own farmland

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6stanislaus_20110411_gardner			no				
6stanislaus_20110415_miller	diverse community of Modesto area created new vibrant community together		no				
6sjoaquin_20110404_trezza			no				
6sjoaquin_20110415_aliferis	economy of Co depends on reps based in Co that will fight for it	draws district south of SJ Co that meets federal requirements (assuming this means Sect 2 and 5 of VRA) and allows SJ Co to stay separate and whole	yes	Merced	compliance (with federal law)		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6sjoaquin_20110415_harrington	4152011	Joseph Harrington	yes	President CEO, Lodi Memorial Hospital	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	keep SJ County whole
6sjoaquin_20110415_martin	4152011	Manuel Martin	no			San Joaquin	yes	keep SJ County whole, 1 CD, 1 SD, and 2 AD
6sjoaquin_20110415_wiley	4152011	Donald J. Wiley	yes	President CEO St. Josephs Medical Center	Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	keep SJ County whole, 1 CD, 1 SD, and 2 AD
6sjoaquin_20110417_wright	4172011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
6kern_20110414_wright	4142011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6sjoaquin_20110415_harrington	SJ County	Stockton, Lodi, Galt (Sac Co), Ione (Amador Co)	I-5 and 99 bind county	no	yes	share common history culture going back to statehood, share education, share I-5 and 99 corridors, share health care system (hospitals, clinics (incl. in GaltIone), SJ Med Society (prof org of MDs in Co since 1874),UOP Pharm School and Health Sciences)	share agriculture, share hardships of unemployment, foreclosures, water shortages
6sjoaquin_20110415_martin	SJ County	Stockton, Lodi, Tracy, Manteca, Acampo, Lockeford, Clements, Escalon, Linden, Ripon, Galt (Sac Co)		no	yes	culture stems from agriculture	ag unites all SJ Co into one COI; prod 1.5 billionyear crops - sign co prod level nationly; Co depend both crops livestockpoultry; 90 of SJ Co farmland, incl in cities; Farm Bureau UC Ext Prog serves Co since 1914; youth active 4-H FFA orgs
6sjoaquin_20110415_wiley	SJ County	Stockton		yes	yes	hospital service areas connect communities in SJ Co; Stockton neighborhoods, school districts, hospital service areas (currently cut up)	Stockton worse foreclosure crisis in nation
6sjoaquin_20110417_wright				no	no		
6kern_20110414_wright				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6sjoaquin_20110415_harrington	current districts split up this community		no				
6sjoaquin_20110415_martin	all residents of Co share common interest in agriculture		no				
6sjoaquin_20110415_wiley	no elected reps live in SJ Co; current districts cut through neighborhoods, school districts and hospital services areas within Stockton		no				
6sjoaquin_20110417_wright			no				Merced meeting summary
6kern_20110414_wright			no				Bakersfield meeting summary

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6sjoaquin_20110419_vogel	4192011	Ken Vogel	yes	Sup of district 4, SJ Co Board of Supervisors		San Joaquin	no	To get 2 AD, east SJ Co might fit better with Amador Calavers Cos
6kern_20110419_hurst	4192011	Susan Russell Hurst	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern County
6fresno_20110415_wright	4152011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
6madera_20110418_dolph	4182011	Terry Dolph	no		Madera	Madera	yes	Madera County remain whole
6sjoaquin_20110420_park	4202011	Linton Park	no		Tracy	San Joaquin	yes	San Joaquin County remain whole, 1 CD, 2 AD, and 1 SD
6sjoaquin_20110420_coldani	4202011	Steve Coldani	yes	Coldani Realtors	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	San Joaquin County remain whole, 1 CD, 1 SD, and 1AD
6sjoaquin_20110421_zarczynski	4212011	Jan Zarczynski	no		Ripon	San Joaquin	yes	1 SD, 2 AD, and 1 CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6sjoaquin_20110419_vogel	SJ, Amador, Calaveras			no	no	Mother Lode League for high school sports includes all HS in Amador Calavares Co.s and Linden School Dist which is much of east SJ Co.	agri-tourism industry - built on small wineries and growing in all 3 counties
6kern_20110419_hurst	Kern County	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6fresno_20110415_wright				no	no		
6madera_20110418_dolph	Madera, Merced, Fresno, Mariposa, Stanislaus	City of Madera		no	yes	diversity of Madera County	Madera City has unemployment of 22, County is 17.7 - so to have adequate representation keep county together
6sjoaquin_20110420_park	SJ County		Delta R., Altamont, N. ag., E. Foothills, Stanislaus R.	no	yes	County residents look within SJ County for jobs, trans., services, entertainment due to the inaccessibility of outside population centers	Share agriculture
6sjoaquin_20110420_coldani	SJ County			no	yes		Agriculture most imp. common interest, and also provides a network of jobs within county
6sjoaquin_20110421_zarczynski	SJ County	Ripon, Tracy, Manteca	580 through Tracy	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6sjoaquin_20110419_vogel			no				
6kern_20110419_hurst	interests and concerns more in line with Kern Co than LA or San Bern Co		no				
6fresno_20110415_wright			no				Hanford meeting summary
6madera_20110418_dolph	if make foothill district then segregate whitenon-hispanic from communities of color		no				
6sjoaquin_20110420_park	more efficient and fair to have less officials involved		no				
6sjoaquin_20110420_coldani	economy depends on agriculture		no				
6sjoaquin_20110421_zarczynski	Share water concerns due to farming industry; unique housing concerns dif. from San Ramon, Blackhawk, etc		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6sjoaquin_20110421_herche	4212011	Jesse Herche	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep SJ County whole, 1 CD, 1 AD, and 1 SD
6merced_20110420_jabs	4202011	Jacque Jabs	no		Merced	Merced	yes	Keep communities along the 1-5 corridor together, 1 CD
6kern_20110421_roper	4212011	Celeste Roper	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Kern county whole and separate from San Bernadino or LA
6kern_20110421_acton	4212011	Lori Acton	no			Kern	yes	Keep Kern County whole, 1 AD, 1 SD, 1 CD
6kern_20110422_butterfield	4222011	Richard Maryann Butterfield	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Kern County whole, and separate from San Bernadino and LA
6kern_20110510_mulvihill	5102011	Thomas Mulvihill	yes	Indian Wells Valley Water District		Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110512_scherry	5122011	Jackie Scherry	yes	Mickeys Pub and Grill	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6sjoaquin_20110421_herche	SJ County			no	no		
6merced_20110420_jabs			EastWest bad divider	no	no		
6kern_20110421_roper	Kern		Indian Wells Valley should not be aligned with another county	no	yes		
6kern_20110421_acton	Kern	Bakersfield	EastWest bad divider	no	yes		
6kern_20110422_butterfield	Kern	California City, Mojave, Tehachapi, Isabella, and Bakersfield		no	yes	Nothing in common with the political and welfare attitudes of LASan Bernadino	Rural area
6kern_20110510_mulvihill	Kern	Bakersfield, Tehachapi, Mojave, and Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110512_scherry	Kern	see comment 24		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6sjoaquin_20110421_herche	Political issues involved in splitting up the growing county; partisan concerns		no				
6merced_20110420_jabs			no				
6kern_20110421_roper	Services, courts, and voting issues - should remain within the Kern county to better provide for its residents		no				
6kern_20110421_acton	Helps create a balance between rural and urban areas that promotes regional economic growth, delivery of services, and quality of life		no				
6kern_20110422_butterfield	Established connections with particular interests that do not match the big politics of LASan Bernadino		no				
6kern_20110510_mulvihill	share county resources and services; Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake; Edwards Air Force Base; Keeping Ridgecrest together makes sense from a water standpoint		no				
6kern_20110512_scherry	see comment 24		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110513_bennett	5132011	Jan Albert Bennett	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110513_christensen	5132011	Richard Christensen	no		Rosamond	Kern	yes	Keep Rosamond with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110513_corlett	5132011	Deborah Corlett	yes	Carriage Inn	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110513_gates	5132011	Deb Gates	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110513_schultz	5132011	Marjorie Jerry Schultz - each sent email	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110513_smith	5132011	John Smith	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110513_weaver	5132011	Judy Weaver	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110513_wojciehowski	5132011	James Wojciehowski	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest and Indian Wells Valley with rest of kern
6kern_20110514_brown	5142011	Samuel Brown	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110513_bennett	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110513_christensen	Kern	Rosamond		no	no		
6kern_20110513_corlett	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110513_gates	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110513_schultz	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110513_smith	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes	Conservative county	Naval Air Air Force Center - China Lake major employer
6kern_20110513_weaver	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110513_wojciehowski	Kern	Ridgecrest and Indian Wells Valley		no	yes	Philosophically, culturally, and politically similar to the rest of Kern; dissimilar to LASan Bernadino	
6kern_20110514_brown	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110513_bennett	Navy Base at China Lake; law enforcement, parks, economic development, education, and veterans services and many of the departments of Kern County are integrally connected to these activities		no				
6kern_20110513_christensen			no				
6kern_20110513_corlett	see comment 24		no				
6kern_20110513_gates			no				
6kern_20110513_schultz			no				
6kern_20110513_smith			no				
6kern_20110513_weaver			no				
6kern_20110513_wojciehowski			no				
6kern_20110514_brown	agriculture, defense, resources		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110514_cabral	5142011	Raul Cabral	no		N. Bakersfield	Kern	no	
6kern_20110514_anonymous	5142011	Anonymous	no			Kern	no	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110514_kinley-wood	5142011	Nancy Kinley-Wood	no			Kern	yes	Include Antelope Valley as its own district; Victor Valley as its own district; High Desert Senate separate from Santa Clarita; 2 AD, 2 SD
6kern_20110514_lane	5142011	Dale Lane	no		Bakersfield	Kern	yes	Keep Kern county whole and separate from LASan Bernadino
6kern_20110514_long	5142011	Everett and Ann Long	no			Kern	yes	Keep Indian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110514_cabral				yes	yes	Westchester minorities (Gays, Latinos, and African-Americans) Wants COI issue addressed since he describes this community as having a smaller voice	
6kern_20110514_anonymous	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110514_kinley-wood	Kern	Palmdale, Lancaster, Rosamond, Mojave, Boron and California City; Victorville, Hesperia, Adelanto, Apple Valley and Barstow		no	yes		
6kern_20110514_lane	Kern	Bakersfield		no	yes		
6kern_20110514_long	Kern	Ridgecrest, Inyokern, and China Lake Navy Base		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110514_cabral			no				
6kern_20110514_anonymous			no				
6kern_20110514_kinley-wood	more like the Central Valley than the rest of Los Angeles due to agriculture, water and air policy needs.		no				
6kern_20110514_lane	personal relationship with Bakersfield representatives; no common interests with outside metropolitan areas		no				
6kern_20110514_long	strong historic ties and want to remain voters with the rest of Kern County		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6sjoaquin_20110406_weatherford	462011	Willy Weatherford	yes	Mayor of Manteca; Manteca City Council	Manteca	San Joaquin	yes	Keep San Joaquin County whole; less districts than the current 3AD, 2SD, and 2CD would better serve the area
6sjoaquin_20110514_hodson	5142011	Sharon Hodson	no			San Joaquin	yes	Keep Stockton, Tracy, Lathrop, and French Camp together
6kern_20110501_lowry	512011	Barry Lowry	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6sjoaquin_20110501_baumbach	512011	Lorey Baumbach	no			San Joaquin	yes	Keep city boundaries within SJ County; 1 SD, 1 CD, and no more than 2 SD
6sjoquin_20110501_kuzyk	512011	Paul Kuzyk	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep city boundaries within SJ County; 1 SD, 1 CD, and no more than 2 SD - see comment 43
6fresno_20110502_flores	522011	Alfred Flores	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	Do not hesitate to separate the different communities and cities in Fresno into different districts; Distinguishes two different communities within county
6kern_20110502_cooper	522011	Ruth Cooper	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest, NWC, and Edwards in their current districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6sjoaquin_20110406_weatherford	San Joaquin			no	yes		
6sjoaquin_20110514_hodson	San Joaquin	Tracy, Lathrop, Stockton, French Camp, Modesto	Highway 205, I-5, Highway 99	no	yes		Hodsons company is located in Lathrop and its employees live in Stockton, Tracy, French Camp and Modesto. Customers from South Valley.
6kern_20110501_lowry	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6sjoaquin_20110501_baumbach	San Joaquin			no	no		
6sjoquin_20110501_kuzyk	San Joaquin			no	no		
6fresno_20110502_flores	Fresno	Community 1 NE and NW Fresno Community 2 South of Shields		no	yes		
6kern_20110502_cooper	Kern			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6sjoaquin_20110406_weatherford		14th amendment prohibits any prodedure which would result in denial or abridgement of the voting rights of any racial or language minority.	no				
6sjoaquin_20110514_hodson			no				
6kern_20110501_lowry	less in common with the LASan Bernadino counties		no				
6sjoaquin_20110501_baumbach	more effective to have less districts		no				
6sjoquin_20110501_kuzyk	see comment 43		no				
6fresno_20110502_flores			no				
6kern_20110502_cooper			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110502_holloway	522011	Marshall Holloway	yes	Mayor Pro Term of Ridgecrest	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	No need to keep Kern county whole; problematizes the BRAC process and suggests it makes no economic or political sense to keep Kern whole since it causes such a deficit due to military expenses
6kern_20110502_pockrandt	522011	Donna Duane Pockrandt	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Kern county whole
6kern_20110502_speegle	522011	Gary Diane Speegle	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110502_welcome	522011	Dennis Welcome, M.D.	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110503_rhynsburger	532011	Dirk Ryhnsburger	no			Kern	yes	Keep Kern County whole; 1 AD for E. KernAntelope Valley; 1 AD for Victor Valley; 1 High Desert SD
6kern_20110503_villarreal	532011	Rosalin Villarreal	no			Kern	yes	Keep Kern County whole; 1 AD for E. KernAntelope Valley; 1 AD for Victor Valley; 1 High Desert SD - see comment 51
6mono_20110504_torchia	542011	Domenic Torchia	no		Columbia	Tuolomne	yes	Move Mono County into the 19th CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110502_holloway		Ridgecrest; China Lake Naval Base and Edwards Air Force Base		no	no		
6kern_20110502_pockrandt	Kern	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield	EW bad divider	no	yes	Depend on county seat in Bakersfield for services Indian Wells Valley cannot supply like shopping	
6kern_20110502_speegle		Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110502_welcome	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110503_rhynsburger	Kern			no	yes		
6kern_20110503_villarreal	Kern			no	yes		
6mono_20110504_torchia	Mono			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110502_holloway			no				
6kern_20110502_pockrandt			no				
6kern_20110502_speegle			no				
6kern_20110502_welcome	more in common with the rest of Kern than with Antelope Valley		no				
6kern_20110503_rhynsburger	agriculture, viticulture, air and policy needs; more like Central Valley and nothing in common with the rest of LA		no				
6kern_20110503_villarreal	see comment 51		no				
6mono_20110504_torchia	ethnicity composition, recreational, and other concerns closely align with the other Mother Lode communities		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110506_breeden	562011	Peggy Breeden	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110507_byarushengo	572011	Erick Byarushengo	no			Kern	yes	Antelope Valley E. Kern into 1 district; Elizabeth Lake, Lake Hughes, and Leona Valley in the same district; 1 High Desert SD; 1 AD for N. San Bernadino County
6kern_20110509_reams	592011	Bud Reams	yes	Past President of Antelope Valley Board of Trade		Kern	yes	Endorse the recommended plan by the Antelope Valley Board of Trade at Lancaster hearing
6sjoaquin_20110509_andal-johnston	592011	Dean Andal Patrick Johnston	yes	Past CA Senator and Assemblyman		San Joaquin	yes	1 CD, 1 AD, and 2 SD
6kern_20110504_robinson	542011	Steven Robinson	no			Kern	yes	3 AD; 1. Kern, Southern Kings, Southern Tulare, and South-Western Fresno Counties 2. Northern Kings County, Northern Tulare County, and Fresno County 3. Fresno Metro Area, all of Madera, Merced, Mariposa, and Turlock
6kern_20110510_amarante	5102011	Anthony Amarante	no				yes	1 SD and 1 CD
6kern_20110510_lloyd	5102011	Marsha Lloyd	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110510_sutton	5102011	Lee Sutton	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110506_breeden	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110507_byarusheng o	Kern; San Bernadnio		Highway 14	no	yes	Connected by shopping and school district in Lancaster and Palmdale	
6kern_20110509_reams				no	no		
6sjoaquin_20110509_andal-johnston				no	no		
6kern_20110504_robinson	Kernn	Distinguishes districts 1, 2, 3, as listed in geographic comment		no	yes		
6kern_20110510_amarante	Kern	Bakersfield, Lamont, Arvin, Shafter, and Edison		no	yes		
6kern_20110510_lloyd	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110510_sutton	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110506_breeden	strengthened by diversity; the military, businesses, tourism, the arts, education, city interests, environmental interests and ordinary individuals		no				
6kern_20110507_byarushengo	connected by schools, shopping, and AVEK		no				
6kern_20110509_reams			no				
6sjoaquin_20110509_andal-johnston			no				
6kern_20110504_robinson	1. commercial connection, population increase, and race 2. cultural and commercial commonalities 3. racial makeup, media describes as North Valley		no				
6kern_20110510_amarante	community of raising children; first or second generation Americans		no				
6kern_20110510_lloyd			no				
6kern_20110510_sutton	complicate elections and tie to Bakersfield if moved to San Bernadino County		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110511_mcactor	5112011	Robert McActor	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6sjoaquin_20110512_jonassen	5122011	John Jonassen	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Split SJ County into N and S
6kern_20110514_shaffer	5142011	Robert Shaffer	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110515_jaauregui	5152011	Martha Jaauregui	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110516_charlon	5162011	Gary Charlon	yes	State Farm Insurance (Agent)		Kern	yes	Keep Kern County whole
6kern_20110517_duncan	5172011	William Linda Duncan	no			Kern	yes	Keep Indian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110516_murray	5162011	Cliff and Georgina Murray	no			Kern	yes	Keep Kern County whole
6kern_20110516_patin	5162011	Deidre Patin	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_bell	5172011	Theresa bell	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_bouyer	5172011	Tammy Bouyer	yes	State Farm Insurance		Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110511_mcactor	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6sjoaquin_20110512_jonassen			divider being Stockton	yes	no		
6kern_20110514_shaffer	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110515_jaauregui	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110516_charlon	Kern			no	no		fear that taxes will go up
6kern_20110517_duncan	Kern			no	no		
6kern_20110516_murray	Kern			no	no		
6kern_20110516_patin	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_bell	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_bouyer	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110511_mcactor	different lifestyle than LA; neglected for tax purposes; area is vital function for the military and would suffer in a new district		no				
6sjoaquin_20110512_jonassen	rental property in Lodi - different neighborhood and property value		no				
6kern_20110514_shaffer	nothing in common with LA County		no				
6kern_20110515_jaauregui	content with current representation; nothing in common with LA county		no				
6kern_20110516_charlon			no				
6kern_20110517_duncan	content with current representation		no				
6kern_20110516_murray			no				
6kern_20110516_patin	maintain good relationship with Bakersfield representative		no				
6kern_20110517_bell	interests will be neglected if joined with larger cities in LASan Bernadino County		no				
6kern_20110517_bouyer			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110517_burgner	5172011	Gary Burgner	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_caesar	5172011	Santiago Caesar	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep RidgecrestIndian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_carter	5172011	Kevin Carter	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_charlon_g	5172011	Gary Charlon	yes	State Farm Insurance		Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_charlon_r	5172011	Ricca Charlon	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_cornell	5172011	Dave Cornell	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_dibble	5172011	John Corrine Dibble	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_flaharty	5172011	Sherri Flaharty	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_garot	5172011	Guy Ann Garot	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_griffin	5172011	April Griffin	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep RidgecrestIndian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_hargrove	5172011	Dianne Hargrove	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_joyal	5172011	Rick Joyal	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_kirkpatrick	5172011	Robert Kirkpatrick	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110517_burgner	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110517_caesar	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes	shared cultural and non-urban values	government revenue and services through Kern County
6kern_20110517_carter	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes	LA area does not represent political interests	
6kern_20110517_charlon_g	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_charlon_r	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_cornell	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_dibble	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_flaharty	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110517_garot	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110517_griffin	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110517_hargrove	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_joyal	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_kirkpatrick	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110517_burgner	maintain relationship with Kern so that military and land use issues are addressed		no				
6kern_20110517_caesar	Kern community college district; knowledge of military issues		no				
6kern_20110517_carter	voice will be masked by metropolitan area and neglect needs unique to the area		no				
6kern_20110517_charlon_g			no				
6kern_20110517_charlon_r	will cause voices to be lost		no				
6kern_20110517_cornell	will cause voices to be lost		no				
6kern_20110517_dibble			no				
6kern_20110517_flaharty	essential to growth; maintain voice for China Lake Naval Base		no				
6kern_20110517_garot	share resources and services with the rest of Kern County; interests involved in China Lake Naval Base		no				
6kern_20110517_griffin	militaryagricultural interests		no				
6kern_20110517_hargrove			no				
6kern_20110517_joyal			no				
6kern_20110517_kirkpatrick	protect interests		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110517_kleinschmidt	5172011	Patricia Kleinschmidt	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_lacher	5172011	Linda Lacher	no		Inyokern	Kern	yes	Keep Indian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_leffler	5172011	Crystal Leffler	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_martinez	5172011	Karen Martinez	no			Kern	yes	Keep Kern County whole
6kern_20110517_mauldin	5172011	Margaret Mauldin	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_miller	5172011	Trisha Miller	yes	Boys and Girls Club	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_moline	5172011	Jeannine Moline	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_parkin	5172011	Patti Parkin	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep RidgecrestIndian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_pate	5172011	Kelly Pate	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_slater	5172011	Dave Sandy Slater	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110517_welsh	5172011	Michael Welsh	yes	Michelson Lauritsen Laboratories	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_bohnert	5182011	Roy Bohnert	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_brigham	5182011	Ronald Brigham	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_bryant	5182011	James Bryant	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_corley	5182011	Ronnie Corley	no	RE-MAX	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep RidgecrestIndian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_hargrove	5182011	Jeff Hargrove	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep RidgecrestIndian Wells Valley with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_hartman	5182011	Jerry Hartman	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110517_kleinschmidt	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_lacher	Kern	Inyokern		no	no		
6kern_20110517_leffler	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		see comment 73
6kern_20110517_martinez	Kern			no	no		
6kern_20110517_mauldin	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		see comment 73
6kern_20110517_miller	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_moline	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110517_parkin	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_pate	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_slater	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110517_welsh	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_bohnert	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_brigham	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_bryant	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		see comment 73
6kern_20110518_corley	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110518_hargrove	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110518_hartman	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110517_kleinschmidt	Ridgecrest and Navy Base are important parts of Kern County		no				
6kern_20110517_lacher			no				
6kern_20110517_leffler	see comment 73		no				
6kern_20110517_martinez	voice is heard		no				
6kern_20110517_mauldin	see comment 73		no				
6kern_20110517_miller			no				
6kern_20110517_moline	ties to China Lake; rural needs of Indian Wells Valley; lost in metropolitan area		no				
6kern_20110517_parkin			no				
6kern_20110517_pate			no				
6kern_20110517_slater	maintain voice in Kern County		no				
6kern_20110517_welsh			no				
6kern_20110518_bohnert	fear of political motivation behind redistricting		no				
6kern_20110518_brigham	see comment 96		no				
6kern_20110518_bryant	see comment 73		no				
6kern_20110518_corley	rural; landlocked; conservative		no				
6kern_20110518_hargrove	ties to China Lake		no				
6kern_20110518_hartman	political identity		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110518_hensley	5182011	Wesley Hensley	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_lamberth	5182011	Jim Lamberth	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_martin	5182011	Judith Martin	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_mather	5182011	Melvin Mather	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_metziner	5182011	Heather Metziner	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_regnier	5182011	William Regnier	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_retterer	5182011	Mary Retterer	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_rodriguez	5182011	Eloy Rodriguez	yes	Ridgecrest Realty	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Move Ridgecrest into LA County
6kern_20110518_schmigel	5182011	Eileen Schmigel	yes	Eileen Western Homes	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_shaffer	5182011	Richard Shaffer	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_silva	5182011	Katheryn Silva	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110518_smith	5182011	Pete Smith	no			Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6stanislaus_20110516_monroe	5162011	Nathan Monroe	yes	Poli Sci Prof. UC Merced	Hughson	Stanislaus	yes	Keep San Joaquin Valley mostly whole; 3 AD in N. San Joaquin Valley; Have each of the three counties make up one AD
6madera_20110517_fursman	5172011	Mike Fursman	no		Madera Ranchos	Madera	yes	Keep Madera County separate from the City of Madera in the west to the mountains in the northwest

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110518_hensley	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_lamberth	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		see comment 73
6kern_20110518_martin	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		see comment 73
6kern_20110518_mather	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_metziner	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_regnier	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_retterer	Kern	Ridgecrest	395 South	no	no		
6kern_20110518_rodriguez	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_schmigel	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		see comment 73
6kern_20110518_shaffer	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_silva	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110518_smith	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6stanislaus_20110516_monroe	Stanislaus, San Joaquin		Highway 99	no	no		
6madera_20110517_fursman	Madera		Highway 40	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110518_hensley			no				
6kern_20110518_lamberth	see comment 73		no				
6kern_20110518_martin	see comment 73		no				
6kern_20110518_mather	maintain voice in Kern County		no				
6kern_20110518_metziner			no				
6kern_20110518_regnier	loss of identity		no				
6kern_20110518_retterer	anticipates political scheme		no				
6kern_20110518_rodriguez	LA would bring business opportunities and attention to cultural diversity		no				
6kern_20110518_schmigel	see comment 73		no				
6kern_20110518_shaffer			no				
6kern_20110518_silva	strong relationship to Kern County; historic bond		no				
6kern_20110518_smith			no				
6stanislaus_20110516_monroe	avoid gerrymandering; keep SJ Valley whole for the interest of the people, crops, water issues; giving Latino pop. in Merced its voice; (included maps)		no				
6madera_20110517_fursman	shopping; transportation; economic benefits; recreation and tourism		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110521_cram	5212011	Loxie Cram	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110522_lusk	5222011	David Lusk	yes	M.D.	Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110522_alloway	5222011	Dana Alloway	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110522_bruce	5222011	Doris Bruce	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110522_lewis	5222011	Joy Lewis	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110522_westa-lusk	5222011	Renee Westa-Lusk	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
6kern_20110522_malahowski	5222011	Roy Malahowski	no			Kern	no	
6kern_20110522_sorge	5222011	Dennis Becky Sorge	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep Ridgecrest with the rest of Kern
7sclara_20110504_baker	542011	Jason T. Baker	yes	mayor, city of Campbell	Campbell	Santa Clara	yes	keep Campbell together
7sclara_20110415_presser	4152011	Dan Presser	yes	owner, FourWinds Travel	-	Santa Clara	yes	15th district needs to be redrawn to reflect social makeup
7sclara_20110509_mann	592011	Craig Mann	yes	member, Santa Clara County Board of Education	-	Santa Clara	yes	put Evergreen in 23rd assembly district
7scruz_20110503_rawlings	532011	Dorelle Rawlings	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110521_cram	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110522_lusk	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110522_alloway	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		see comment 73
6kern_20110522_bruce	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110522_lewis	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
6kern_20110522_westa-lusk	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	yes		
6kern_20110522_malahowski				no	no		
6kern_20110522_sorge	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no		
7sclara_20110504_baker	Santa Clara	Campbell	-	no	yes	preserves communities of interest	-
7sclara_20110415_presser	Santa Clara	Los Angeles, San Francisco	-	no	yes	reflects mindset of northernsouthern end of the district	-
7sclara_20110509_mann	Santa Clara	San Jose	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7scruz_20110503_rawlings	Santa Cruz, Monterey	-	separated by mountains from other regions	no	yes	government, media, transportation coherence	similar industries of tourism, agriculture

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110521_cram			no				
6kern_20110522_lusk	medically, close ties with Bakersfield. Medical patients get their specialist treatment at Kern Medical Center in Bakersfield.		no				
6kern_20110522_alloway	see comment 73		no				
6kern_20110522_bruce	Ties in business, economics, health care, specialty treatments, education, recreation; China Lake and rural alliances with Kern County.		no				
6kern_20110522_lewis			no				
6kern_20110522_westa-lusk	see comment 117		no				
6kern_20110522_malahowski	(error corrected from earlier letter)		no				
6kern_20110522_sorge			no				
7sclara_20110504_baker	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7sclara_20110415_presser	reflects political views of county	-	no	-	-		
7sclara_20110509_mann	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110503_rawlings	geography, similar economic goals	-	no	-	-		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110414_bruffey	4142011	Charles H. Buffey	yes	Chief Administrative Officer, Salinas Valley Radiologists, Inc.	-	Santa Cruz	no	keep current representation in Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110414_endert	4142011	Allison Endert	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	keep Santa Cruz and Monterey together as a district
7scruz_20110414_fogel	4142011	H.L. Fogel	no	-	Scotts Valley	Santa Cruz	yes	keep Scotts Valley inside 17th District
7scruz_20110414_howells	4142011	Suz Howells	no	-	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Santa Cruz and San Luis Obispo should be separated
7scruz_20110414_johnston	4142011	Paul Johnston	yes	sociology professor, UC Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Monterey Bay together
7scruz_20110414_marohn	4142011	Christopher G. Marohn	no	-	Seaside	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and MontereySanta Cruz separate
7scruz_20110414_mcgooden	4142011	Judy McGooden	no	-	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110414_oliver	4142011	Michael Oliver	no	-	Aptos	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110414_roth	4142011	Sue Roth	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110414_smith	4142011	Juliet Smith	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110414_spickler	4142011	Adam Spickler	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110414_bruffey	Santa Cruz	-	-	no	yes	common political stance	-
7scruz_20110414_endert	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7scruz_20110414_fogel	Santa Cruz	Scotts Valley	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7scruz_20110414_howells	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, San Benito	Arroyo Grande	-	no	yes	similar interests, political views	-
7scruz_20110414_johnston	Santa Cruz, Monterey	Santa Cruz	-	no	yes	correct gerrymandering	-
7scruz_20110414_marohn	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	Seaside	-	no	yes	correct gerrymandering, government coherence	shared infrastructure
7scruz_20110414_mcgooden	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	agriculture
7scruz_20110414_oliver	Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo	Aptos	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area, correct gerrymandering	-
7scruz_20110414_roth	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	Scotts Valley	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7scruz_20110414_smith	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, San Benito, San Mateo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7scruz_20110414_spickler	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, San Benito, San Mateo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110414_bruffey	similar political goals	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_endert	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_fogel	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_howells	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_johnston	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_marohn	shared government services, community of interest perserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_mcgooden	-	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_oliver	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_roth	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_smith	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110414_spickler	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110414_vittor	4142011	Jamilah Vittor	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110415_clarenbach	4152011	Sara Clarenbach	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110415_dann	4152011	Rachel Dann	no	-	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110415_gardner	4152011	Adele Gardner	no	-	Aptos	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110415_maxfield	4152011	Bill and Susan Maxfield	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz separate
7scruz_20110509_patton	592011	Gary A. Patton	yes	former member, Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa CruzMonterey separate
7monterey_20110414_diggins	4142011	Thom Diggins	no	-	-	Monterey	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa CruzMonterey separate
7monterey_20110414_fields	4142011	Wendy Fields	yes	State Farm Auto Claims	Carmel	Monterey	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa CruzMonterey separate
7monterey_20110414_keeley	4142011	Fred Keeley	yes	board member, California Forward	-	Monterey	yes	keep Monterey Bay together
7monterey_20110414_schaller	4142011	Glen Schaller	no	-	-	Monterey	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Santa CruzMonterey separate

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110414_vittor	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, San Benito, San Mateo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7scruz_20110415_clarenbach	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7scruz_20110415_dann	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, San Benito, San Mateo	Santa Cruz	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area, government coherence in area	-
7scruz_20110415_gardner	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, San Benito	Aptos	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	shared tourism, agricultural interests
7scruz_20110415_maxfield	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	Salinas, Hollister, San jose, Half Moon Bay, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Carmel	-	no	yes	-	business interests in Santa Cruz County and surrouding areas
7scruz_20110509_patton	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	common history, educational goals, media coherence, diversity	agricultural interests, existing business relationships
7monterey_20110414_diggins	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7monterey_20110414_fields	Monterey, San Luis Obispo	Carmel, Big Sur, King City, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Ventura	-	no	yes	correct gerrymandering, political views	-
7monterey_20110414_keeley	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area	-
7monterey_20110414_schaller	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	-	existing roads and freeways connecting county

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110414_vittor	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110415_clarenbach	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110415_dann	shared geography, political, community interests	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110415_gardner	community of interest preserved, shared commerical industries	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110415_maxfield	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110509_patton	community of interest preserved, shared commerical industries	-	no	-	-		
7monterey_20110414_diggins	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7monterey_20110414_fields	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7monterey_20110414_keeley	community of interest preserved	15th Senate district violateds VRA	no	-	-		
7monterey_20110414_schaller	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110415_critchley	4152011	Spencer Critchley	no	-	-	Monterey	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Monterey separate
7monterey_20110422_quinn	4222011	Tony Quinn	no	-	-	Monterey	yes	follow Section 5 and keep San Luis Obispo and Santa CruzMonterey separate
7monterey_20110511_pohlhammer	5112011	Carl Pohlhammer	yes	professor emeritus, Monterey Peninsula College	-	Monterey	yes	make Cabrillo College, Hartnell College, and Monterey Peninsula College one senate district
7monterey_20110422_aarons	4222011	Herb Aarons	no	-	-	Monterey	yes	15th district should not include San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara, instead should include Monterey Bay cities
7scruz_20110517_schiffrin	5172011	Andrew Schiffrin	no	-	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz together
7scruz_20110518_caras	5182011	Sylvia Caras	no	-	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7scruz_20110518_braudrick	5182011	Hazel Louise Braudrick	no	-	-	-	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7scruz_20110522_trujillo	5222011	Steve Trujillo	yes	member, Santa Cruz city school board of trustees	Capitola	Santa Cruz	yes	Santa Cruz county needs to have one district for Congress and state senate
7monterey_20110521_mitchell	5212011	Ed Mitchell	yes	Prunedale Neighbors Group	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Do not let state senate and assembly districts cross the crest of the Coastal Range

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110415_critchley	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	-	no	yes	reflects community of interest in area, correct gerrymandering	-
7monterey_20110422_quinn	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	Salinas, Watsonville, San Jose, Berryessa, Milpitas, Fremont, Simi Valley	-	no	yes	ensure Latino minority representation	-
7monterey_20110511_pohlhammer	Santa Cruz, Monterey	-	-	no	yes	common educational, political interests	-
7monterey_20110422_aarons	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Barbara	Monterey, Seaside, Carmel, Aptos, Capitola, Santa Cruz, Gilroy, San Martin, Morgan Hill, Watsonville, Salinas, Hollister	-	no	yes	correct gerrymandering, minority representation	economic interests preserved
7scruz_20110517_schiffrin	Santa Cruz	-	-	no	yes	-	-
7scruz_20110518_caras	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Santa Maria	-	no	yes	-	common agricultural interests
7scruz_20110518_braudrick	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Saratoga, Santa Maria	Big Sur wilderness	no	yes	media coherence, recreation, educational goals	common economic interests
7scruz_20110522_trujillo	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara	Capitola	Highway 1	no	yes	higher education in UC Santa Cruz, common newspaper, Spanish-speaking, coastline is part of national sanctuary	easier oversight over finances of school districts, common use of Highway 1
7monterey_20110521_mitchell	Monterey	Pacifica, Paso Robles	Coastal Mountain Range, Salinas Valley, San Joaquin Valley	no	yes	-	method of water use (e.g. fishing, agriculture)

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110415_critchley	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7monterey_20110422_quinn	minority representation, community of interest preserved	-	yes	Monterey	ensured large Latino population has a voice in government representation		
7monterey_20110511_pohlhammer	educational interests, minority representation,community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7monterey_20110422_aarons	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110517_schiffrin	community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110518_caras	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110518_braudrick	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no	-	-		
7scruz_20110522_trujillo	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110521_mitchell	community of interest preserved	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110522_ezekiel	5222011	Lucero Ezekiel	no	-	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey together
7monterey_20110522_garrettson	5222011	Garry Garrettson	no	-	Pebble Beach	Monterey	yes	Keep Monterey and San Luis Obispo together
7monterey_20110522_bean	5222011	Beverly Bean	yes	president, League of Women Voters of the Monterey Peninsula	-	Monterey	yes	Keep Santa Cruz and costal regions of Monterey together
7monterey_20110522_mason	5222011	Melvin T. Mason	no	-	Seaside	Monterey	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7santacruz_20110522_murtha	5222011	Brian T. Murtha	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7monterey_20110522_orona	5222011	Ignacio Orona	no	-	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Keep Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and northern Santa Barbara together
7monterey_20110522_shiffman	5222011	Brian Shiffman	no	-	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo and Monterey together, not Santa Cruz
7monterey_20110521_rivera	5212011	Gregory Rivera	no	-	Hollister	San Benito	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7monterey_20110522_bernosky	5222011	Robert E. Bernosky	no	-	Hollister	San Benito	yes	Keep San Benito, Monterey, and Merced together
7monterey_20110522_logue	5222011	Susan Logue	no	-	Hollister	San Benito	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7scruz_20110520_dixon	5202011	Mary O. Dixon	no	-	Aptos	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7scruz_20110520_garcia	5202011	Rebecca J. Garcia	yes	chair, Watsonville Redistricting Committee	Watsonville	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Watsonville and Salinas together as a senate district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110522_ezekiel	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Salinas, Gilroy, Berkeley, Santa Cruz	Highway 101	no	yes	common shopping areas	working in local area
7monterey_20110522_garrettson	Monterey, San Luis Obispo	-	Highway 101	no	yes	shared institutions of higher learning	shared agricultural industry, linked by Highway 101, similar water use
7monterey_20110522_bean	Santa Cruz, Monterey	-	-	no	yes	shared institutions of higher learning and research institutions, media outlets	shared agricultural industry
7monterey_20110522_mason	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Seaside	-	no	yes	protection of diverse minority populations	-
7santacruz_20110522_murtha	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Santa Cruz, San Jose	-	no	yes	shared public institutions, Latino community	-
7monterey_20110522_orona	Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara	-	-	no	yes	-	-
7monterey_20110522_shiffman	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo	Salinas	-	no	yes	-	similar land use
7monterey_20110521_rivera	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Hollister, San Juan Bautista, Monterey, Salinas, Santa Cruz,	-	no	yes	shared institutions of higher learning, history, recreational facilities	-
7monterey_20110522_bernosky	San Benito, Monterey, Merced	-	-	no	yes	-	-
7monterey_20110522_logue	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Hollister, Watsonville	-	no	yes	shared geography, medical facilities, shared community	-
7scruz_20110520_dixon	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Aptos	-	no	yes	shared community	-
7scruz_20110520_garcia	Santa Cruz	Watsonville, Salinas, San Jose	-	no	yes	speak Spanish, low-income, farm workers	shared agricultural industry, shared water district

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110522_ezekiel	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_garrettson	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_bean	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_mason	protection of diverse minority populations	protect the diverse community in Monterey	no				
7santacruz_20110522_murtha	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_orona	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_shiffman	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110521_rivera	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_bernosky	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_logue	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no				
7scruz_20110520_dixon	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7scruz_20110520_garcia	community of interest preserved	-	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110522_didday	5222011	Rich Didday	no	-	-	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz grouped with regions around Monterey Bay
7scruz_20110522_hernandez	5222011	Felipe Hernandez	yes	member, American Legion	Watsonville	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito together
7monterey_20110522_nakamura	5222011	J. Nakamura	no	-	-	Monterey	yes	Pajaro, Las Lomas, Castroville, Boronda, Salinas, Chualar, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, King City should be in one congressional district
7sclara_20110523_calvert	5232011	Beth Calvert	no	-	Morgan Hill, Gilroy	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy together
8napa_20110316_myers	3162011	Kathleen Heitz Myers	yes	The Napa Valley Vintners, President		Napa	yes	Keep counties of Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo continuous
8napa_20110331_beckstoffer	3312011	David Beckstoffer	yes	Napa Valley Grapegrowers, President		Napa	yes	Keep counties of Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo continuous
8marin_20110408_vanmeter	482011	Peter Van Meter	yes	Former Sausalito Council Member (CRC applicant)	Sausalito	Marin	yes	Set the Golden Gate as the SW boundary for all N California districts; 3 SD and nested AD
8sonoma_20110413_patterson	4132011	Jeff Patterson	no			Sonoma	yes	N. Sonoma more in common with rural Mendocino County rather than Santa Rosa, Rohnert ParkPetaluma
8sonoma_20110415_frey	4152011	Nick Frey	yes	Sonoma County Winegrape Commission, President		Sonoma	yes	Keep counties of Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo continuous
8napa_20110421_lincoln	4212011	Jim Lincoln	yes	Napa County Farm Bureau, President		Napa	yes	Keep counties of Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, and Yolo continuous

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110522_didday	Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo	-	Santa Cruz Mountains	no	yes	shared geography	-
7scruz_20110522_hernandez	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, San Luis Obispo	Watsonville, Paso Robles, Hollister, Salinas Valley	Highway 5	no	yes	working-class, Latino immigrant populations	-
7monterey_20110522_nakamura	Monterey	Pajaro, Las Lomas, Castroville, Boronda, Salinas, Chualar, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, King City	-	no	yes	speak Spanish, low number have higher education degrees	-
7sclara_20110523_calvert	Santa Clara	Morgan Hill, Gilroy, San Martin	-	no	yes	family-oriented community	shared agricultural community
8napa_20110316_myers				no	yes		
8napa_20110331_beckstoffer				no	yes		
8marin_20110408_vanmeter				no	no		
8sonoma_20110413_patterson				no	no		
8sonoma_20110415_frey				no	yes		
8napa_20110421_lincoln				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110522_didday	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no				
7scruz_20110522_hernandez	geography, community of interest preserved	-	no				
7monterey_20110522_nakamura	community of interest preserved	-	no				
7sclara_20110523_calvert	community of interest preserved	-	no				
8napa_20110316_myers	agricultural community of interest; grape growing and wine making; share transportation, economic interests, and access to the same media outlets		no				
8napa_20110331_beckstoffer	wine, tourism, recreation, and agricultural industries		no				
8marin_20110408_vanmeter			no				
8sonoma_20110413_patterson			no				
8sonoma_20110415_frey	see comment 24		no				
8napa_20110421_lincoln	common social and economic interests		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110425_hartwell-herrero	4252011	Pam Hartwell-Herrero	yes	Fairfax Vice Mayor (representative of ind. opinion only)	Fairfax	Marin	yes	Keep Marin Couty separate from San Francisco
8marin_20010501_moore	512011	David Moore	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110503_moody	532011	Elizabeth Moody	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8sclara_20110504_baker	542011	Jason Baker	yes	Mayor of Campbell	Campbell	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Campbell entirely in one legislative district
8marin_20110504_vanmeter	542011	Peter Van Meter	yes	Marin Independent Journal		Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8smateo_20110506_chapman	562011	Dave Chapman	no			San Mateo	yes	Keep San Mateo cost part of a coastal community of interst which would include Capitola, Aptos, and Monterey
8marin_20110507_belser	572011	Amy Belser	yes	Former four-term Mayor and 17-year elected Councilmember	Sausalito	Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County; 3 SD needs repairs (not contiguous) consider adding MendocinoHumboldt; AD are easily nested; CD does not need fixing
8marin_20110508_sweeny	582011	John Sweeny	no		Sausalito	Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110509_beittel	592011	Suzanne Beittel	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110425_hartwell-herrero	Marin			no	no		
8marin_20010501_moore	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		business conducteed in Sonoma, none in SF
8marin_20110503_moody	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes	children move to Sonoma	workers come from Sonoma
8sclara_20110504_baker	S Clara	Campbell		no	yes		
8marin_20110504_vanmeter	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes		
8smateo_20110506_chapman	S Mateo	Capitola, Aptos, Monterey		no	yes		
8marin_20110507_belser	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110508_sweeny	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110509_beittel	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110425_hartwell-herrero	Marin differs from SF because of emphasis on rural and suburban land use; voice would be limited if had to compete with SF		no				
8marin_20010501_moore			no				
8marin_20110503_moody	suburban and rural areas		no				
8sclara_20110504_baker			no				
8marin_20110504_vanmeter			no				
8smateo_20110506_chapman			no				
8marin_20110507_belser	Marin is suburbanrural not urban; significant agriculture; progressive infrastructure linked to SonomaMarin counties SMART train, US 101, and CA 1 transportation corridors		no				
8marin_20110508_sweeny			no				
8marin_20110509_beittel	see comment 41		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110510_arnold	5102011	Judy Arnold	yes	Marin County Supervisor District 5		Marin	yes	Continue single district elected representation for the County of Marin, and to maintain unified elected representation for counties north of the Golden Gate Bridge
8marin_20110510_brown	5102011	Harold Brown	yes	Marin County Supervisor District 2		Marin	yes	see comment 43
8marin_20110510_praetzel	5102011	Nancy Praetzel	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8napa_20110511_florin	5112011	Larry Florin	yes	Napa County Board of Supervisors, Director of Housing and Intergovernmental Affairs		Napa	yes	Keep Napa County together; 1 AD with SonomaNapa County in same assembly; 1 SD with Lake, Napa, Sonoma, and Mendocino Counties
8marin_20110511_graber	5112011	Linda Graeber	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110510_arnold				no	no		suburban, rural; common interest with N counties - including geographic, economic, and social character; common bus and rail trans; common water supply; small business; tourism
8marin_20110510_brown				no	no		
8marin_20110510_praetzel	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes		
8napa_20110511_florin				no	yes		
8marin_20110511_graber	Marin, Sonoma		Golden Gate Bridge	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110510_arnold			no				
8marin_20110510_brown	see comment 43		no				
8marin_20110510_praetzel	share rural life, agriculture, open space, climate, and housing types		no				
8napa_20110511_florin	winegrape industry, tourism industry, local government partnerships and regional watersheds; one daily newspaper, one valley-wide local radio station, one bus system and one large school district		no				
8marin_20110511_graber	brige barrier (tolls, busferry prices); decline in SF headquarters less commuters; shared ag, workforce, hispanic heritage, with Sonoma; SMART train; Highway 101		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8smateo_20110511_weller	5112011	James Weller	no			San Mateo	yes	Coastal areas in S Mateo, all of S Cruz County and N Monterey County, along with San Benito in 1 SD; do not combine N portions of S Clara County;
8marin_20110513_wernick	5132011	Susan Wernick	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110513_huster	5132011	John Huster	no		Corte Madera	Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110513_olsen	5132011	Don Olsen	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110514_scharf_j	5142011	Jerome Scharf	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110514_anderson	5142011	Ruth Anderson	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110514_scharf_c	5142011	Cathy Scharf	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110514_boessenecker_janet	5142011	Janet Boessenecker	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin County with Sonoma County
8marin_20110518_vanmeter	5182011	Peter Van Meter (3rd submission)	yes	Principal, MyCRE LLC; Former Sausalito City Council Member, CRC Applicant			yes	submitted powerpoint from hearing
8ccosta_20110522_cloidt	5222011	Jacqueline Cloidt	no		Orinda		no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8smateo_20110511_weller				no	yes		economic and demographic interests
8marin_20110513_wernick	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110513_huster	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110513_olsen	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110514_scharf_j	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110514_anderson	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		different financial interests than SF; fear of a rise in taxes
8marin_20110514_scharf_c	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110514_boessenecker_janet	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8marin_20110518_vanmeter				no	no		
8ccosta_20110522_cloidt				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8smateo_20110511_weller			no				
8marin_20110513_wernick	shares nothing in common with SF or East Bay		no				
8marin_20110513_huster	similar interests; lost with SF		no				
8marin_20110513_olsen			no				
8marin_20110514_scharf_j			no				
8marin_20110514_anderson			no				
8marin_20110514_scharf_c	share demographics with Sonoma		no				
8marin_20110514_boessenecker_janet			no				
8marin_20110518_vanmeter			no				
8ccosta_20110522_cloidt			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110522_kahnhut	5222011	Rachel Kahn-Hut	no		Oakland	Alameda	yes	Have U. S. Congressional seat 9 run along the SF Bay from Richmond down to Hayward, including areas such as the island of Alameda which between Oakland and the bay, but which is in another district; same for state senate seat 9;
8alameda_20110522_hutchison	5222011	Helen Hutchinson	no				yes	submitted link httpouroakland.blogspot.com201003my-oakland-map.html on how Oakland neighborhoods defined
1imperial_20110623_1	6232011	Darryl and Gisela Greenamyer	yes		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley cities separate from Imperial cities
1imperial_20110623_2_2	6232011		no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley separate from Imperial; Imperial should stay with San Diego
1sdiego_20110623_1	6232011	Len Schultz	no				no	
1sdiego_20110623_2	6232011	Tommie Camarillo	yes	Chairperson, Chicano Park Steering Committee	Barrio Logan	San Diego	yes	Keep Barrio Logan together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110522_kahnhut		Assembly districts take dividing line, like rt24 which goes across most of Oakland from bay to hills, but divides Rockbridge or 51st (natural one) or 14 to go farther north w OaklandBerkeley border; have one assembly for OaklandAlameda		no	no		
8alameda_20110522_hutchison				no	no		
1imperial_20110623_1	Riverside, Imperial	Indio, Coachella, Mecca, La Quinta		no	yes	shared interests, geography	
1imperial_20110623_2_2	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	yes	Shared media, standard of living, freeway system	Tourism industry
1sdiego_20110623_1				no	no		
1sdiego_20110623_2	San Diego	Barrio Logan		no	yes	Shared interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110522_kahnhut	assembly current 16 and 14 bulge confusing for people doing political work; western halves of Contra Costa Alameda Counties have more in common w each other in terms of demographies, concerns and allegiances than does either with its eastern half.		no			Current lines for congressional 9, senate 9, assembly 16 and 14 make no sense culturally, politically, geographically	I am speaking here as someone who lives in Oakland, in the western half of Alameda County, that we too on this side of the Berkeley Oakland Hills feel the same cultural, political and geographic divide that those in the eastern half spoke of.
8alameda_20110522_hutchison			no				
1imperial_20110623_1			no				
1imperial_20110623_2_2			no				
1sdiego_20110623_1			no				When will June 20th San Diego redistricting meeting video be put online?
1sdiego_20110623_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110623_3	6232011	Cindy Chan	no			San Diego	yes	Keep Asian Pacific Islander communities of interest together, according to the maps of Southwest Cener for Asian Pacific American Law and Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting
1sdiego_20110623_4	6232011	Humberto	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Keep Chula Vista together
2riverside_20110623_1	6232011	John A Wells	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Combine Imperial and Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110623_3	6232011	Elaine Finch	yes	member, Palm Springs Republican Women Federated		Riverside	yes	Do not combine Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110623_4	6232011	Ellen Swensen	no			Riverside	yes	Do not combine Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110623_7	6232011		no			Riverside	yes	Keep desert cities of Coachella Valley in Coachella Valley, Riverside, not Imperial
2riverside_20110623_8	6232011	Don Wagner	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella as one district
2riverside_20110623_9	6232011	William G. Pursley	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Keep Desert Cities within Riverside County
2riverside_20110623_11	6232011	Val Ogburn	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley should be kept together
2riverside_20110623_12	6232011	Eduardo Hernandez	no		Jurupa	Riverside	yes	Keep Riverside intact

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110623_3	San Diego			no	yes	Cultural, ethnic, religious, language needs	socio-economic similarities
1sdiego_20110623_4	San Diego	Chula Vista, Barrio Logan		no	yes	Keeps Latino vote together	
2riverside_20110623_1	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego	Palm Desert		no	yes	Hispanic population, unemployment rate	agricultural economic base, focus on renewable energy in both counties
2riverside_20110623_3	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110623_4	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	yes		Tourism industry in Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110623_7	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110623_8	Riverside, Imperial, Orange	Indio		no	no		
2riverside_20110623_9	Riverside	Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta		no	yes		Tourism
2riverside_20110623_11	Riverside	Palm Springs		no	yes	Transportation, airports, schools	Tourism
2riverside_20110623_12	Riverside, San Bernardino	Jurupa		no	yes	Shopping	Work

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110623_3			no				
1sdiego_20110623_4			no				
2riverside_20110623_1			no				
2riverside_20110623_3			no				
2riverside_20110623_4			no				
2riverside_20110623_7			no				
2riverside_20110623_8			no				
2riverside_20110623_9			no				
2riverside_20110623_11			no				
2riverside_20110623_12			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110623_1	6232011	Brian Pry	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Relands, ONTPOM should include Chino Hills and Upland, SBRIA should include Fontana; San BernardinoRiverside should include Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley; Inyo and Mono should be removed from INMNOSB
2sbernardino_20110623_2	6232011	Ruben Gasco	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_3	6232011	Sherise Franklin	no			San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide the Inland Empire
2sbernardino_20110623_4	6232011	Victoria Watson	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide the Inland Empire; do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_5	6232011	James W. Pry	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Relands, ONTPOM should include Chino Hills and Upland, SBRIA should include Fontana; San BernardinoRiverside should include Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley; Inyo and Mono should be removed from INMNOSB
2sbernardino_20110623_6	6232011	Sue Owens	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_7	6232011	Jannette Curti	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Leave Redlands in the same district
2sbernardino_20110623_8	6232011	James R. Holmes	yes	President, CEO; Redlands Community Hospital	Redlands	San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110623_9	6232011	Bob Duron	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_10	6232011	Leslie Groher	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands; keep within San Bernardino district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110623_1	Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands, Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley	I-215	no	yes		Rural community
2sbernardino_20110623_2	San Bernardino	Highland, Loma Linda, Redlands, Yucaipa		no	yes	Cultural ties, Schools	Economic background
2sbernardino_20110623_3	San Bernardino			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_4	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_5	Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands, Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley		no	yes	Cultural community	
2sbernardino_20110623_6	San Bernardino, Inyo, Mono	Redlands		no	yes	Similar interests	
2sbernardino_20110623_7	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_8	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes	Demographics	Economic needs
2sbernardino_20110623_9	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_10	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes	Political representation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110623_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_2			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_3			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_4			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_5			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_6			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_7			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_8			no			Support Inland Actions recommendations	
2sbernardino_20110623_9			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110623_11	6232011	Lora L. Pry	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Relands, ONTPOM should include Chino Hills and Upland, SBRIA should include Fontana; San BernardinoRiverside should include Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley; Inyo and Mono should be removed from INMNOSB
2sbernardino_20110623_12	6232011	Jon Harrison	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_13	6232011	James H. Johnson	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_14	6232011	W. R. Helbron	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_15	6232011	John Davidson	yes		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Relands, ONTPOM should include Chino Hills and Upland, SBRIA should include Fontana; San BernardinoRiverside should include Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley; Inyo and Mono should be removed from INMNOSB
2sbernardino_20110623_16	6232011	Keith Moreland	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_17	6232011	John	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_18	6232011	Janette Smiley	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Divide Redlands along Interstate 10 (see map)
2sbernardino_20110623_19	6232011	Mirella Preciado	no		Rialto	San Bernardino	yes	Follow the 4-3-21 strategy for San Bernardino
2sbernardino_20110623_20	6232011	Anthony Dedeaux	no			San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110623_21	6232011	Carol Whiteside	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110623_11	Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands, Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_12	San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands		no	yes	Common political issues	
2sbernardino_20110623_13	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes	Common political issues	
2sbernardino_20110623_14	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes	Common political representation	
2sbernardino_20110623_15	Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands, Highland, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Yucaipa, Moreno Valley		no	yes	Common interests	
2sbernardino_20110623_16	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_17	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_18	San Bernardino	Redlands	Interstate 10	no	yes	Demography	
2sbernardino_20110623_19	San Bernardino, Riverside, Los Angeles, Kern	Rialto		no	yes	Politicans will be focused on our needs	
2sbernardino_20110623_20	San Bernardino, Riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_21	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	yes	Common political issues	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110623_11			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_12			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_13			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_14			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_15			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_16			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_17			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_18			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_19			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_20			no			Support Inland Actions proposed maps	
2sbernardino_20110623_21			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110623_23	6232011	Jeffrey and Sharon Sabatini	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110623_24	6242011	Lillian Silva	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Chino Hills together in San Bernardino County
2sbernardino_20110623_25	6242011	Elizabeth R. Heinze	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_26	6242011	Cheryl Flynn	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_27	6232011	John and Ellen Egan	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Redlands with Loma Linda, Highland, Yucaipa, San Bernardino
2sbernardino_20110623_28	6232011	Deborah Crowley	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	
2sbernardino_20110623_29	6232011	Dick and Martha Young	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Dont split Redlands; dont put Lewis and Baca in same district as Redlands
2sbernardino_20110623_30	6242011	Mary Jo Holmes	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands
3orange_20110623_1	6232011	Michael P. Dunbar	yes	General Manager, South Coast Water District	Laguna Beach	Orange	yes	Keep South Coast County with other south Orange County cities
3orange_20110623_2	6232011	Scott Howley	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Include Westminster, Fountain Valley, with Huntington Beach and not Irvine or other south County cities
3orange_20110623_3	6232011	Arthur A. Julian III	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Do not put Rossmoor in Los Angeles County, keep in Orange County
3orange_20110623_4	6232011	Donald and Alvina Phillips	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Do not put Rossmoor with Long Beach, Lakewood, Paramount; keep with Orange County
3orange_20110623_5	6232011	Kathi and Cliff Anderson	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana Point whole
3orange_20110623_6	6232011	David Arden	no		Anaheim	Orange	yes	Split Anaheim and Santa Ana because of Latino majority

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110623_23				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_24	San Bernardino	Chino Hills, Phillips Ranch		no	yes	Cultural ties	Economic earnings
2sbernardino_20110623_25	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_26	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_27	San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland, Yucaipa, San Bernardino		no	yes	Common interests	
2sbernardino_20110623_28	San Bernardino, Riverside	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_29	San Bernardino	Lewis, Redlands, Baca		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110623_30	San Bernardino	Redlands, Mammoth Lakes		no	yes	Common history	
3orange_20110623_1	Orange	Laguna Beach		no	yes	Wastewater treatment, water storage, ocean water quality	
3orange_20110623_2	Orange	Westminster, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Irvine		no	yes	Common political interests	
3orange_20110623_3	Orange	Rossmoor		no	yes	Political representation	
3orange_20110623_4	Orange	Long Beach, Lakewood, Paramount, Rossmoor		no	yes	Political representation	
3orange_20110623_5	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Homogeneous community	
3orange_20110623_6	Orange	Anaheim		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110623_23			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_24			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_25			no			Support Inland Actions proposed maps	
2sbernardino_20110623_26			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_27			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_28			no			Support Inland Actions proposed maps	
2sbernardino_20110623_29			no				
2sbernardino_20110623_30			no				
3orange_20110623_1			no				
3orange_20110623_2			no				
3orange_20110623_3			no				
3orange_20110623_4			no				
3orange_20110623_5			no				
3orange_20110623_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110623_1	6232011	Martha Kelley	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Clarita Valley congressional district
4langeles_20110623_2	6232011	Lori OBryan	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole in district maps
4langeles_20110623_3	6232011	Primo Castro	no		Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	See map
4langeles_20110623_4	6232011	William F. Girouard	yes	Professor Emeritus, Cal Poly Pomona	Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	Keep LaCanada-Flintridge, Western Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Marino
4langeles_20110623_5	6232011	Kathi Flood	no		Sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Sherman Oaks
4langeles_20110623_6	6232011	Vikki Brink	yes	FTDNC Equestrian Committee Chair		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujuga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank together
4langeles_20110623_7	6232011	Melody Redmond Kelly	no		Ontario	Los Angeles	yes	Ponoma Valley map is perfect
4langeles_20110623_8	6232011	Ron Ostrow	yes	Franklin Hills Residents Association	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Griffith Park, Los Feliz within Hollywood district, do not divide up current districts
4langeles_20110623_9	6232011	Katie Braude	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Combine West Side-Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains Assembly Districts into a Senate District

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110623_1	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall, Valencia		no	yes	Environmental, social, and environmental concerns	
4langeles_20110623_2	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_3	Los Angeles	Pomona		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_4	Los Angeles	Pomona		no	yes	Common social, ethnic, economic interests; educational facilities	
4langeles_20110623_5	Los Angeles	Sherman Oaks		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_6	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujuga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	Interest in environmental protection	Water use
4langeles_20110623_7	Los Angeles	Ontario		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_8	Los Angeles	Griffith Park, Los Angeles, Los Feliz, Silver Lake, Miracle Mile, Hermosa Beach, LaCanada-Flintridge, Burbank, Studio City, Glendale		no	yes	Shared geography	Entertainment industry
4langeles_20110623_9	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades		no	yes	School districts	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110623_1			no				
4langeles_20110623_2			no				
4langeles_20110623_3			no			Support POMVAL district map	
4langeles_20110623_4			no				
4langeles_20110623_5			no				
4langeles_20110623_6			no				
4langeles_20110623_7			no				
4langeles_20110623_8			no				
4langeles_20110623_9			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110623_10	6232011	William F. Girouard	yes	Professor Emeritus, Cal Poly Pomona	Pomona	Los Angeles	yes	Keep LaCanada-Flintridge, Western Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Marino together
4langeles_20110623_11	6232011	Pauline Corse	no		Chino Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep current boundaries
4langeles_20110623_12	6232011	Greg Wessels	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep East Pasadena with Pasadena
4langeles_20110623_13	6232011	Sonia Tatulian	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Tujunga with La Crescenta, La Canada, and Lakeview in Foothill District
4langeles_20110623_14	6232011	James Oliver	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Shadow Hills with Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Tuna Canyon, Sunalnd, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
4langeles_20110623_15	6232011	Laura King	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita, add Newhall into the Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley congressional district
4langeles_20110623_16	6232011	Peggy Bayne	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Shadow Hills with Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Tuna Canyon, Sunalnd, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
4langeles_20110623_17	6232011	Michael Strangel	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Sunland, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Tujunga, Glendale, Burbank together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110623_10	Los Angeles	LaCanada-Flintridge, Western Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Marino		no	yes	Common social, ethnic, economic interests	
4langeles_20110623_11	Los Angeles	Chino Hills		no	yes	Social services	
4langeles_20110623_12	Los Angeles	Pasadena		no	yes	Political representation	
4langeles_20110623_13	Los Angeles	Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada, Lakeview		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_14	Los Angeles	Shadow Hills, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Tuna Canyon, Sunalnd, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	Common water issues, freeway corridor, common history	
4langeles_20110623_15	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	yes		
4langeles_20110623_16	Los Angeles	Shadow Hills, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Tuna Canyon, Sunalnd, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	Common water issues, freeway corridor, common history	
4langeles_20110623_17	Los Angeles	Sunland, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Tujunga, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	Geography, environmental conservation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110623_10			no				
4langeles_20110623_11			no				
4langeles_20110623_12			no				
4langeles_20110623_13			no				
4langeles_20110623_14			no				
4langeles_20110623_15			no				
4langeles_20110623_16			no				
4langeles_20110623_17			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110623_18	6232011	John Aguinaga	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Monrovia, Irwindale, Duarte, Baldwin Park, Azusa, West Covina, La Puente separate from Monterey Park, San Gabriel, Temple City, Arcadia, Alhambra
4langeles_20110623_19	6232011	Margaret Granado	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Do not keep Whittier and Gabriel Valley in the same district and instead with Santa Fe Springs, South Whittier, La Habra, Pico Rivera, Montebello, La Mirada, Commerce and West WhittierLos Nietos
4langeles_20110623_20	6232011	Thomas DuKet	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Topanga is a better match to Malabu and Calabasas than to Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110623_21	6232011	Laurel Klick	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank together
4langeles_20110623_22	6232011	Brian J. Hayes	no		Arcadia	Los Angeles	yes	Divide Burbank and Upland; Keep South Pasadena and Pasadena united
4langeles_20110623_23	6232011	Thomas Spicer Pierson	no		Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep East Hollywood separate from Hollywood
4langeles_20110623_24	6232011	Cile Borman	no		Lake View Terrace	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada-Flintridge, Montrose together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110623_18	Los Angeles	Monrovia, Irwindale, Duarte, Baldwin Park, Azusa, West Covina, La Puente, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, Temple City, Arcadia, Alhambra		no	yes	Ethnic similarity	
4langeles_20110623_19	Los Angeles	Santa Fe Springs, South Whittier, La Habra, Pico Rivera, Montebello, La Mirada, Commerce and West WhittierLos Nietos, Whittier		no	yes	Schools, sports leagues, cultural similarity	
4langeles_20110623_20	Los Angeles	Topanga, Malabu, Calabasas, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Political representation, government facilities	Economic interests
4langeles_20110623_21	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	Rural livelihood	
4langeles_20110623_22	Los Angeles	Burbank, Upland, Pasadena, Arcadia		no	yes	Freeway development interests	Business interests
4langeles_20110623_23	Los Angeles	Hollywood, East Hollywood		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_24	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada-Flintridge, Montrose		no	yes	Freeway connection, rural background, environmental conservation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110623_18			no				
4langeles_20110623_19			no				
4langeles_20110623_20			no				
4langeles_20110623_21			no				
4langeles_20110623_22			no				
4langeles_20110623_23			no				
4langeles_20110623_24			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110623_25	6232011	Gayle Jemison	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Clarita; add Newhall into Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita congressional district
4langeles_20110623_26	6232011	Peter M. Warren	yes	Member, Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pedro together with Port of Los Angeles for Assembly and Senate Districts
4langeles_20110623_27	6232011	Michael Hart	no		Agoura	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Mountains Recreational Area; Do not include Agoura with Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110623_28	6232011	Donald Dunham (duplicate)	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Shadow Hills, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Tuna Canyon together
4langeles_20110623_29	6232011	Janice Cunningham	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita together
4langeles_20110623_31	6232011	Farley Olander	no		Rancho Cucamonga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Gabriel Mountains with Congressional Districts to the south
5ventura_20110626_5	6262011	Jim Rogers	no				yes	Do not align Moorpark and Simi Valley with Santa Clarita. Do not make coastline a single district
5ventura_20110626_6	6262011	Gordon Lindeen	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Thousand Oaks together.
6tuolummne_20110626_1	6262011	Alan and Doris Horvath	no				yes	Keep Tuolumne, Calavera, Amador together
6tuolummne_20110626_2	6262011	Beth Hatcher	no		Sonora	Tuolumne	yes	Keep foothill counties in single district.
6tuolummne_20110626_3	6262011	Peggy Kingman	no		Sonora	Tuolumne	yes	Combine Amador, Calaveras and Tuolumne
6tuolummne_20110626_4	6262011	Janet Maffei,	no			Tuolumne	yes	Supports redistricting of foothills together
7sclara_20110626_1	6262011	Esther Peralez-Dieckmann	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep AD 23 and 28 in one district with Monterey and San Benito
7sclara_20110626_2	6262011	Jason Spitzer	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Do not put E. San Jose with Monterey

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110623_25	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_26	Los Angeles	San Pedro, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110623_27	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Agoura, Antelope Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_28	Los Angeles	Shadow Hills, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, La Tuna Canyon		no	yes	Environmental, shopping, entertainment interests	
4langeles_20110623_29	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110623_31	Los Angeles	Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes	Public land use, geography, recreation	
5ventura_20110626_5	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110626_6		Simi Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks		no	yes		
6tuolummne_20110626_1	Tuolumne, Calavera, Amador			no	no		
6tuolummne_20110626_2				no	no		
6tuolummne_20110626_3	Tuolumne, Calavera, Amador			no	no		
6tuolummne_20110626_4				no	no		
7sclara_20110626_1	Monterey, San Benito			no	yes	Latino population	
7sclara_20110626_2	Monterey	San Jose		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110623_25			no				
4langeles_20110623_26			no				
4langeles_20110623_27			no				
4langeles_20110623_28			no				
4langeles_20110623_29			no				
4langeles_20110623_31			no				
5ventura_20110626_5			no				
5ventura_20110626_6	work, shopping, recreation		no			nothing in common with Malibu	
6tuolummne_20110626_1			no				
6tuolummne_20110626_2			no				
6tuolummne_20110626_3			no				
6tuolummne_20110626_4			no				
7sclara_20110626_1	victims of violence need to be coordinated		no				
7sclara_20110626_2			no			san jose vs. rural. Political interests disenfranchised	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110626_3	6262011	Quyen Vuong	no			Santa Clara	yes	Keep Evergreen together in San Jose with Little Saigon. Put Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Cupertino and Santa Clara in one district. Do not put Alum Rick with rural district
8alameda_20110626_1	6262011	Henry Hutchins	no				yes	Keep Fremont, Newark, and Union City together. Do same for East San Jose
8alameda_20110626_2	6262011	Dr. Rakesh Sharma	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Newark and Union City together
8alameda_20110626_3	6262011	Mei-ling Leong	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Do not split Fremont into two districts
8alameda_20110626_4	6262011	Robert Ferreira	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Do not redistrict San Leandro
8alameda_20110626_5	6262011	Judy Donovan	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro in one district
8alameda_20110626_6	6262011	Janet Crocker	yes	NUSD Board of Education Member	Newark	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Union City, Newark whole and together
8ccosta_20110626_1	6262011	Patrice Young	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in single district
8ccosta_20110626_2	6262011	Margaret Jordan	yes	Richmond Progressive Alliance	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole.
8ccosta_20110626_3	6262011	David Cole	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond.
8ccosta_20110626_4	6262011	Elizabeth Summer	no				yes	Do not put Fremont with San Ramon, etc.
8ccosta_20110626_5	6262011	Theresa de Valence	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond.
8ccosta_20110626_6	6262011	Claire, Elizabeth DeSophia	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond into 2 districts. Keep in Contra Costa
8ccosta_20110626_7	6262011	Ron Palmer	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond with Contra Costa, do not put with Oakland
8ccosta_20110626_8	6262011	Margaret M. Clowrey	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not redistrict Richmond

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110626_3	Santa Clara	San Jose, Mountain View, sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clara		no	yes	Latino population, Vietnamese community	
8alameda_20110626_1		Fremont, Newark, Union City, East San Jose		no	no		
8alameda_20110626_2		Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	no		
8alameda_20110626_3		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110626_4		San Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110626_5		san Leandro		no	no		
8alameda_20110626_6		Fremont, Union City, Newark		no	no		
8ccosta_20110626_1		Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110626_2		Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110626_3		Richmond		no	yes	common interests,	
8ccosta_20110626_4		Fremont		no	no		
8ccosta_20110626_5		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110626_6	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110626_7	Contra Costa	Richmond, Oakland		no	no		
8ccosta_20110626_8		Richmond		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110626_3	shopping, work, public tranportation		no				
8alameda_20110626_1			no			communities are very differentn	
8alameda_20110626_2			no				
8alameda_20110626_3			no				
8alameda_20110626_4			no			will be eaten up by larger cities	
8alameda_20110626_5			no				
8alameda_20110626_6			no				
8ccosta_20110626_1	welfare of citizens, social impacts		no				
8ccosta_20110626_2	one richmond, diversity		no				
8ccosta_20110626_3	school district		no				
8ccosta_20110626_4			no			dividing lines should be as natural as possible	
8ccosta_20110626_5			no				
8ccosta_20110626_6	representation		no				
8ccosta_20110626_7			no			Richmond would take 2nd place to Oaklands needs	
8ccosta_20110626_8			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110626_9	6262011	George Martin	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not cut out Richmond from the district.Keep with coastside industrial zone, Martinez.
8ccosta_20110626_10	6262011	Susan Pomeroy	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in one district.
8ccosta_20110626_11	6262011	Jon Johnsen	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond between districts
8ccosta_20110626_12	6262011	Richard W. Ahern	no		Oakley	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Oakley, Brentwood and Antioch together in Contra Costa.
8marin_20110626_1	6262011	Peter Applegate	no				yes	Marin should be separate from San Francisco
8marin_20110626_2	6262011	John E. David	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Do not put Marin County with San Francisco
8marin_20110626_3	6262011	Debora Busse	no		Larkspur	Marin	yes	Include Marin with Sonoma with small part of Napa. Do not put with SF
8marin_20110626_4	6262011	Deb Waldt	no			Marin	yes	Do not include San Francisco with Marin
8marin_20110626_5	6262011	Nicholas Clark	no			Marin	yes	San Francisco should not be in the same district as Marin, Sonoma
8marin_20110626_6	6262011	Bob Ruzick	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Do not include San Francisco with Marin
8marin_20110626_7	6262011	Lee Hamovitz	no				yes	Marin should not be part of North Coast district
8marin_20110626_8	6262011	Wendy Friefeld	no		Point Reyes	Marin	yes	Do not cut Santa Rosa out of district.
8marin_20110626_9	6262011	Brenda Jo Morales	no			Marin	yes	Leave SF out of Marin district, keep Marin and Sonoma together
8marin_20110626_10	6262011	Tim Rice	no				yes	Keep Marin with Sonoma. Do not include SF

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110626_9		Richmond, Martinez		no	no		
8ccosta_20110626_10		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110626_11		Richmond		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110626_12	Contra Costa	Oakley, Brentwood, Antioch	Highway 4 bypass	no	yes	common borders, intertwined	tourism
8marin_20110626_1	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_2	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_3	Marin, Sonoma, Napa	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_4	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_5	marin, Sonoma	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_6	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_7	Marin			no	no		
8marin_20110626_8		Santa Rosa,		no	yes		
8marin_20110626_9	Marin, Sonoma	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_10	Marin, Sonoma	San Francisco		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110626_9	political influence		no				
8ccosta_20110626_10			no				
8ccosta_20110626_11	would have negative effects on revitalization efforts		no				
8ccosta_20110626_12	local events, representation, population, urban communities		no				
8marin_20110626_1			no				
8marin_20110626_2			no				
8marin_20110626_3			no				
8marin_20110626_4			no			agricultural connections	
8marin_20110626_5			no			little open space	
8marin_20110626_6			no			different lifestyle	
8marin_20110626_7			no				
8marin_20110626_8	shopping		no				
8marin_20110626_9			no			no COI	
8marin_20110626_10			no			metro area v. small towns with agriculture	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110626_11	6262011	Pat Long	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Do not group Marin with SF
8marin_20110626_12	6262011	Charles Auerbach	no				yes	Keep Marin with counties North of Golden Gate, not with SF
8marin_20110626_13	6262011	Robert Sanderson	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin with counties North of Golden Gate, not with SF
8marin_20110626_14	6262011	Tom Dicker	no				yes	Keep Marin separate from San Francisco
8napa_20110626_1	6262011	Scott Young	no		St Helena	Marin	yes	Do not separate Napa, Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino, Yolo, Solano counties.
8napa_20110626_2	6262011	Robert and Jacalyn Pierce	no			Napa	yes	Keep Napa with other North Coast counties
8napa_20110626_3	6262011	Ellen Eshelby	no			Napa	yes	Keep Napa with Sonoma, not Yolo. Keep American canyon in Napa
8napa_20110626_4	6262011	Rick Thornberry	no			Napa	yes	Keep Napa Valley with other North Coast counties
8napa_20110626_5	6262011	Faith Munn	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Include American Canyon
8smateo_20110626_1	6262011	Mickie Winkler, Former Mayor	no		Menlo Park		yes	Do not split Menlo Park
8smateo_20110626_2	6262011	Thomas Wong	no				yes	Do not divide Menlo Park. Join with East Palo Alto, Atherton, Palo Alto. All of Redwood City should be with San Mateo County
8smateo_20110626_3	6262011	Eva Cuffy	no			San mateo	yes	Do not split Menlo Park
9calaveras_20110626_1	6262011	Dave Self	no				yes	Calaveras, Tuolomne, and Amador Counties should be in same district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110626_11	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_12	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_13	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110626_14	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8napa_20110626_1	Napa, Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino, Yolo, Solano counties.			no	yes		wine, tourism, agricultural interests
8napa_20110626_2	Napa			no	yes		
8napa_20110626_3	Napa, Sonoma, Yolo	American Canyon		no	yes		
8napa_20110626_4	Napa			no	yes		same economic base
8napa_20110626_5		American Canyon		no	no		
8smateo_20110626_1		menlo Park		no	no		
8smateo_20110626_2	San Mateo	Menlo Park, Redwood City, Palo Alto, Atherton		no	no		
8smateo_20110626_3		Menlo Park		no	no		
9calaveras_20110626_1	Calaveras, Tuolomne, Amador			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110626_11			no			urban v. small towns. Homelessness, public transport, tourism. Different lifestyles and populations	
8marin_20110626_12			no				
8marin_20110626_13			no			representation	
8marin_20110626_14			no				
8napa_20110626_1	financially and culturally		no				
8napa_20110626_2	economic, geophysical, political		no				
8napa_20110626_3	issues, weather, industries, political views,		no				
8napa_20110626_4	wine grape growers,		no				
8napa_20110626_5			no				
8smateo_20110626_1			no				
8smateo_20110626_2			no				
8smateo_20110626_3	small and do not need to be divided		no				
9calaveras_20110626_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9calaveras_20110626_2	6262011	Chris Sampson	no				yes	Calaveras, Tuolomne, and Amador Counties should be in same district
9siskiyou_20110626_1	6262011	Norman R. Malmberg, Captain	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not place Scott Valley and Happy Camp from Siskiyou into coastal district.
9siskiyou_20110626_2	6262011	Heidy Carver	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou.
9siskiyou_20110626_3	6262011	Lee Bundy	no		Callahan	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county.
9siskiyou_20110626_4	6262011	Don Mackintosh	no		Weed	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County. Scott Valley should not be added to Coastal District. Scott Valley and Yreka are connected
9siskiyou_20110626_5	6262011	Jim and Marjorie Clemons	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County
9siskiyou_20110626_6	6262011	Amber Verry	no			Siskiyou	yes	Against splitting Siskiyou County. Keep Scott Valley and Shasta Valley together, not with Eureka
9siskiyou_20110626_7	6262011	Kevin Hammon	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou into two Districts.
9siskiyou_20110626_8	6262011	Ken Oliver	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County
9siskiyou_20110626_9	6262011	Don Hugo	no		Scott Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9calaveras_20110626_2	Calaveras, Tuolomne, Amador			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110626_1	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Happy Camp, Yreka		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110626_2	Siskiyou			no	yes	school districts,	agriculture, foresting, mining, land use
9siskiyou_20110626_3	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110626_4	siskiyou	Scott Valley, Yreka	I-5	no	yes	shopping, services,	irrigation, agriculture, lumbur industry,
9siskiyou_20110626_5	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110626_6	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Shasta Valley, Eureka		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110626_7	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110626_8	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110626_9	siskiyou			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9calaveras_20110626_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110626_1			no			5 hours driving time from the coast	
9siskiyou_20110626_2	endangered species, water rights, representatives, travel expense		no				
9siskiyou_20110626_3			no			topography seperates from the coast. Control of natural resources.	
9siskiyou_20110626_4	government		no			isolated from coast by rough terrain and 5 hours	
9siskiyou_20110626_5	agriculture, water rights, dams, foresting, mining, recreation, neighborhoods and transportation		no			5 hour drive	
9siskiyou_20110626_6			no			Native American population not that prominent	
9siskiyou_20110626_7			no			Geographical distrance, No fishing, no significant Native American Polulation	
9siskiyou_20110626_8			no			Coast is hours away	
9siskiyou_20110626_9			no			Add to expense of elections, representation, economy. No significant Native American population	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110626_10	6262011	Harry L. Lake	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou county, Scott Valley, Shasta Valleye
9siskiyou_20110626_11	6262011	Mike and Lynne Bryan	no		Etna	siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou. Do not split off Scott Valley.
9siskiyou_20110626_12	6262011	Lorrie Bundy	no		Callahan	Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou. Scott Valley shares common bond with eastern Siskiyou
9siskiyou_20110626_13	6262011	Lodema Oliver	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou. County seat is Yreka not Eureka
9siskiyou_20110626_14	6262011	Anthony Intiso LLB	yes	Siskiyou County Water Users Association		Siskiyou	yes	Current map is in violation of Federal and State Statutes
9sjoaquin_20110626_1	6262011	Williamson Ron and Susan	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with San Joaquin Valley.
9sjoaquin_20110626_2	6262011	Kathy Polense	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Include Galt in district. Lodi should be in same district as Stockton.
9sjoaquin_20110626_3	6262011	Kathy Meek	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with San Joaquin, not Sonoma and Napa
9sjoaquin_20110626_4	6262011	Bev Lacy	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi with San Joaquin, not North Bay
9sjoaquin_20110626_5	6262011	Vernon Renwanz	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be included in East Bay boundaries
9sjoaquin_20110626_6	6262011	Steve andor Nancy Scott	no				yes	Do not put Lodi in same district with Bay Area Cities
9sjoaquin_20110626_7	6262011	Paula Simpfenderfer	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Remove Lodi from mapping draft.Do not group with Benicia, Woodland

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110626_10	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Shasta Valley		no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110626_11	Siskiyou	Scott Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110626_12	Siskiyou	Scott Valley		no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110626_13	Siskiyou	Eureka, Yreka		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110626_14				no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110626_1	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110626_2	San Joaquin	Lodi, Galt, stockton		no	yes	school districts, public tranport, newspapers	statistical groupings, agricultural, community college
9sjoaquin_20110626_3	San Joaquin, Sonoma, Napa	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110626_4	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110626_5		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110626_6		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110626_7		Lodi, Benicia, Woodland		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110626_10	farming and ranching lifestyle.		no			Native American Pop. Not significant.	
9siskiyou_20110626_11			no			No commonalities, history or economic basis with coastal region. Five hour drive	
9siskiyou_20110626_12	ranching community, social economic issues,		no			we do not travel to coast for shopping and culture	
9siskiyou_20110626_13			no				
9siskiyou_20110626_14			no				
9sjoaquin_20110626_1			no			have never connected with any of the cities	
9sjoaquin_20110626_2			no				
9sjoaquin_20110626_3			no			Population and incomes vary with Bay area, as with gricultural interests, schools, transportation	
9sjoaquin_20110626_4			no			Nothing in common with North Bay	
9sjoaquin_20110626_5			no			Clearly in central Valley	
9sjoaquin_20110626_6			no				
9sjoaquin_20110626_7			no			Wineries, agriculture, different concerns	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110626_1	6262011	Don Saylor	no			Yolo	yes	Do not carve Yolo county into five districts. Place Davis and Woodland together.
9yolo_20110626_2	6262011	Don Saylor	no			Yolo	yes	Do not carve Yolo county up. Include Davis and woodland
9yolo_20110626_3	6262011	Sherri Venezia	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not add Yolo and Davis to Sacramento District
9yolo_20110626_4	6262011	Janet Mercurio	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo unified.
9yolo_20110626_5	6262011	Joanne	no			Yolo	yes	Redrawing of boundaries in Yolo makes sense
9yolo_20110626_6	6262011	Michael Bartolic	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County intact.
9yolo_20110626_7	6262011	Timothy Fenton	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County together
9yolo_20110626_8	6262011	Karen Klussendorf	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County together in one district. Share more in common with each other than Sacramento or San Joaquin. More aligned with Solano.
9yolo_20110626_9	6262011	Davis Campbell	no			Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo county, do not put in Sacramento
9yolo_20110626_10	6262011	Raymond E. Borton	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County together in one district.
9yolo_20110626_11	6262011	Brian Sway	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County intact
9yolo_20110626_12	6262011	Norma Rice	yes	Knits by Norma	Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not join Davis to Sacramento or split from Yolo County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110626_1	Yolo	Woodland, Davis		no	yes		
9yolo_20110626_2	Yolo	Woodland, Davis		no	yes	social fabric	economies,
9yolo_20110626_3	Yolo	Davis	West Side of the Sacramento River	no	yes		
9yolo_20110626_4	Yolo			no	yes	sense of community, county fair	
9yolo_20110626_5	Yolo			no	no		
9yolo_20110626_6	Yolo			no	no		
9yolo_20110626_7	Yolo			no	yes		
9yolo_20110626_8	Yolo, Sacramento, Solano, San Joaquin	Sacramento	I-80, Sacramento River	no	yes		agriculture, environment
9yolo_20110626_9	Yolo, Sacramento			no	yes	quality of life, coorperation, shared interest	agricultural base
9yolo_20110626_10	Yolo			no	yes	culture of collaboration, set of shared values	agriculture, emerging technologies
9yolo_20110626_11	Yolo		Blue Ridge Mountains, Sacramento River	no	yes	shared values,	economic well being, UC Davis
9yolo_20110626_12	Yolo	Davis, Sacramento		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110626_1	political strength, representation		no				
9yolo_20110626_2	geography, governance		no			will be difficult to have collective voice heard	
9yolo_20110626_3	environment, air quality, water, wild river status, university		no			not oriented toward urban issues of crime, traffic patterns, etc	
9yolo_20110626_4	political clout		no				
9yolo_20110626_5			no				
9yolo_20110626_6			no			redistricting would disenfranchise Yoloans by scattering votes	
9yolo_20110626_7	common interests political, economic, cultural, historical		no				
9yolo_20110626_8	open space		no			smart growth planing could be diluted in urban district	
9yolo_20110626_9	university farm in Davis.		no				
9yolo_20110626_10	natural boundaries		no				
9yolo_20110626_11	geography, governance		no			Yolo county should be an odd number	
9yolo_20110626_12	developed avenues and means of cooperation		no			Davis should not be in separate district from county seat	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110626_13	6262011	Helen M. Thomson	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County intact, do not include with Sacramento
9yolo_20110626_14	6262011	Barbara A. King	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo county. Do not separate Davis from Woodland
9yolo_20110626_15	6262011	Karen Mo	no			Yolo	yes	Do not divide Yolo county
9yolo_20110626_16	6262011	David Naliboff, MD	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo county together. Do not give Woodland and Davis away.
9yolo_20110626_17	6262011	Charlie Russell	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not lump Davis and Yolo in with Sacramento. Do not separate from Woodland
9yolo_20110626_18	6262011	Sandra K. Weiss	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Davis has more in common with Yolo than Sacramento. Yolo should be kept as whole as possible
CSCFR_20110626_1	6262011	Phyllis Platt	yes	Coaltion of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep East Ventura county together. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura, not Malibu.
CSCFR_20110626_2	6262011	Terry Platt	yes	Coaltion of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thouasand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep East Ventura county together. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura, not Malibu.
general_20110626_1	6262011	Margo Morales	yes	Chinese American Citizens Alliance	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries will disenfranchise Latino Voters
general_20110626_2	6262011	Bruce Knoles	no		Azusa	Los Angeles	yes	Commissions maps do not provide opportunities for fair Ltino representation
general_20110626_3	6262011	Bill and Carol Meehleis	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110626_13	Yolo	Sacramento		no	yes		
9yolo_20110626_14	Yolo,	Davis, Woodland		no	yes		farmland, food,
9yolo_20110626_15	Yolo			no	yes		
9yolo_20110626_16	Yolo	Davis, Woodland		no	yes		farming communities, UC Davis,
9yolo_20110626_17	Yolo	Davis, Woodland, Sacramento		no	yes		
9yolo_20110626_18	Yolo	Davis, Sacramento		no	yes	small cities, rural activities, intellectual center, activist orientation to preserving lands for public use	
CSCFR_20110626_1	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes		
CSCFR_20110626_2	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes		
general_20110626_1				no	yes	Latino voter	
general_20110626_2				no	yes	Latino population	
general_20110626_3				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110626_13	working together for the common goood of our counties residents		no			Davis is not a suburb of Sacramento	
9yolo_20110626_14	Clean Water agency		no				
9yolo_20110626_15	shared interests		no			other communities do not share commonalities	
9yolo_20110626_16	water access, UCD		no				
9yolo_20110626_17			no				
9yolo_20110626_18	restaurants, productions, growth, birds, integrity		no				
CSCFR_20110626_1			no				supports Coaltion of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
CSCFR_20110626_2			no				supports Coaltion of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation
general_20110626_1			no			adopt maps proposed by Chinese American Citizens Alliance	
general_20110626_2		Equitable representation for latinos required by VRA	no				people should be fairly represented
general_20110626_3			no			considerable miscalculation in fair representation	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110626_4	6262011	Gordon C. Macleod, M.D.	no		Fremont	Alameda	no	
general_20110626_5	6262011	Mark Bonar	no				yes	Supports new Foothills district.
smonicamtns_20110626_1	6262011	John Suwara	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not break up West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu
smonicamtns_20110626_2	6262011	Pamela Evans	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not break up West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu
smonicamtns_20110626_3	6262011	Joanne Suwara	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not break up West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu
5sbarbara_20110626_1	6262011	Regina Lingl	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110626_2	6262011	Marie Pope	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110626_3	6262011	Bob Lingl	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110626_4	6262011	Rod Golden	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110626_5	6262011	Dr. and Mrs. John D. Sawyer	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc into two districts.
5ventura_20110626_1	6262011	Pat Kubach	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley in LA county.
5ventura_20110626_2	6262011	Ann Lindeen	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not separate Simi Valley and Moorpark from Thousand Oaks
5ventura_20110626_3	6262011	Peggy Jane Sadler	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark in Ventura County.
5ventura_20110626_4	6262011	Diantha Ain	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley and Moorpark in Ventura, not LA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110626_4				no	no		
general_20110626_5				no	no		
smonicamtns_20110626_1		West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes		
smonicamtns_20110626_2		West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes		
smonicamtns_20110626_3		West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110626_1		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110626_2		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110626_3		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110626_4		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110626_5		Lompoc		no	no		
5ventura_20110626_1	Los Angeles, Ventura	Simi Valley		no	yes	unique	
5ventura_20110626_2		Simi Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110626_3	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark	mountain ranges, high desert	no	yes	close knit county,	
5ventura_20110626_4	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110626_4			no				Pleased at the work you are doing.
general_20110626_5			no				
smonicamtns_20110626_1	mountains, quality of life, fire stations, sherrifs station, water district		no				
smonicamtns_20110626_2	mountains, quality of life, fire stations, sherrifs station, water district		no				
smonicamtns_20110626_3	mountains, quality of life, fire stations, sherrifs station, water district		no				
5sbarbara_20110626_1			no				
5sbarbara_20110626_2			no				
5sbarbara_20110626_3			no				
5sbarbara_20110626_4			no				
5sbarbara_20110626_5			no				
5ventura_20110626_1	topologically, personality.		no			would disappear if part of L.A.	
5ventura_20110626_2	should not be seperated from neighbors		no				
5ventura_20110626_3	water, tranportation, association of governments		no				
5ventura_20110626_4	pioneer spirit		no			different lifestyles	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110627_10	6272011	J. Mendoza	yes	Department Of Commerce Specialist			yes	San Diegos interest in Imperial Valley is because of leverage in funding. Leave Imperial with Coachella Valley.
1imperial_20110627_11	6282011	Glenn Jr. Dinsmore	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Add Imperial county to Riverside, along with East L.A. and Watts.
1imperial_20110627_12	6272011	Kathy Gillman	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Include Imperial Valley in the same district as Coachella Valley.It has much more in common with CoachellaRiverside than with San Diego County.
1imperial_20110627_13	6282011	Robert Zweibel	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Do not sort Imperial County with San Diego County.It must be included with Coachella ValleyRiverside.
1imperial_20110627_14	6272011	Sue E. Caspari	no			Riverside	yes	Imperial County should remain joined to Eastern Riverside County.
1imperial_20110627_15	6272011	Johanna Cullip	no				yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, and keep Coachella Valley with Riverside County.
1imperial_20110627_16	6272011	Ron Siegel	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not separate Imperial and Coachella valley.They should be combined, very similar.
1imperial_20110627_17	6272011	Edgar Bourquin	no				yes	Coachella ValleyRiverside has more in common with Imperial Valley than San Diego does.Imperial county and Coachella should be in same district.
1imperial_20110627_18	6272011	Anonymous	no				yes	CoachellaRiverside must be connected to Imperial County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110627_10	Imperial,San Diego, Riverside.			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_11	Imperial			no	yes		
1imperial_20110627_12	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	yes		
1imperial_20110627_13	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_14	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes	Low income housing, Public school challenges with language,	
1imperial_20110627_15	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_16	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_17	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside.			no	yes	Agricultural Commerce, Land use, similar temperature and plant life, mexican and american population and public school students.	
1imperial_20110627_18	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110627_10			no				
1imperial_20110627_11	Diversity		no				
1imperial_20110627_12	People working in Imperial valley live in Coachella. Vice versa.Not in San Diego.		no				
1imperial_20110627_13			no				
1imperial_20110627_14			no				
1imperial_20110627_15			no				
1imperial_20110627_16			no				
1imperial_20110627_17			no				
1imperial_20110627_18			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110627_19	6272011	Charles William Gay	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Congressional district should include Imperial County with Coachella ValleyRiverside.Two assembly districts one with Imperial and Eastern Coachella Valley,Other with West Coachella through the pass to Beaumont and Banning, State senate with both assembly
1imperial_20110627_20	6272011	John Ressler	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Opposing proposal to split Imperial County from Eastern Riverside County.East Riverside, including Coachella Valley much more in common with Imperial Co. than it does with Western Riverside County
1imperial_20110627_21	6272011	Linda Zieff	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County Separate from Coachella Valley
1imperial_20110627_22	6272011	Madeline and John Grant	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego County and not Palm Springs.Imperial has no connection to Palm Springs,Rancho Mirage, or Indian Wells
1imperial_20110627_23	6272011	Darlene and Frank Casella	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Do not put Imperial County with Coachella Valley. Leave it with San Diego
1imperial_20110627_24	6272011	Greg Lucas Rodriguez	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	
1imperial_20110627_25	6272011	Susan Guardino	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Imperial County should remain with Coachella Valley in redistricting.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110627_19	Imperial, Riverside	Beaumont, Banning	Pass to Beaumont and Banning	no	yes		
1imperial_20110627_20	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes		
1imperial_20110627_21	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_22	Imperial, San Diego		I 8 freeway keeps these two counties connected.	no	no		
1imperial_20110627_23	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_24				no	no		
1imperial_20110627_25	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110627_19	Great bond and great diversity among these people.		no				
1imperial_20110627_20	Much in common.		no				
1imperial_20110627_21			no				
1imperial_20110627_22			no				
1imperial_20110627_23			no				
1imperial_20110627_24			no				Blatantly partisan emails are being sent to the commission in favor of white, old, retired republicans when it comes to drawing maps for Imperial And Coachella Valley.Please take this into consideration.
1imperial_20110627_25	Salton Sea is shared by both districts.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110627_26	6272011	William Post	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Congressional district should include Imperial and Coachella Valley,Two assembly districts one with Imperial and Eastern Coachella Valley, other with West Coachella through pass to Beaumont and Banning, S.S. including both Assembly districts
1imperial_20110627_27	6282011	Joanne E. Bourquin	no				yes	Imperial County and Coachella Valley should be in the same district.Coachella Valley has more in common with Imperial than San Diego.
1imperial_20110627_28	6282011	Edgar J. Bourquin	no				yes	Imperial County should be zoned with Coachella Valley rather than San Diego.
1imperial_20110627_29	6272011	Claudia Fausett	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, not with Coachella Valley.Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside County.
1imperial_20110627_30	6272011	Roberta Moore	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Congressional district should include Imperial and Coachella Valley,Two assembly districts one with Imperial and Eastern Coachella Valley, other with West Coachella through pass to Beaumont and Banning, S.S. including both Assembly districts
1sdiego_20110627_1	6272011	Ken Magro	no				yes	Do not Divide San Diego County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110627_26	Imperial, Riverside	Beaumont,Banning	Pass	no	no		
1imperial_20110627_27	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	yes	Agriculture,plant, animal life, need for solar energy,common temperatures, mexican american population	
1imperial_20110627_28	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	yes	Agriculture, high mexican american population, Solar energy, plantanimal life, shared school.	
1imperial_20110627_29	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_30	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego	Beaumont, Banning.	Pass	no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_1	San Diego.			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110627_26			no				
1imperial_20110627_27			no				
1imperial_20110627_28			no				
1imperial_20110627_29			no				
1imperial_20110627_30			no				
1sdiego_20110627_1			no				The criteria for this process is racist, sexist, and classist.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_2	6272011	Shannon Muir	yes	UC San Diego Graduate Student Association	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Propose that boundary for assembly districts RACHOBMM and CRNOSAND be moved to the west between Gilman Drive and Genesee Avenue,in order to include students residing on UCSDs campus and residing in University town center.this would unite small portion of
1sdiego_20110627_2	6272011	Shannon Muir	yes	UC San Diego Graduate Student Association	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Student housing sitting east of Hwy 5 with rest of community.Boundary run north along Hwy 5 until Gilman exit, Gilman north to Torrey Pines Road, Until Genesee Ave, turn east on Genesee, back to hwy. 5 and continue north.
1sdiego_20110627_3	6272011	Hector Martinez	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Draw congressional and state senate district along mexican border that links San Diego with Imperial County.
1sdiego_20110627_4	6272011	Josie L. Caldernon Scott	yes	Mexican American Business and Professional Association	Bonita	San Diego	yes	Thank you for keeping Lemon Grove, Southeasten San Diego, Spring Valley and Bonita connected while still bringing in La Mesa. Keep this connection for the final maps.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_2				no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_2	San Diego	La Jolla	Hwy 5,Gilman St. Exit, Torrey Pines Road, Genesee Ave.	no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_3	San Diego, Imperial			no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_4	San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_2			no				
1sdiego_20110627_2	College community should stay together.		no				
1sdiego_20110627_3		This will provide for VRA districts will be provided for in order to protect the right to representation by the latino community in the region, and allow better and consistent representation on border issues at state and fed levels.	no				
1sdiego_20110627_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_5	6272011	Audie J. de Castro	yes	President of Filipino American Chamber of Commerce, San Diego County		San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110627_6	6272011	Areeluck Parnsoonthorn	yes				no	
1sdiego_20110627_7	6272011	Marykay Burch	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	Please keep Rancho Santa Fe in the north area district.
1sdiego_20110627_8	6272011	Grace Fordan Almazar	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center For Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)			no	
1sdiego_20110627_9	6272011	Bill Weber	no				yes	Place Rancho Santa Fe in the RanchoBMM or NCoastSan District for assembly, and in the Nesan or Sanoc District for senate.Rancho Santa Fe should not be in Ocean district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_5				no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_6				no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_7	San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe		no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_8				no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_9	San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe		no	yes	School district,fire, ambulance, sewer and water districts.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_5			no				FACCI supports a group of speakers who testified on June 20th, 2011 about comissions first draft assembly and senate maps and their requests to keep API COIs together.The comission should follow maps submitted by CAPAFR.
1sdiego_20110627_6			no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_7			no				
1sdiego_20110627_8	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_9	It is a COI. Should be with Inland district.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_10	6272011	Lusito Jr. Melchor	yes	Fil Am Fest			no	
1sdiego_20110627_11	6272011	Shirley Kaltenborn	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Clairemont should not be divided. Neither should Mira Mesa, University City or others.Del Mar does not have much in common with Imperial Beach.
1sdiego_20110627_12	6272011	Atilio Alicio	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center For Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)			no	
1sdiego_20110627_13	6272011	Sandy Spackman	yes	Lao American Coalition		San Diego	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_10				no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_11	San Diego	Clairemont,Mira Mesa, University City,Del Mar, Imperial beach		no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_12				no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_13				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_10	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_11			no				
1sdiego_20110627_12	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_13	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_14	6272011	Virginia H. Ferrer	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center For Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)			no	
1sdiego_20110627_15	6272011	Amanda Soloman	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center For Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)			no	
1sdiego_20110627_16	6272011	Johnny H. Tran	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center For Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)	San Diego	San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110627_17	6272011	Don Higginson	yes	Mayor, City of Poway	Poway	San Diego	yes	Please keep Poway,Rancho Bernardo4SRanch and Rancho Penasquitos as one congressional district.These areas are a COI together and should be kept together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_14				no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_15				no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_16				no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_17	San Diego	Poway,Rancho Bernardo,Carmel Mountain Ranch,Sabre Springs,Rancho Penasquitos		no	yes	all under one school district,San Diego Economic Development Council works to support economic development in areas.Poway Community College serves areas,Same health care for area,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_14	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_15	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_16	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_17	all function together within San Diego County.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_18	6272011	Tara O Brien	no	SCAPAL(Southwest Center For Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)			no	
1sdiego_20110627_19	6272011	Anonymous	no				no	
1sdiego_20110627_20	6272011	Audie J. de Castro	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center For Asian Pacific American Law) and CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)			no	
2riverside_20110627_1	6272011	Kerstin B. Pollack	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110627_2	6272011	Don Anderson	no				yes	Keep Coachella Valley with San Diego, Not Palm Springs.
2riverside_20110627_3	6272011	Hannah Cline	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Eastern Riverside County and Imperial County must remain together.Same desert issues.Do not separate them.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_18				no	yes		
1sdiego_20110627_19				no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_20				no	yes		
2riverside_20110627_1				no	no		
2riverside_20110627_2	Riverside, San Diego	Palm Springs, Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110627_3	Riverside, Imperial,San Diego	Rancho Mirage		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_18	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_19			no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
1sdiego_20110627_20	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego County Together based on Similar Socio economic, cultural, ethnic, religious and language access needs.		no				Support same speakers who testified on June 20th to keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs together.Including Speaker numbers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91
2riverside_20110627_1			no				I full endorse contents of the letter from Arthur A. Copleston dated June 26, 2011.
2riverside_20110627_2			no				
2riverside_20110627_3	Shared desert issues and the Salton Sea		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110627_4	6272011	Sheri Borax	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, Not with Coachella Valley.
2riverside_20110627_5	6272011	Julie Bornstein	yes	The Bornstein Group	Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Include Imperial County and East Riverside County in same assembly,senate,congressional district.
2riverside_20110627_6	6282011	Ken Hobbs	no				yes	Strongly endorse proposed maps for Coachella Valley.Please keep Imperial County out of the Coachella Valley.
2riverside_20110627_7	6272011	Samuel H. Medrano	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and East Riverside are a COI.They should be combined.District should include all of Imperial,Palo Verde Valley at the border(Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley) and East Coachella Valley from Palm Desert East.Second Assembly district would start at
2riverside_20110627_7	6272011	Samuel H. Medrano	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Political boundaries seperating Rancho Mirage from Palm Desert and move west to include Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass.
2riverside_20110627_8	6272011	Deborah Hobbs	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Riverside Countys Coachella Valley Intact.Do not merge with Imperial or San Diego.
2riverside_20110627_9	6272011	Diana G. Gottschalk	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, Not with Coachella Valley.
2riverside_20110627_10	6272011	Jamie Humphrey	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, Not with Coachella Valley.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110627_4	Imperial,Riverside, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_5	San DiegoRiverside, Imperial			no	yes	Similar ethnic group dynamics,work,family,shopping,education,health care.	Largely agricultural and tourism based.
2riverside_20110627_6	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_7	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	no		
2riverside_20110627_7	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_8	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	yes	healthcare,regional airport,transportation	Military,economics
2riverside_20110627_9	Riverside,Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_10	Riverside,Imperial, San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110627_4			no				
2riverside_20110627_5			no				
2riverside_20110627_6			no				
2riverside_20110627_7			no				
2riverside_20110627_7			no				
2riverside_20110627_8			no				
2riverside_20110627_9			no				
2riverside_20110627_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110627_11	6272011	Peter East	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Do not connect Imperial Valley to San Diego County.
2riverside_20110627_12	6272011	Diana G. Gottschalk	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside for Voting purposes.
2riverside_20110627_13	6272011	Paul Lewin	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and Coachella Valley are a COI.They have nothing in common with San Diego County.
2riverside_20110627_14	6272011	Lillian P. Reeves	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, not with Coachella Valley.Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside.
2riverside_20110627_15	6272011	Carolyn E. Krause	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Do not divide desert communities into multiple districts.Coachella and Imperial Valley stay together.Rewdraw maps to exclude Cabazon and beyond.Include Desert Springs and the Imperial Valley. Do not cater to West of the mountains.
2riverside_20110627_16	6272011	Deborah Hobbs	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Riverside Countys Coachella Valley intact.Do not group with San Diego or Imperial
2riverside_20110627_17	6272011	Rob Atkins	no				yes	Merge Eastern Riverside County with Imperial County
2riverside_20110627_18	6282011	Arturo Hernandez(Duplicate)	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Do not divide desert communities into multiple districts.Coachella and Imperial Valley stay together.Rewdraw maps to exclude Cabazon and beyond.Include Desert Springs and the Imperial Valley. Do not cater to West of the mountains.
2riverside_20110627_19	6272011	Donald Bilby	no				yes	Keep Coachella Valley and Imperial County together.
2riverside_20110627_20	6272011	Dennis Elsasser	no				yes	Please include Imperial County with Coachella Valley district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110627_11	Riverside,Imperial, San Diego. Should not be connected, no similarities.			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_12	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_13	Riverise,Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_14	Imperial, Riverside,San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_15	Imperial, Riverside	Cabazon,Calimesa,		no	yes	mexican farm worker population, salton sea issues.	
2riverside_20110627_16	Riverside, San Dieogo, Imperial			no	yes	Transportation,healthcare, Regional airport	Economics,military
2riverside_20110627_17	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_18	Imperial, Riverside	Cabazon,Calimesa,		no	yes	mexican farm worker population, salton sea issues.	
2riverside_20110627_19	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes	Salton Sea Issues	major agricultural issues.
2riverside_20110627_20	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110627_11			no				
2riverside_20110627_12			no				
2riverside_20110627_13			no				
2riverside_20110627_14			no				
2riverside_20110627_15			no				
2riverside_20110627_16			no				
2riverside_20110627_17			no				
2riverside_20110627_18			no				
2riverside_20110627_19			no				
2riverside_20110627_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110627_21	6282011	Kenneth Hobbs	no				yes	Strongly endorse existing plans for Coachella Valley.It should not be mixed with Imperial Valley.
2riverside_20110627_22	6272011	Joanne Bourquin	no				yes	Coachella valley has more in common with Imperial County than San Diego does.Imperial should be included in same district as Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110627_23	6272011	Judith Butler	no				yes	Do not redistrict Imperial County. It belongs with Coachella Valley portion of Riverside County.Imperial has nothing in common with San Diego
2riverside_20110627_24	6272011	Lauran Findlay	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Palm Springs and surrounding areas in the Riverside County. Keep Imperial County with San Diego.
2riverside_20110627_26	6272011	Roberta Grubb	no				yes	Include Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley in redistricting.
2riverside_20110627_27	6272011	Susan Guardino	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley and Imperial County within same district.
2riverside_20110627_28	6272011	Walter Clark	no				yes	Riverside and Imperial should be connected, Not Imperial with San Diego.Also, communities of Banning, Beaumont, San Jacinto, Hemet and Calimesa should be in Los Angeles district. Not in the desert.
2riverside_20110627_29	6272011	Tracy Turner	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and Riverside should be connected. Shared interests.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110627_21	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_22	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_23	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_24	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	yes	Tourism	
2riverside_20110627_26	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	yes	Retirement Communities,Schools, Salton Sea Issues, Agricultural.	
2riverside_20110627_27	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes	Both concerned about restoration of Salton Sea.	
2riverside_20110627_28	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego, Los Angeles	Banning, Beaumont, San Jacinto, Hemet, Calimesa		no	no		
2riverside_20110627_29	Riverside, Imperial			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110627_21			no				
2riverside_20110627_22			no				
2riverside_20110627_23			no				
2riverside_20110627_24			no				
2riverside_20110627_26			no				
2riverside_20110627_27			no				
2riverside_20110627_28			no				
2riverside_20110627_29			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110627_30	6272011	Kris Mazure	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and East Riverside are a COI.They should be combined.District should include all of Imperial,Palo Verde Valley at the border(Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley) and East Coachella Valley from Palm Desert East.Second Assembly district would start at
2riverside_20110627_30	6272011	Kris Mazure	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Political boundaries seperating Rancho Mirage from Palm Desert and move west to include Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass.
2riverside_20110627_31	6272011	Bob and Rosa Lee Schneck	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not move Imperial County in with the Coachella Valley.Imperial Is much more aligned with San Diego County.
2riverside_20110627_32	6272011	Anne LaConde	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep the Imperial Valley with Riverside County.
2riverside_20110627_33	6272011	Barbara and Mel Liner	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and East Riverside are a COI.They should be combined.District should include all of Imperial,Palo Verde Valley at the border(Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley) and East Coachella Valley from Palm Desert East.Second Assembly district would start at

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110627_30	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_30	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_31	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_32	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_33	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110627_30			no				
2riverside_20110627_30			no				
2riverside_20110627_31			no				
2riverside_20110627_32			no				
2riverside_20110627_33			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110627_33	6272011	Barbara and Mel Liner	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Political boundaries seperating Rancho Mirage from Palm Desert and move west to include Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass.
2riverside_20110627_34	6272011	Donald Bilby	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley and Imperial County part of the same district.
2riverside_20110627_35	6272011	Mr. and Mrs. Jeff Lilley	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside,and Keep Imperial County with San Diego.
2riverside_20110627_36	6272011	John Hendrick	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside County
2riverside_20110627_37	6272011	Robert T. Jones	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, Not Riverside and keep Coachella Valley with Riverside.
2riverside_20110627_38	6272011	Gregorio Carrasco Cervantes, Jr.	no		Coachella	Riverside	yes	Do not divide Imperial and Riverside County.
2riverside_20110627_39	6272011	Carl R. Poirot	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Join RiversideCoachella Valley with Imperial County into one district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110627_33	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_34	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_35	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego.			no	yes	tourism, Transit,healthcare,	Military, past funding
2riverside_20110627_36	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_37	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_38	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes	Salton Sea, Agribusiness, Water Development, Renewable energy concerns,	
2riverside_20110627_39	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego.			no	yes	rural and agricultural aspects, Rural, salton sea	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110627_33			no				
2riverside_20110627_34			no				
2riverside_20110627_35			no				
2riverside_20110627_36			no				
2riverside_20110627_37			no				
2riverside_20110627_38			no				Remember our history and the history of these areas when looking at redistricting them.
2riverside_20110627_39			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110627_40	6272011	Don O Loghlin	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and East Riverside are a COI.They should be combined.District should include all of Imperial,Palo Verde Valley at the border(Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley) and East Coachella Valley from Palm Desert East.Second Assembly district would start at
2riverside_20110627_40	6272011	Don O Loghlin	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Political boundaries seperating Rancho Mirage from Palm Desert and move west to include Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass.
2riverside_20110627_41	6272011	Joe Salata	no				yes	Maps for Coachella Valley and Riverside do not reflect the growth of Latino Population over past ten years.Please make the maps give latinos a chance to be represented.
2riverside_20110627_42	6272011	Robert C. Lawrence Jr.	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego. Not with the Coachella Valley. Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside Only.
2riverside_20110627_43	6272011	G.J. Laurin	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego. Not with the Coachella Valley. Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside Only.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110627_40	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_40	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_41	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes	Latino Populations	
2riverside_20110627_42	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_43	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110627_40			no				
2riverside_20110627_40			no				
2riverside_20110627_41		Current maps do not keep with the VRA	no				
2riverside_20110627_42			no				
2riverside_20110627_43			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110627_44	6272011	Daniel V. Pepper	no				yes	Imperial County and East Riverside are a COI.They should be combined.District should include all of Imperial,Palo Verde Valley at the border(Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley) and East Coachella Valley from Palm Desert East.Second Assembly district would start at
2riverside_20110627_44	6272011	Daniel V. Pepper	no				yes	Political boundaries seperating Rancho Mirage from Palm Desert and move west to include Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass.
2riverside_20110627_45	6272011	Pat Jerich	no				yes	Leave the district as it is in the Coachella Valley.
2riverside_20110627_46	6272011	Douglas Hanson	no				yes	Coachella Valley must remain apart from Imperial.Not with San Diego.
2riverside_20110627_47	6272011	Regina Schroeder	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley in Riverside County.
2sbernardino_20110627_1	6272011	Michael Kaiser	no				yes	Displeased with splitting of Redlands into two congressional Districts with half of Redlands in large district that reaches all the way to Mammoth which is 300 miles away.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110627_44	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_44	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,BanningBeaumont Pass,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley.		no	yes	Climate,Population Demographics,Shared Salton Sea,Large communities of retired people,Lower Income,Suburban and rural,snow bird populations,same school districts,same newspaper	
2riverside_20110627_45	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_46	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110627_47	Riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_1	San Bernardino	Mammoth, Redlands		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110627_44			no				
2riverside_20110627_44			no				
2riverside_20110627_45			no				
2riverside_20110627_46			no				
2riverside_20110627_47			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110627_2	6272011	Rebecca McKeever	no				yes	Opposed to redrawing lines in Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110627_3	6272011	James H. Belote	no				yes	Do not split Redlands, especially along Highland Ave, which is a historic street.Splitting the street in two makes it difficult to insure its status in the future
2sbernardino_20110627_5	6272011	Tobey Robertson	no				yes	Support Inland Actions maps for San Bernardino and Riverside Counties
2sbernardino_20110627_6	6272011	Neil Derry	yes	San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors		San Bernardino	yes	Reconsider splitting Redlands. It has strong bond with Loma Linda.Crestline to Big Bear are COIs,keep them together.
2sbernardino_20110627_7	6272011	Winona Hendrickson	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Start map drawing from East Border of CA and move west.This would help concerns with San Diego,San Bernardino,Redlands Area.View attached maps.Create a district with Imperial and Coachella Valley.65th AD should go from West Coachella to BeaumontBanning
2sbernardino_20110627_8	6262011	Robert Pearce	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Redlands in two.Split will put City Hall on one side,town on the other.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110627_2	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_3	San Bernardino	Redlands	Highland Ave.	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_5	San Bernardino, Riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_6	San Bernardino	Redlands,Crestline,Big Bear		no	yes	suffering from real estate crash,water and renewable energy sources, military bas, transportation,	
2sbernardino_20110627_7	San Diego,San Bernardino, Imperial, Riverside	Beaumont, Banning,Redlands, Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Desert Hot Springs, Thousand Palms,	Bob Hope St.	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_8	San Bernardino	Redlands, Rialto,Colton,Loma Linda		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110627_2			no			I do not want Joe Baca to represent me. I do not support his tax and agenda or views on immigration	
2sbernardino_20110627_3			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_5			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_6	These mountain communities are a COI. All very similar and share stuggles.		no				
2sbernardino_20110627_7			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_8	Geographic Integrity,Redlands has no commonality with West San Bernardino,Rialto,Colton.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110627_9	6272011	Samuel H. Medrano	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Start map drawing from East Border of CA and move west.This would help concerns with San Diego,San Bernardino,Redlands Area.View attached maps.Create a district with Imperial and Coachella Valley.65th AD should go from West Coachella to BeaumontBanning
2sbernardino_20110627_10	6282011	Donna Zdrojewski	yes	Inland Action			no	
2sbernardino_20110627_11	6272011	Kathleen Johnson	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide city of Redlands.Do not alight with Colton or Fontana.School district serves Loma Linda, Highland, Mentone,Forest Falls, Angeles Oaks, and Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110627_12	6272011	Arthur H. Ullrich	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Chino Hills in two districts.Should be associated with Pomona rather than an Los Angeles County city.
2sbernardino_20110627_13	6272011	Fabian Villenas	yes	City Managers Office	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	yes	View attached Map.Keep Rancho Cucamonga under one assembly and one senate district, within San Bernardino County.It should not be lumped in with Los Angeles, this would disenfranchise it.Rancho Cucamonga shares no interests with Los Angeles communities.
2sbernardino_20110627_14	6282011	Gloria Ybarra	no		Alta Loma	San Bernardino	no	
2sbernardino_20110627_15	6282011	John Zdrojewski	yes	Inland Action		San Bernardino	yes	Support position of Inland Action.
2sbernardino_20110627_16	6272011	Earl De Vries	no		Ontario	San Bernardino	yes	Do not cut off parts of San Bernardino County Cities and attach them to surroundig counties.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110627_9	San Diego,San Bernardino, Imperial, Riverside	Beaumont, Banning,Redlands, Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Desert Hot Springs, Thousand Palms,	Bob Hope St.	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_10				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_11	San Bernardino	Redlands,Loma Linda,Highland,Mentone,Forest Falls,Angeles Oaks.		no	yes	shared school districts.	
2sbernardino_20110627_12	San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Chino Hills, Pomona		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_13	San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Rancho Cucamonga,La Verne,San Dimas,Glendora,Azusa,Duarte,Sierra Madre,La Canada Flintridge,Pasadena,Burbank,Glendale,		no	yes	Law enforcement,fire, emergency response,Transit	
2sbernardino_20110627_14				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_15				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_16	San Bernardino			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110627_9			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_10			no			I support the position of Inland Action	
2sbernardino_20110627_11			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_12			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_13	it is a COI		no				
2sbernardino_20110627_14			no			Latin population is strong in Alta LomaRancho Cucamonga.	
2sbernardino_20110627_15			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_16			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110627_17	6272011	Renea Wickman	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Redlands whole and connected with Loma Linda and Highland.San Bernardino,Yucaipa, Rancho Cucamonga should also be connected with Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110627_18	6272011	David Tennies	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Chino Hills is San Bernardino, not Orange County.Chino Valley AD should be Pomona,Chino,Chino Hills,Ontario.Chino Valley SS district should be Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.
2sbernardino_20110627_18	6272011	David Tennies	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Chino Valley Congressional District should be Pomona, Chino,Chino Hills,Ontario,Montclair,Rancho Cucamonga.
2sbernardino_20110627_19	6272011	Daniel Pepper	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	maps should start from eastern border of CA and move west.View Attached Maps.
2sbernardino_20110627_20	6272011	Mychal Ray Rodriguez	no				yes	Chino Hills is San Bernardino, not Orange County.Chino Valley AD should be Pomona,Chino,Chino Hills,Ontario.Chino Valley SS district should be Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110627_17	San Bernardino	Redlands,Loma Linda, Highland, Rancho Cucamonga,Yucaipa		no	yes	connected through transit,shopping, jobs,school district	
2sbernardino_20110627_18	San Bernardino	Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_18	San Bernardino	Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_19	San Bernardino, Riverside, Imperial	Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Desert Hot Springs,Thousand Palms		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_20	San Bernardino	Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110627_17			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_18			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_18			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_19			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110627_20	6272011	Mychal Ray Rodriguez	no				yes	Chino Valley Congressional District should be Pomona, Chino,Chino Hills,Ontario,Montclair,Rancho Cucamonga.
2sbernardino_20110627_21	6272011	Samuel Crowe	no		Ontario	San Bernardino	yes	Ontario,Chino,Montclair,Pomona,Rancho Cucamonga are connected. Should be in same district.
2sbernardino_20110627_22	6272011	Yvette Hernandez	no			San Bernardino	yes	Chino Hills is San Bernardino, not Orange County.Chino Valley AD should be Pomona,Chino,Chino Hills,Ontario.Chino Valley SS district should be Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.
2sbernardino_20110627_22	6272011	Yvette Hernandez	no			San Bernardino	yes	Chino Valley Congressional District should be Pomona, Chino,Chino Hills,Ontario,Montclair,Rancho Cucamonga.
3orange_20110627_1	6282011	Debbie Ricker	no			Orange	yes	Do not annex Orange into Los Angeles County.
3orange_20110627_2	6272011	David DuRee	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not divide Dana Point, Or place city of Dana Point outside of Orange County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110627_20	San Bernardino	Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_21	San Bernardino	Ontario,Chino,Montclair,Pomona,Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110627_22	San Bernardino	Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_22	San Bernardino	Pomona, Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Chino Hills,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Fontana,Southridge,San Antonio Heights.		no	no		
3orange_20110627_1	Orange, Los Angeles			no	no		
3orange_20110627_2	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Business matters,Ocean water quality,Transit,affordable housing	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110627_20			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_21	People in all these cities work together		no				
2sbernardino_20110627_22			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_22			no				
3orange_20110627_1			no				
3orange_20110627_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110627_3	6272011	Daralie H. Hamilton	no				yes	Huntington Beach should be with Seal Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa.Not with Irvine,Laguna Beach,etc.
3orange_20110627_4	6272011	Zeke Hernandez	yes	League of Unified Latin American Citizens	Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Acknowledge the Hispanic population in Orange county and take them into consideration when revising maps. They are very much a part of Oranges COI.Santa Ana Must be included with Orange.
3orange_20110627_5	6272011	Angelina Cisneros	no			Orange	yes	Santa Ana and Anaheim must be included with Orange County.They can not be split or the latino voice will be crushed.
3orange_20110627_6	6272011	Susanne Farjami	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor should not be included with Long Beach District.No common interests.
3orange_20110627_7	6272011	Ralph D. Rodriguez	yes	La Palma City Council,Mayor	La Palma	Orange	yes	La Palma should not be grouped with Los Angeles County Cities.La Palma has more in common with Orange Cities like Cypress,Buena Park,Fullerton,Los Alamitos.
3orange_20110627_8	6272011	Dianna Gadberry	yes		Huntington Beach	Orange	no	
3orange_20110627_9	6282011	Terri Nguyen	no				yes	Do not divid the Asian Communities.they should be together.Little Saigon area should stay together with Garden Grove,Fountain Valley,Westminster, and part of Santa Ana.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110627_3	Orange	Huntington Beach,Seal Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa,Irvine,Laguna beach,Aliso Viejo, Fountain Valley		no	no		
3orange_20110627_4	Orange	Santa Ana		no	yes	Healthcare,Culture and heritage.Businesses and major markets.	
3orange_20110627_5	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim		no	yes	Latinos together.	
3orange_20110627_6	Orange, Long Beach	Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110627_7	Orange, Los Angeles	Cypress,Buena Park,Fullerton,Los Alamitos,La Palma		no	yes	School districts,fire protection,emergency services,recreational activities,water,sanitation, waste and recycling,newspapers	
3orange_20110627_8				no	no		
3orange_20110627_9				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110627_3			no				
3orange_20110627_4			no				
3orange_20110627_5			no				
3orange_20110627_6			no				
3orange_20110627_7			no				
3orange_20110627_8			no			Attached is the redistricting comment.	
3orange_20110627_9			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110627_10	6282011	Mary Young	no		Aliso Viejo	Orange	yes	Do not bunch Aliso Viejo with Seal Beach and Huntington Beach.Our COI is with Lake Forest,Mission Viejo,Laguna Hills, Laguna Woods, Irvine, etc.
3orange_20110627_11	6272011	Rod Bell	no		La Palma	Orange	yes	Orange County cities of La Palma and Los Alamitos need to remain groupd with Fullerton,Cypress,La Habra,etc.Not with Long Beach, Hawaiian Garderns, Paramount.
3orange_20110627_12	6272011	Daralie Hamilton	no			Orange	yes	Huntington Beach is a COI with Seal Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa.Not COI with south cities like Irvine,Laguna Beach,Aliso Viejo.
3orange_20110627_13	6282011	Cyril Yu	no			Orange	yes	Do not split Latino COIs in Orange County.
3orange_20110627_14	6282011	Jason Le	no			Orange	yes	Keep Asian Communities together in Orange. Little Saigon Area must stay together, including Garden Grove,Fountain Valley, Westminster,Santa Ana.
3orange_20110627_15	6272011	Aaruni Thakur	no		Fullerton	Orange	yes	Keep the lines how they are in the first draft maps for Orange.
4langeles_20110627_1	6272011	Jake Smith	no				yes	Assembly and Congressional district must include North Hollywood, Studio City,Sherman Oaks, Hollywood Hills, Beverly Hills, and Hancock Park.
4langeles_20110627_2	6272011	Bill Knox	yes	Ventura County Tax Payers Association,East Ventura Community Council,California Stat University.			yes	City of Los Angeles should be kept whole.Ventura County area should not be included, it fits with East District.
4langeles_20110627_3	6272011	Eliane Gans	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide the 90049 District.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110627_10	Orange	Aliso Viejo, Seal Beach, Huntington,Irvine,Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills,Mission Viejo,Lake Forest		no	yes		
3orange_20110627_11	Orange	Long Beach, Hawaiian Gardens,Paramount,La Palma,La Habra, Cypress, Fullerton		no	no		
3orange_20110627_12	Orange	Seal Beach, Westminster,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa, Irvine,Laguna beach,Aliso Viejo		no	yes	School districts,water, college	
3orange_20110627_13	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110627_14	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110627_15	Orange			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_1	Orange	North Hollywood, Studio City,Sherman Oaks, Hollywood Hills, Beverly Hills, and Hancock Park.		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_2	Los Angeles, Ventura			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_3	Los Angeles			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110627_10	much more in common.		no				
3orange_20110627_11			no				
3orange_20110627_12			no				
3orange_20110627_13			no				
3orange_20110627_14			no				
3orange_20110627_15			no				
4langeles_20110627_1			no				
4langeles_20110627_2			no				
4langeles_20110627_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_4	6272011	Leonard Blum	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide current Brentwood community into two districts.
4langeles_20110627_5	6272011	Seth Weisberg	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood together in one congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_6	6272011	Ken Mazur	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	People of Santa Clarita have issues for their area, little in common with West sideSanta Monica area of Los Angeles.Los Angeles shares similar concerns with Santa Monica Mountains.Consider combining Thousand OaksSanta Monica with West Santa Monica.
4langeles_20110627_7	6272011	Joan Greenwood	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	port of Long Beach should not be seperated from rest of Long Beach.Long Beach should all be in one district.
4langeles_20110627_8	6272011	Jacqui Viale	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach should not be connected with another county aside from Los Angeles.
4langeles_20110627_9	6272011	Carol Soccio	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beachs east side must be kept in district with Los Angeles County.Not doing so will leave this area unrepresented.
4langeles_20110627_10	6272011	Phyllis Spierer	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Venice and Santa Monica are not a part of our Southbay Community.Lawndale and Hawthorne are.Add section of Harbor Gateway south of 405 Fwy,and north of Sepulveda.All of San Pedro included as well as Lennox and Gardena west of Western Ave.For Assembly,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_4	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_5	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_6	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Santa Monica		no	yes	Public education, historical preservation,public safety, watersheds.	
4langeles_20110627_7	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_8	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_9	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_10	Los Angeles	Lennox, Gardena,Westchester,Palos Verdes Estates,Marina Del Rey,Lawndale, Harbor Gateway,Santa Monica,Hawthorne.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_4	We work well together, do not split us.		no				
4langeles_20110627_5			no				
4langeles_20110627_6			no				
4langeles_20110627_7			no				
4langeles_20110627_8	Long Beach is never with all of Los Angeles and it should be.		no				
4langeles_20110627_9			no				
4langeles_20110627_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_10	6272011	Phyllis Spierer	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Westchester and Marina Del Ray should be eliminated and Lawndale,Section of Del Aire south of El Segundo BLVD added.
4langeles_20110627_11	6272011	Joe Mello	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach should not be with Orange County.Do not slip Long Beach into three congressional districts.
4langeles_20110627_12	6272011	Karen Highberger	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Long Beach into three districts.Keep this city together
4langeles_20110627_13	6272011	John Stammreich	no	Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	All of San Pedro and Port of Los Angeles should be kept together in one district.
4langeles_20110627_14	6272011	Sanford and Nancy King	no		Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Altadena and Pasadena.
4langeles_20110627_15	6272011	Carlos Rodriguez	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boudaries for community should be Saticoy,Woodman,White Oak.
4langeles_20110627_16	6272011	Antonio Bernado	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boudaries for COI should be Roscoe Blvd., Burbank Blvd., Woodman Blvd., White Oak. COI is different from Sherman Oaks,Topanga,Burbank, Encino. Similar to Panorama City,North Hollywood,Arleta.
4langeles_20110627_17	6272011	Christy Vasquez	no		Downey	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Downey.Redistricting will change progress and increase crime.
4langeles_20110627_18	6272011	Mildred Hubert	no				yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County.Keep Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley with Santa Clarita.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_10	Los Angeles	Lennox, Gardena,Westchester,Palos Verdes Estates,Marina Del Rey,Lawndale, Harbor Gateway,Santa Monica,Hawthorne.		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_11	Los Angeles,Orange	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_12	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_13	Los Angeles	San Pedro		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_14	Los Angeles	Altadena,Pasadena,Flintridge		no	yes	Socially,racially,shopping,socialize,recreation	
4langeles_20110627_15	Los Angeles	Van Nuys	Woodman,White Oak.	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_16	Los Angeles	Van Nuys,Panorama City,North Hollywood,Arleta,Sherman Oaks,Burbank,Encino	Roscoe Blvd., Burbank Blvd., Woodman Blvd., White Oak	no	yes	latina, armenian,filipina populations.affordable rent, spanish speaking.	
4langeles_20110627_17	Los Angeles	Downey		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_18	Ventura, Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Malibu,Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley.Santa Clarita		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_10			no				
4langeles_20110627_11			no				
4langeles_20110627_12			no				
4langeles_20110627_13	Common bond, and would be diminished if split		no				
4langeles_20110627_14			no				
4langeles_20110627_15	Spanish, community celebrates together, works together, speaks spanish and eats together.		no				
4langeles_20110627_16	lots of immigrants, spanish speaking, working together and political.		no				
4langeles_20110627_17			no				
4langeles_20110627_18	Historically connected,divide inland and coastal populations.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_19	6272011	Rusty Deisbeck	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley Whole.Do not split it into two congressional districts.add community of Newhall into Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley district.
4langeles_20110627_20	6272011	Kathleen M. Saenz	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley as a whole district.
4langeles_20110627_21	6272011	Mildred Hubert	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley Whole.Do not split it into two congressional districts.add community of Newhall into Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley district.
4langeles_20110627_22	6272011	Juanita Tillman	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena and Altadena together for redistricting.
4langeles_20110627_23	6272011	Fred Seeley	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep all the Santa Clarita Valley in one district.
4langeles_20110627_24	6272011	Edward Corridori	yes	Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation(LVHF)	Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	oppose proposed LASCV plan and to support Proposal by LVHF.No COI between Santa Clarita and communities in this region.
4langeles_20110627_25	6272011	Michael Berger	no				yes	Please keep Santa Clarita Whole.
4langeles_20110627_26	6272011	Dave Goodman	no				yes	In East San Gabriel Valley drawing line dividing North and South Glendora and La Verne would weaken voices of area. Keep El Monte whole and use the 605 as a line,add rest of Glendora and La Verne.El Monte should be with Temple City,South Elmonte,Montabell
4langeles_20110627_27	6272011	J. Sullivan	no			Los Angeles	yes	No links with Santa Monica,Malibu,Santa Clarita,Palos Verdes with Beverly Hills.Bring south Valley together with the Westside.This area would then pull in Westwood,Century City.Divide Westchester along Sepulved or Lincoln.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_19	Ventura, Los Angeles	Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_20	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_21	Ventura, Los Angeles	Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_22	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Altadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_23	Los Angeles			no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_24	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills,Santa Barbara,Malibu,Santa Monica,West L.A. Oxnard,Ventura,Chatsworth.		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_25	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_26	Los Angeles	Alhambra,Montabello,South Elmonte,Temple City, La Verne,Glendora,San Dimas,Covina,Industry,Baldwin Park, El Monte.	the 605.	no	no		
4langeles_20110627_27	Los Angeles	Westchester,Westwood,Century City,Miracle Mile,Calabasas,Topanga, Malibu,Santa Monica	Sepulveda, Lincold	yes	yes	Schools,Hospitals,Services,entertainment.LGBT communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_19			no				
4langeles_20110627_20			no				
4langeles_20110627_21			no				
4langeles_20110627_22	many commonalities.		no				
4langeles_20110627_23	If we are split we will be disenfranchised		no				
4langeles_20110627_24			no				
4langeles_20110627_25			no				
4langeles_20110627_26			no				
4langeles_20110627_27			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_28	6272011	Tom and Jane Hanson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole.Do not split part of Valencia south of Lyons Ave and make them part of San Fernando.
4langeles_20110627_29	6272011	Fred Arnold	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole.
4langeles_20110627_30	6272011	Karin Accomando	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep south Bay together. Westchester,El Segundo,Manhattan Beach,Hermosa Beach,Redondo,Torrance and Palos Verdes in one district.
4langeles_20110627_31	6272011	Kathryn Liescheidt	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Santa Clarita and put it with San Fernando.
4langeles_20110627_32	6272011	Marguerite Mautner	yes	Pacific Palisades Community Council			yes	District stretching to Kern County line is not practical.use proposed boundaries WestsideSanta Monica and Thousand OaksSanta Monica Mountains.
4langeles_20110627_33	6272011	Mike Reed	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Chino Hills into two congressional districts.
4langeles_20110627_34	6272011	Shan Haq	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach should be kept in a single district.
4langeles_20110627_35	6262011	Stuart Garrison	yes	Westchester Neighbors Association	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep WestchesterPlaya Del Rey together.
4langeles_20110627_41	6272011	Brendan T. Dooley	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	on north and east sides,405 Fwy on west and Sherman Way on south.West district,Mountains on the north and west sides,405 Fwy on east and Vanowen st. on the south.These three should be combined with BurbankGlendale to make 2 senate districts.View map.
4langeles_20110627_42	6272011	Fred Roberts	yes	L.A. Veterans Affairs	Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Does not make sense to split up 90049. Especially splitting the Veterans Affairs away from the community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_28	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	Mountain Barrier.	no	no		
4langeles_20110627_29	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_30	Los Angeles	Westchester,El Segundo,Manhattan Beach,Hermosa Beach,Redondo Beach,Torrance, Palos Verdes		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_31	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,San Fernando.		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_32	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_33	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Chino Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_34	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_35	Los Angeles	Westchester,Playa Del Rey		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_41	Los Angeles	Northridge,Thousand Oaks,Calabasas,Burbank, Glendale	Mulholland Drive,101,Cahuenga Pass,Vanowen St.,405 Fwy, Mountains, Vanowen St.	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_42	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_28			no				
4langeles_20110627_29			no				
4langeles_20110627_30	Strong Community of Interest, deserves special consideration.		no				
4langeles_20110627_31			no				
4langeles_20110627_32			no			Consider proposed boundaries by PPCC to keep westside communities together.	
4langeles_20110627_33			no				
4langeles_20110627_34			no				
4langeles_20110627_35			no				
4langeles_20110627_41	Cities go with cities, commonalities.		no				
4langeles_20110627_42			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_43	6272011	Eugene Lee	yes	Voting Rights Project,Asain Pacific American Legal Center			yes	Cong. District LAWSG supported by CAPAFR and APALC.Keep this district as proposed in drafts.
4langeles_20110627_44	6272011	Eric David	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Splitting of Long Beach does not serve the areas interests.Long Beach should be one district.
4langeles_20110627_45	6272011	Fawn R. Sheen	no				yes	Do not divide 90049 into two congressional districts.
4langeles_20110627_46	6272011	Bob Berglass	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide 90049 Los Angeles district into two zones.
4langeles_20110627_47	6272011	John M. Isen	no		Sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Move southern boundary of Congressional district for West San Fernando ValleyCalabasas from Ventura Blvd. to Mulholland Dr. Because this is a COI.
4langeles_20110627_48	6272011	Tom Yocis	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Long Beach into three districts.This would violate intent of comission.
4langeles_20110627_49	6272011	Judi Neal	no		San Dimas	Los Angeles	yes	Unhappy with the drawn lines for San Dimas area.Do not keep this draft.
4langeles_20110627_50	6272011	Edward Callahan	no		Playa Del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Playa Del Rey is part of Westchester Play Neighborhood. Shares interests with Los Angeles.Area has nothing in common with Inglewood and Lennox.Playa Del Rey and Westchester must be kept together.
4langeles_20110627_51	6272011	Nancy Jaffe	yes	Brentwood Veterans Affairs		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood.this would split it into two parts, and removes Veterans Affairs from Brentwood.
4langeles_20110627_52	6272011	Paula Mejia	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Downey together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_43	Los Angeles	Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights.		yes	yes	Common media outlets serve asian population.Unified voice,	
4langeles_20110627_44	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_45	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_46	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_47	Los Angeles	City of San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles, Santa Clarita, Sherman Oaks, Thousand Oaks.	Ventura Boulevard, Mulholland Drive	yes	yes	Work,shop,worship,exercise,socialize,	
4langeles_20110627_48	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_49	Los Angeles	San Dimas		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_50	Los Angeles	Playa Del Rey,Westchester,El Segundo,Inglewood, Lennox		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_51	Los Angeles	Brentwood.		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_52	Los Angeles	Downey		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_43		shared interest is fulfilled by media sources and this district as mentioned in VRA	no				
4langeles_20110627_44			no				
4langeles_20110627_45			no				
4langeles_20110627_46			no				
4langeles_20110627_47			no				
4langeles_20110627_48	Shared common goals and interests among residents.		no				
4langeles_20110627_49			no			Do not cross county lines,draw for density of population not race,Keep cities whole	
4langeles_20110627_50	Shared interests,Coastal communities.		no				
4langeles_20110627_51			no				
4langeles_20110627_52			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_53	6272011	Raymond Klein	yes	Brentwood City Council		Los Angeles	yes	Support views of BCC.Do not divide Brentwood.No division along San Vincente Blvd.This split cuts out Veterans Admin.Boundaries should be Mulholland Dr. north,405 Fwy east,26th St. west,Wilshire Blvd south.View Map.
4langeles_20110627_54	6272011	Kay Austen	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Connect Topanga with Los Angeles,Westside,Pacific Palisades,Santa Monica. Do not split it from LA.
4langeles_20110627_55	6272011	Patricia Kelly	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope ValleySanta Clarita valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_56	6272011	Gary Gisel	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach is a COI and should not be split up.Deserves representation at State and Federal Levels.
4langeles_20110627_57	6272011	Adam Litzer	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Agoura Hills should be with neighbors in Westlake Village to be in West San Fernando Valley district. Not with Ventura.
4langeles_20110627_58	6272011	Linnea Mielcarek	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not group Topanga,Calabasas,Westside together with Santa Clarita area district.Regroup this area to be a new Senate district renoted as Santa Monica mountainsBay West Side.
4langeles_20110627_59	6272011	Ronnie Ressner	no		Westlake Village	Los Angeles.	yes	Do not put Westlake Village with Ventura County district.Westlake should be in West San Fernando Valley District instead.Should be linked to Granada Hills,Northride,West Valley.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_53	Los Angeles	Brentwood	Mulholland Dr. 405 Fwy,26th St, Wilshire Blvd.	yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_54	Los Angeles	Topanga,Pacific Palisades,Santa Monica		yes	yes	Activist community,environmental,	
4langeles_20110627_55	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_56	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_57	Los Angeles, Ventura	Agoura Hills, Westlake Village,Granada Hills,Northridge,		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_58	Los Angeles	Calabasas,Topanga,Santa Monica.		yes	yes	work,play,school	
4langeles_20110627_59	Los Angeles,Ventura	Westlake Village,Agoura Hills		yes	yes	high tech and defense industry companies, connected by 101.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_53			no				
4langeles_20110627_54	shared interests,geographic closeness.		no				
4langeles_20110627_55			no				
4langeles_20110627_56	Stong Community		no				
4langeles_20110627_57	shared concentration of high tech and defense companies, 101 freeway connection.		no				
4langeles_20110627_58			no				
4langeles_20110627_59			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_60	6272011	Mattew Seyhun	no		Westlake Village	Los Angeles.	yes	Do not put Westlake Village with Ventura County district.Westlake should be in West San Fernando Valley District instead.Should be linked to Granada Hills,Northride,West Valley.
4langeles_20110627_61	6272011	Andrew Hewitson	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Agroura Hills and Westlake Village should be in the West San Fernando Valley district instead of East Ventura.
4langeles_20110627_62	6272011	Bonnie Hood	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts.Add community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_63	6272011	Irene Maldonado	no		La Verne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up San Gabriel Valley by race.
4langeles_20110627_64	6272011	Michael Stark	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not group Topanga,Calabasas,Westside together with Santa Clarita area district.Regroup this area to be a new Senate district renoted as Santa Monica mountainsBay West Side.
4langeles_20110627_65	6272011	Kyle Shorten	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Agroura Hills and Westlake Village should be in the West San Fernando Valley district instead of East Ventura.
4langeles_20110627_66	6272011	Laura Friedman	yes	Mayor,City of Glendale	Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Glendale should remain in a single congressional district.Keep it with Burbank,Pasadena, we are a COI.Move Southern part of Glendale from East San Gabriel Valley Diamond Bar district into San Gabriel Mountains Foothill district to make it whole.Move

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_60	Los Angeles,Ventura	Westlake Village,Agoura Hills		yes	yes	high tech and defense industry companies, connected by 101.	
4langeles_20110627_61	Los Angeles,Ventura	Westlake Village,Agoura Hills		yes	yes	high tech and defense industry companies, connected by 101.	
4langeles_20110627_62	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Newhall		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_63	Los Angeles	La Verne		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_64	Los Angeles	Calabasas,Topanga,Santa Monica.		yes	yes	work,play,school	
4langeles_20110627_65	Los Angeles,Ventura	Westlake Village,Agoura Hills		yes	yes	high tech and defense industry companies, connected by 101.	
4langeles_20110627_66	Los Angeles	Glendale,Burbank,Pasadena		yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_60			no				
4langeles_20110627_61			no				
4langeles_20110627_62			no				
4langeles_20110627_63			no				I want David Dreier to remain my congressman.
4langeles_20110627_64			no				
4langeles_20110627_65			no				
4langeles_20110627_66	Tri City relationship.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_66	6272011	Laura Friedman	yes	Mayor,City of Glendale	Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Upland from San Gabriel Mountains foothill district into Ontario district.Move southeast portion of Chino Hills from Ontario district into the East San Gabriel Valley Diamond Bar area.
4langeles_20110627_67	6272011	Karen Ressner	no		Westlake Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Westlake Village with Ventura County district.Westlake should be in West San Fernando Valley District instead.Should be linked to Granada Hills,Northride,West Valley.
4langeles_20110627_68	6272011	Peter Sanchez	no				no	
4langeles_20110627_69	6272011	Cindy Bisciglia	no		Westlake Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Westlake Village with Ventura County district.Westlake should be in West San Fernando Valley District instead.Should be linked to Granada Hills,Northride,West Valley.
4langeles_20110627_36	6272011	Judy Handler	yes	West L.A. Veterans Administration	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide our city into two different districts.
4langeles_20110627_37	6272011	Laura Williamson	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena, do not group with cities of Boyle Heights and East L.A. It should remain within boundary as Pasadena and Altadena are COIs.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_66	Los Angeles	Glendale,Burbank,Pasadena		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_67	Los Angeles,Ventura	Westlake Village,Agoura Hills		yes	yes	high tech and defense industry companies, connected by 101.	
4langeles_20110627_68				no	no		
4langeles_20110627_69	Los Angeles,Ventura	Westlake Village,Agoura Hills		yes	yes	high tech and defense industry companies, connected by 101.	
4langeles_20110627_36	Los Angeles			no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_37	Los Angeles	Pasadena,Altadena,Boyle Heights		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_66	Tri City relationship.		no				
4langeles_20110627_67			no				
4langeles_20110627_68			no				Our group would like to have a speaker July 20th to discuss redistricting.July 20th is our membership quarterly meeting, 7 to 9 PM.We expect Howard Berman to come.
4langeles_20110627_69			no				
4langeles_20110627_36	West L.A. verterans Administration is major part of community and should stay with LA		no				
4langeles_20110627_37			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_38	6272011	Sara Melzer	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not exclude the Veterans Affairs from our area and break up Breantwood into two groups.This would divide our community in half.
4langeles_20110627_39	6272011	Richard O Leary	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not continue with plan to redistrict Long Beach.Do not divide it.
4langeles_20110627_40	6272011	Mary Sidell	yes	Brentwood Community Council	Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Brentwood into two districts.
4langeles_20110627_41	6272011	Brendan T. Dooley	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	San Fernando Valley daft one maps are not good.San Fernando valley is a COI.Do not split the valley up.They valley needs three complete districts as such.South district,Mulholland drive from 101 in Calabasas to 101 in Cahuenga Pass.East district,Mountains
4langeles_20110627_70	6272011	John L. Rosenfeld	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split 90049 area.Keep within same district.Split would affect Veterans Administration
4langeles_20110627_71	6272011	Jeff Berman	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Agoura Hills with East Ventura County. Keep Agoura Hills with Westlake Village and to be in West San Fernando Valley District.
4langeles_20110627_72	6272011	Doug Arseneault	yes	San Fernando Redistricting Comission		Los Angeles	yes	Unify West Valley communities of Reseda,Northridge,Sherman Oaks,all of Lake Balboa in the West San Fernando Valley district.Unify Latino communities of Van Nuys,Valley Glen,North Hollywood in East San Fernando Valley district.Move Newhall to the East San

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_38	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_39	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_40	Los Angeles	Brentwood		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_41	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_70	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_71	Los Angeles,Ventura	Agoura Hills,Westlake Village		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_72	Los Angeles	Reseda,Northridge,Sherman Oaks,Lake Balboa,Van Nuys,Newhall,Studio City,Shadow Hills,Sunland,Tujunga		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_38			no				
4langeles_20110627_39			no				Committee is not doing what it is supposed to.
4langeles_20110627_40			no				
4langeles_20110627_41			no				
4langeles_20110627_70			no				
4langeles_20110627_71			no				
4langeles_20110627_72			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_72	6272011	Doug Arseneault	yes	San Fernando Redistricting Comission		Los Angeles	yes	San Fernando District.Place all of Studio City into the West Los Angeles district.Place equestrian communities of Shadow Hills,Sunland,Tujunga into San Gabriel Mountains foothill district.
4langeles_20110627_73	6272011	Jeff Salisbury	yes	TLMI Environmental Education Committee,Environmental Health and Safety Committee		Los Angeles	yes	Do not group ELB with Lakewood.Different needs.
4langeles_20110627_74	6272011	John Walker	yes	Studio City Neighborhood Council	Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City and all communities that share Ventura Blvd corridor and 101 Fwy, with Santa Monica Mountains to south,170 Fwy to the East, Calabasas,Hidden Hills,Agoura,Westlake Village,Thousand Oaks to West.One whole Studio City district.
4langeles_20110627_75	6272011	Al Matta	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Chino Hills and Chino have close ties.Do not divide Chino Hills to L.A. County
4langeles_20110627_76	6272011	Chris Broquist	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Monica Las Virgenes portion of LASCV be cut out and placed with Santa Monica.Simi Valley also be removed from East Ventura and placed with Santa Clarita Chatsworth portion.
4langeles_20110627_77	6272011	Linda Lucks	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Venice.Part of city South of Washington Blvd are in Venice. Line can not be drawn on Washington Blvd.Marina Del Rey,Playa Del Rey,Westchester should remain in a Northern District.
4langeles_20110627_78	6272011	Christine Warner	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not place some of Long Beach with Orange County.Keep in Los Angeles County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_72	Los Angeles	Reseda,Northridge,Sherman Oaks,Lake Balboa,Van Nuys,Newhall,Studio City,Shadow Hills,Sunland,Tujunga		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_73	Los Angeles	Lakewood		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_74	Los Angeles	Studio City,Calabasas,Hidden Hills,Agoura,Westlake Village,Thousant Oaks,	Ventura Blvd,101 Fwy,170 Fwy	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_75	Los Angeles,San Bernardino	Chino,Chino Hills		no	yes	Work,School district,recreational activities	
4langeles_20110627_76	Los Angeles,Ventura	Santa Monica,Oxnard,Santa Clarita,Chatsworth,Los Angeles		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_77	Los Angeles	Marina Del Rey,Playa Del Rey,Westchester,Venice	Washington Blvd.	no	no		
4langeles_20110627_78	Los Angeles,Orange	Long Beach		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_72			no				
4langeles_20110627_73			no				
4langeles_20110627_74	Connected by mountains, Populations,connected by many roads and highways.		no				
4langeles_20110627_75			no				
4langeles_20110627_76	Long running connections.		no				
4langeles_20110627_77			no				
4langeles_20110627_78	Different views and political agenda		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_79	6272011	Anonymous	no				yes	Keep all of Long Beach in a single district.
4langeles_20110627_80	6272011	Christopher T. Hicks	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Long Beach in one congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_81	6272011	Alan Tolkoff	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach in one Congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_82	6272011	William Wells	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach in one Congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_83	6272011	Filemon Santiaguel	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Chino Hills into two congressional districts.
4langeles_20110627_84	6272011	Madeline Hyman	yes	Veterans Administration	Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split city and divide the Veterans Administration.
4langeles_20110627_85	6272011	Kyu San Josh Lee	yes	Inland Empire Korean American Association			yes	Oppose division of Chino Hills.San Gabriel Asian Americans and those in Diamond Bar,Walnut,Chino Hills are very different.Keep Chino Hills as one. Splitting creates a Safe district,not a competitive one, but grouping large populations of Asian Americans
4langeles_20110627_86	6272011	Melinda Muller	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City in Los Angeles district,with Thousand Oaks,Santa Monica Mountains,West Side,.
4langeles_20110627_87	6272011	Rod Bell	no				yes	Orange County cities La Palma and Los Alamitos must remain with Fullerton,Cypress,La Habra.Do Not group with Long Beach,Paramount area.Different politics and interests
4langeles_20110627_88	6272011	Shari Laham	yes	Veterans Administration		Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict community of Brentwood.This would split up VA.
4langeles_20110627_89	6272011	Anonymous	yes	Brentwood Community Council,Veterans Administration			yes	Do not divide Brentwood in half at San Vicente.Do not relocate area from Granvill to East of 405, Sunset south to Wilshire.This would separate VA from community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_79	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_80	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_81	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_82	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_83	Los Angeles,San Bernardino	Chino Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_84	Los Angeles	Pacific Palisades,Brentwood.		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_85	Los Angeles,San Bernardino,Orange,	Chino Hills,Diamond Bar,Rowland Heights,Walnut		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_86	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Santa Monica,Studio City		yes	yes	Shared transportation corridors,	
4langeles_20110627_87	Los Angeles,Orange	La Palma,Los Alamitos,Fullerton,Cypress ,La Habra,Long Beach,Hawaiian Garderns,Paramount.		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_88	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_89	Los Angeles	Brentwood,	San Vicente,Sunset South, the 405	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_79			no				
4langeles_20110627_80			no				
4langeles_20110627_81			no				
4langeles_20110627_82			no			Proposed boundaries do not follow governmental boundaries	
4langeles_20110627_83			no				
4langeles_20110627_84			no				
4langeles_20110627_85	Asian American Communities must be in a Competitive, not safe district		no				
4langeles_20110627_86	Long standing COI.		no				
4langeles_20110627_87			no				
4langeles_20110627_88			no				
4langeles_20110627_89			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_91	6272011	Charlen L Thoin	yes	CLU,LUTCF	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach in one congressional district.If needed cities like Lakewood,Signal Hill could also be included to meet population requirements.
4langeles_20110627_92	6272011	Anonymous	no				yes	Comment is a map of Santa Monica Mountains area COI. View Map.
4langeles_20110627_93	6272011	Clark Stevens	yes	Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains.			yes	communities of Santa Monica Mountains in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties be included in unified districts.Watershed integrity would be damaged otherwise.
4langeles_20110627_94	6272011	Nancy Ondeck	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Long Beach with Orange County.
4langeles_20110627_95	6272011	Jackie Raymond	yes	Veterans Administration	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood at San Vicente.Split would divide VA.
4langeles_20110627_96	6272011	Jan Wilson	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together.
4langeles_20110627_97	6272011	Ricardo Linarez	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Maintain multiple leaders in Long Beach at federal level and state assembly and state senate.
4langeles_20110627_98	6272011	Ken Schlesinger(Duplicate)	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not include Long Beach with Orange County.
4langeles_20110627_99	6272011	Jack Levenberg	no				yes	Support city of Santa Clarita and its proposed lines.Do not combine Santa Clarita with San Fernando ValleyCalabasas
4langeles_20110627_101	6272011	David C. Conway	no			Los Angeles	yes	San Gabriel Mtn. Foothills district should keep Monorovia,Duarte,etc, in one district.Move Upland and Laverne into other districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_91	Los Angeles,	Lakewood,Signal Hill,Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_92				no	no		
4langeles_20110627_93	Los Angeles, Ventura	Westlake Village,Sherman Oaks,Monte Nido,Cornell,Malibou Lake,Malibu,Topanga,Pacific Palisades,Santa Monica,Bel Air,Westwood,Hollwood	Topanga Creek Watershed,various other watersheds,Los Angeles River system	yes	yes	Shared watersheds,wildlife management,transportation corridors,.	
4langeles_20110627_94	Los Angeles,Orange	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_95	Los Angeles	Brentwood	San Vicente	no	no		
4langeles_20110627_96	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_97	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_98	Los Angeles,Orange	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_99	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Calabasas		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_101	Los Angeles	Monorovia,Duarte,Upland, Laverne.		yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_91			no				
4langeles_20110627_92			no				
4langeles_20110627_93			no				
4langeles_20110627_94			no				
4langeles_20110627_95			no				
4langeles_20110627_96			no				
4langeles_20110627_97			no				
4langeles_20110627_98			no				
4langeles_20110627_99			no				
4langeles_20110627_101	Much more of a COI		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_102	6272011	Al Sheahen	no				yes	Do not put voters south of the 101 in San Fernando Valley into a Los Angeles district.The north south dividing line should be Mulholland drive,not 101 or Ventura Blvd.
4langeles_20110627_103	6272011	Ingrid Peterson	no				no	
4langeles_20110627_104	6272011	Imelda Santiaguel	no		Chino Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Chino Hills into two congressional districts.
4langeles_20110627_105	6272011	Carrie Cass	no				yes	Include Agoura Hills,West Lake Village,Granada Hills,Northridge with Chatsworth and Woodland Hills, Calabasas in one districts.This is a COI
4langeles_20110627_106	6272011	Ruth Judkins	no				yes	Keep Pasadena and Altadena in same congressional,assembly and senate districts.
4langeles_20110627_107	6272011	Mitra Samani and Dr. Farrokh Vatan	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Reseda.Add Agoura Hills,Westlake Village, right up to the LA county line into the West San Fernando Valley district.
4langeles_20110627_108	6272011	Addison Peterson	no				yes	36th assembly district must include Santa Clarita and Victorville.Congress district 25 should include Lancaster and Palmdale.Palmdale,Lancaster,Little Rock should all be in same district.
4langeles_20110627_109	6272011	Ingrid Peterson	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	revisit senate district LASCV and add Santa Monica Assembly distrits within a single district named Santa Monica Mountains Bay west Side.Topanga and Calabasas are a COI together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_102	Los Angeles		Mulholland Drive.	no	no		
4langeles_20110627_103				no	no		
4langeles_20110627_104	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_105	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills,Westlake Village,Granada Hills,Northridge,Chatsworth ,Woodland Hills,Calabasas		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_106	Los Angeles	Pasadena,Altadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_107	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills,Westlake Village,Calabasas,Hidden Hills,Encino		yes	yes	School district	
4langeles_20110627_108	Los Angeles	Lancaster,Palmdale,Little Rock,Santa Clarita,Victorvill		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_109	Los Angeles	Topanga, Calabasas		no	yes	work,shop	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_102			no				
4langeles_20110627_103			no				Cancel previous message I sent it by mistake.
4langeles_20110627_104			no				
4langeles_20110627_105	Aerospace and Technology companies, COI		no				
4langeles_20110627_106	two communities have much in common		no				
4langeles_20110627_107	COI, very much in common		no				
4langeles_20110627_108	Common issues		no				
4langeles_20110627_109	COI together		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_110	6272011	Gordon Murley	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Woodland Hills.Do not cut it at Mulholland Drive.Make it whole and use County line as South Boundary from Santa Maria Road to East to Calabasas.
4langeles_20110627_111	6272011	Brian Chapman	no				yes	Do not make Topanga part of Santa Clarita Valley.
4langeles_20110627_112	6272011	Mark Dispenza	yes	Ventura Chamber of Commerce			yes	City of LA should be kept whole.Ventura County is a better fit with East district.COI with Lancaster,Palmdale and Kern Areas.Kern and Ventura should be in same district.
4langeles_20110627_113	6272011	Ingrid Peterson	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Consider new district called Santa Monica Mountains Bay West Side. Do not separate LASCV from West Side Santa Monica district
4langeles_20110627_114	6272011	Inez Gonzalez	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Westside Santa Monica assembly seat includes Beverly Hills and other wealthy neighborhoods as well as Pico and poor areas. This disenfranchises poor community.Do not do this.
4langeles_20110627_115	6272011	Joe Aguilar	yes	Mayor,City of Commerce	Commerce	Los Angeles	yes	Keep city of Commerce in a single congresional,senate and assembly district.
4langeles_20110627_116	6272011	Ross D. Frankel	no		Lawndale	Los Angeles	yes	Revise Bow Tie shapes of districts 54,56 in LA Orange County areas including Long Beach,Palos Verdes,Revise districts 47,53,58,46,49,44,45,43,43,44. None of these districts should be shaped like this.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_110	Los Angeles	Woodland Hills,Calabasas	Mulholland Dr.County Line,Santa Maria Road.	no	no		
4langeles_20110627_111	Los Angeles	Topanga,Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_112	Los Angeles,Ventura,Kern			no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_113	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Topanga,Calabasas, Woodland Hills,Malibu		yes	yes	Library,Bank,Shopping,sports teams,School,	
4langeles_20110627_114	Los Angeles	Beverly Hills,Pico,Los Angeles		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_115	Los Angeles	Commerce		no	yes	pollution issues,	
4langeles_20110627_116	Los Angeles	Long Beach,Palos Verdes		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_110			no				
4langeles_20110627_111	Liberal power should be together		no				
4langeles_20110627_112	BOE Field office oversees Kern and Ventura,Common interests		no				
4langeles_20110627_113			no				
4langeles_20110627_114			no				
4langeles_20110627_115			no				
4langeles_20110627_116			no				These districts are mis shapen,they have no logic and exclude communities of interest. Re shape these boundaries.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_117	6272011	Daniel Brin	no				yes	Community of West Hills should not be split.New line is unclear.This splits people in West hills with Santa Clarita and Tejon pass,with which these people have nothing in common with.West Hills boundary should be Nordhoff St. from Topanga Canyon Blvd.West
4langeles_20110627_118	6272011	Elliot Tyson	yes	Veterans Admin	Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict 90049 in half.
4langeles_20110627_119	6272011	May A. Ling	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not change or divide 90049 area code.
4langeles_20110627_120	6272011	Annie Greenfeld Wisner	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Leave all districts as is. Do not split Long Beach into three districts.
4langeles_20110627_121	6272011	Carol L. Mosher	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole. Add community of Newhall into Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_122	6272011	Richard Mc Lellan	no				yes	Keep Hollywood,Silverlake,Atwater,Burbank,Glendale together.These areas have common interests not shared with East Los Angeles.
4langeles_20110627_123	6272011	Lucille Polachek	no			Los Angeles	yes	90024 district should have Santa Monica,Beverly Hills,Santa Monica mountains in it.Do not lump us with San Fernando Valley or downtown.
4langeles_20110627_124	6272011	Sylvia Cumming	no		Granada Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Granada Hills.It is a COI within Los Angeles
4langeles_20110627_125	6272011	Frank Scotto	yes	Torrance City Council	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Torrance.Do not group with Redondo Beach.
4langeles_20110627_126	6272011	Ardis M and Edward W. Forgy	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict 90049 area code.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_117	Los Angeles	West Hill, Los Angeles,Santa Clarita,Chatsworth	Nordhoff St, Topanga Canyon Blvd.	yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_118	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_119	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110627_120	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_121	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Newhall		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_122	Los Angeles	Hollywood,Silverlake,Atwater,Burbank,Glendale		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_123	Los Angeles	Santa Monica,Beverly Hills,		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_124	Los Angeles	Granada Hills		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_125	Los Angeles	Redondo Beach,Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_126	Los Angeles			no	yes	education,quality governing.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_117			no				
4langeles_20110627_118			no				
4langeles_20110627_119			no				
4langeles_20110627_120			no				
4langeles_20110627_121			no				
4langeles_20110627_122	Common cultural interests		no				
4langeles_20110627_123	Shared interests.		no				
4langeles_20110627_124			no				
4langeles_20110627_125	Need representation by single district.		no				
4langeles_20110627_126			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_127	6272011	Ronald D. Mosher	no				yes	Keep city of Santa Clarita whole.Add Newhall into Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.
4langeles_20110627_128	6272011	Sharolyn Leithold	yes	Veterans Administration	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood together, split would damage VA.
4langeles_20110627_129	6272011	Marjorie B. Kramer	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Venice,Santa Monica are not a part of SouthBay Community while Lawndale and Hawthorne are.Return these two cities to 36thCD.Remove Venice and Santa Monica.Add Gateway Harbor south of 405,North of Sepulveda.Add San Pedro,Lennox,Gardena west of Western Ave.
4langeles_20110627_129	6272011	Marjorie B. Kramer	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	For AD,Remove Westchester,Marina Del Rey and add Lawndale and Del Aire south of El Segundo Blvd.
4langeles_20110627_130	6272011	Diana Mahmud	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned about Pasadena being split into two Assembly districts.
4langeles_20110627_131	6272011	Nancy Anderson	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood by north or south of San Vicente
4langeles_20110627_132	6272011	Crespin Solarez	no			Ventura	yes	Boundaries should be Telephone Road for North,South 101 Freeway,East Johnson Road West 101 Freeway
4langeles_20110627_133	6272011	Moises Alfaro	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boudaries by direction. North Saticoy,south Oxnard,East Woodman, West White Oak.
4langeles_20110627_144	6272011	Javier Hernandez	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries by direction for COI.North SunlandShadow Hills,south Studio City,East Burbank, West North Hollywood. Do not group with Pacoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_127	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_128	Los Angeles	Brentwood		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110627_129	Los Angeles	Westchester,Marina Del Rey,Del Aire,Lawndale,Venice,Santa Monica,Harbor Gateway	405 Fwy,Sepulveda Blvd,Western Ave,El Segundo Blvd.	yes	yes	Aerospace business jobs,Family ties,operate businesses	
4langeles_20110627_129	Los Angeles	Westchester,Marina Del Rey,Del Aire,Lawndale,Venice,Santa Monica,Harbor Gateway	405 Fwy,Sepulveda Blvd,Western Ave,El Segundo Blvd.	yes	yes	Aerospace business jobs,Family ties,operate businesses	
4langeles_20110627_130	Los Angeles	Los Angeles,Pasadena		yes	yes	water,businesses	
4langeles_20110627_131	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	no		
4langeles_20110627_132	Ventura		101 Freeway,Johnson Road,Telephone Road	no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_133	Los Angeles		Saticoy,Oxnard,Woodman, White Oak.	no	yes	English School,work,immigrants	
4langeles_20110627_144	Los Angeles	Sunland, Shadow Hills,Studio City,Burbank,North Hollywood		yes	yes	Immigrants from latin america in area,Schools for spanish speaking people	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_127			no				
4langeles_20110627_128	Keep VA together in one district.		no				
4langeles_20110627_129			no				
4langeles_20110627_129			no				
4langeles_20110627_130	Historically associated.		no				
4langeles_20110627_131			no				
4langeles_20110627_132	Low Income Housing		no				
4langeles_20110627_133	Latino Community, speaks spanish,work, Church		no				
4langeles_20110627_144			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_145	6272011	Maria DeLazaro	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for COI by direction, North Plamer,South Partenia,East Kester,West Balboa. COI similar to Van Nuys
4langeles_20110627_146	6272011	Teresa Zumora	no		Pacoima	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for COI by direction are North Foothill,South Arleta, East Branfort,West Arrollo.Similar to North Hollywood,Van Nuys
4langeles_20110627_147	6272011	Guillermo Marcial	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	North Hills Boundaries by Direction.are North Hwy 405,South Parthemia,East Keste, West Balboa.Similar to Van Nuys, Panorama.Different that Encino,Sun Valley
4langeles_20110627_148	6272011	Leticia Farias	no		Pacoima	Los Angeles	yes	Pacoica COI boundaries by direction are North Foothill,South Arleta,East Branfort,West Arroyo.Similar to Sun Valley, Van Nuys,Panorama,Different than Encino,Burbank,Granada Hills,Woodland Hills
4langeles_20110627_149	6272011	Fabiona Barcon	no			Los Angeles	yes	COI boundaries for Canoga Park by Direction are North Northoof,South Victory,East Masan,West Shop.
4langeles_20110627_150	6272011	Sonia Murrieta	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for Van Nuys COI by direction are North Saticoy,South Burbank, East Woodman, West White Oaks.Different than Granada Hills, Similar to Pacoima,Sun Valley,Panorama,North Hills

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_145	Los Angeles	Van Nuys, Los Angeles		yes	yes	Transportation, latin american population,work	
4langeles_20110627_146	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes	Church,mexican and central americans,	
4langeles_20110627_147	Los Angeles	Los Angeles,Van Nuys, Panorama	Hwy 405	yes	yes	Park de Parthenia,Mexican and Central American populations,Spanish speaking community.	
4langeles_20110627_148	Los Angeles	Pacoima,Van Nuys,Sun Valley, Panorama,Woodland Hills,Burbank,Encino		yes	yes	Mexican and Central American Community.Church,work, immigrant population	
4langeles_20110627_149	Los Angeles			yes	yes	Latin community,work,speaking spanish and english in area.Public schools,Medical Service,Affordable rent	
4langeles_20110627_150	Los Angeles	Van Nuys,Pacoima,Sun Valley,Granada Hills.	Saticoy Ave,Burbank Ave,Woodman Ave,White Oak Ave.	yes	yes	Work and educational opportunities.Community has social problems like drugs,theft,gangs	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_145			no				
4langeles_20110627_146			no				
4langeles_20110627_147			no				
4langeles_20110627_148			no				
4langeles_20110627_149			no				
4langeles_20110627_150			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_151	6272011	Vicente Hernandez	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for Van Nuys COI by direction are North Saticoy,South Burbank, East Woodman, West White Oaks.Different than Granada Hills, Similar to Pacoima,Sun Valley,Panorama,North Hills
4langeles_20110627_152	6272011	Virgilio	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for Van Nuys COI by direction are North Saticoy,South Burbank,East Woodman,West White Oak.Similar to Woodman,Panorama
4langeles_20110627_153	6272011	Taly Glez	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate our community.Boundaries by direction are North Saticoy,South Burbank,East Woodman,West White Oak.Similar to Sun Valley,San Fernando,Pacoima,North Hollywood,North Hills,Conoga,Panorama
4langeles_20110627_154	6272011	Jose Heriberto Bonilla	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for Van Nuys are North Saticoy,South Burbank,East Woodman,West White Oak.
5sbarbara_20110627_1	6272011	John Duncan	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide City of Lompoc in half, incorporate Santa Ynez,Solvang,Buellton,Los Olivos and Los Alamos into South district SBEVENTSBWENT. Santa Valley is connected more to Lompoc, Santa Maria or Carmel.
5sbarbara_20110627_2	6272011	Cynthia Webster	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Lompoc needs to be represented by one assemblyman and one state senator.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_151	Los Angeles	Van Nuys,Panorama, Sun Valley.Encino	Saticoy Ave,Burbank Ave,Woodman Ave,White Oak Ave.	yes	yes	Mexican and Latin American population, Speaks spanish	
4langeles_20110627_152	Los Angeles	Van Nuys,Woodman,Panorama ,San Fernando	Saticoy Ave,Burbank Ave,Woodman Ave,White Oak Ave.	yes	yes	Public schools of Mexican and Latin Americans.Church for the community,learning English	
4langeles_20110627_153	Los Angeles	Sun Valley,San Fernando,Pacoima,North Hollywood,North Hills,Conoga,Panorama	Saticoy Ave,Burbank Ave,Woodman Ave,White Oak Ave.	yes	yes	Recreation,Diverse peoples,social activity,Work,Spanish speaking poplulation very high	
4langeles_20110627_154	Los Angeles	Encino,North Hills,Sun Valley, Arleta	Saticoy Ave,Burbank Ave,Woodman Ave,White Oak Ave.	yes	yes	Central American Population,Community recreation,transportation.	
5sbarbara_20110627_1	Santa Barbara	Lompoc,Santa Ynez,Solvang,Buellton,Los Olivos,Los Alamos,Carmel		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110627_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_151			no				
4langeles_20110627_152			no				
4langeles_20110627_153			no				
4langeles_20110627_154			no				
5sbarbara_20110627_1			no				
5sbarbara_20110627_2	Small town needs to be together and represented as one.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110627_3	6272011	Joan Davidson	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide City of Lompoc in half, incorporate Santa Ynez,Solvang,Buellton,Los Olivos and Los Alamos into South district SBEVENTSBWENT. Santa Valley is connected more to Lompoc, Santa Maria or Carmel.
5sbarbara_20110627_4	6272011	Myron Webster	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Lompoc needs to be represented by one assemblyman and one state senator.
5sbarbara_20110627_5	6272011	David Corman	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc Valley,which includes Lompoc,Mesa Oaks,Mission Hills, Vandenberg Village as one political entity.
5sbarbara_20110627_6	6272011	George Work	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in half.
4langeles_20110627_155	6272011	Margarita	no		North Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries for North Hollywood COI are North Sherman Way,South Ventura,East Hollywood Way,West Coldwater. COI different from Burbank,Encino,Sherman Oaks. Similar to Van Nuys
4langeles_20110627_156	6272011	Diego Cap	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Boudaries for Van Nuys COI
5slo_20110627_1	6272011	Charlotte Weinberg	no		Shell Beach	San Luis Obispo	yes	Leave San Luis Obispo as a whole area. Do not split it up.
5slo_20110627_2	6272011	GlennaDeane W. Dovey	no				yes	Keep San Luis Obispo county intact,it has many connections with Santa Barbara County.
5slo_20110627_3	6272011	Harry and Jackie Walls	no		Nipomo	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo county whole.
5slo_20110627_4	6272011	Gerry Johnson	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo county whole.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110627_3	Santa Barbara	Lompoc,Santa Ynez,Solvang,Buellton,Los Olivos,Los Alamos,Carmel		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110627_4	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110627_5	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		yes	no		
5sbarbara_20110627_6	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_155	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Van Nuys,Encino,Burbank.	Sherman Way,Hollywood Way	yes	yes	Mexican and Central American community that speaks Spanish,affordable rent,	
4langeles_20110627_156	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Saticoy Ave,Burbank Ave,Woodman Ave,White Oak Ave.	yes	yes	Immigrant community,Public schools for children,large Central American population,Spanish speaking community.	
5slo_20110627_1	San Luis Obispo	Shell Beach		no	no		
5slo_20110627_2	San Luis Obispo,Santa Barbara			no	yes		
5slo_20110627_3	San Luis Obispo			no	no		
5slo_20110627_4	San Luis Obispo			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110627_3			no				
5sbarbara_20110627_4	No community should be split.		no				
5sbarbara_20110627_5			no				
5sbarbara_20110627_6			no				
4langeles_20110627_155			no				
4langeles_20110627_156			no				
5slo_20110627_1			no				
5slo_20110627_2	Councils,shopping,coastal concerns.		no				
5slo_20110627_3			no				
5slo_20110627_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110627_1	6272011	Janice S. Parvin	yes	Moorpark City Council,Mayor		Ventura	yes	Opposition to dividing Ventura County.Moorpark and Simi Valley should not be with Santa Clarita in Los Angeles County.Seperated by geographic barriers and sense of community.Different Interests.
5ventura_20110627_2	6272011	Michael Berger	no				yes	Keep East Ventura County whole.
5ventura_20110627_3	6272011	Kari Green	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks together with Conejo Valley area of Ventura County with Simi Valley and Moorpark. Exclude Oxnard
5ventura_20110627_4	6272011	Suzanna Paroski	no				yes	Santa Paula, Fillmore,Piru should not be lumped with Santa Barbara. Nothing in common.
5ventura_20110627_7	6272011	Greg Stratton	yes	Former Simi Valley Councilman and Mayor	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley,Moorpark should be with Ventura.Not with Los Angeles.These communities are separate by impassable mountains.If Ventura must be moved,use 126Corridor.
5ventura_20110627_7	6272011	Greg Stratton	yes	Former Simi Valley Councilman and Mayor	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Desoto or Tampa would be a good line.Move North San Fernando Valley above 118 up to Santa Clarita.Fill Ventura District with parts N. LA county from around 126 5 Interchange.
5ventura_20110627_8	6272011	Johnny Garcia Vasquez	yes	State Legislation Liasion,Board of Directors, University of California Student Association.	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	Do not split cities of Ventura and Oxnard.Keep Oxnard and Ventura colleges in same assembly district.Keep Oxnard in one Assembly district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110627_1	Ventura,Los Angeles	Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110627_2	Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110627_3	Ventura	Moorpark,Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Oxnard		no	yes		
5ventura_20110627_4	Ventura,San Barbara	Santa Paulo,Fillmore,Piru.		no	no		
5ventura_20110627_7	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Calabasas,Desoto,Tampa,Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110627_7	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Calabasas,Desoto,Tampa,Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110627_8	Ventura	Oxnard,Ventura		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110627_1			no				
5ventura_20110627_2			no				
5ventura_20110627_3	Not coastal community.		no				
5ventura_20110627_4			no				
5ventura_20110627_7			no				
5ventura_20110627_7	,		no				
5ventura_20110627_8	splitting will diverge student advocacy efforts and marginalize students and families,and their communities.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110627_9	6272011	Johnny Garcia Vasquez(Duplicate)	yes	State Legislation Liasion,Board of Directors, University of California Student Association.	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	Do not split cities of Ventura and Oxnard.Keep Oxnard and Ventura colleges in same assembly district.Keep Oxnard in one Assembly district.
5ventura_20110627_10	6272011	Avery Willis	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Interets of people in Ventura are not tied to those in Los Angeles County.Simi Valley,Moorpark are very much like Thousand Oaks and Newberry Park.Let Simi Valley and Moorpark stay in Ventura.
5ventura_20110627_11	6272011	Leigh Nixon	yes	Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce		Ventura	yes	Do not split Simi Valley area out of Ventura for assembly and senate and congressional districts.
5ventura_20110627_13	6272011	Dean Kunicki	yes	Ventura County Board of Education	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley whole,do not split Wood Ranch.Keep Simi Valley with Ventura in Congressional seat.Nest with Santa Clarita for Assembly and Senate district.
5ventura_20110627_14	6272011	Jill Myers	no			Ventura	yes	Do not separate Simi Valley,Moorpark from Ventura.We will be a small part of LA and lose our voice.If you must,place Piru,Fillmore,Santa Paula off 126Hwy with Santa Clarita.
5ventura_20110627_15	6272011	Bob Guhl	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Do not group Moorpark with Los Angeles County.
5ventura_20110627_17	6272011	Peter Foy	yes	Ventura County Board of Supervisors		Ventura	yes	Ventura and East district have shared interests.Move Ventura into East district.Make Los Angeles district true by moving all of City of LA into it.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110627_9	Ventura	Oxnard,Ventura		no	yes		
5ventura_20110627_10	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks,Newberry Park.		no	yes	Better schools,safe neighborhoods,clean parks and cities.	
5ventura_20110627_11	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Camarillo,Newbury Park.		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110627_13	Ventura, Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Simi Valley,Moorpark.		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110627_14	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Santa Clarita,Piru,Fillmore,Santa Paula		yes	yes	Schools,work,living.	
5ventura_20110627_15	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark		no	yes	physical infrastructure,common governmental bodies,Agricultural communities.	
5ventura_20110627_17	Los Angeles,Ventura	Los Angeles		no	yes	shared watershed,agriculture industries,similar lifestyles.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110627_9	splitting will diverge student advocacy efforts and marginalize students and families,and their communities.		no				
5ventura_20110627_10			no				
5ventura_20110627_11	Mayor lives in area which would be split out.Strong cooperation between Simi Valley and close by cities.COI.		no				
5ventura_20110627_13	Keep inlad communties together		no				
5ventura_20110627_14	much in common,similar types of communities		no				
5ventura_20110627_15			no				
5ventura_20110627_17	highly rural,not urban like LA.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110627_18	6272011	Mary E. Bansbach	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley,Moorpark with Santa Clarita,Malibu,Agoura in LA County.Seperated by mountain range that is hard to pass.Take our northern Ventura and put with Santa Barbara.
5ventura_20110627_19	6272011	Bill Fulton	yes	Mayor,City of Ventura.		Ventura	yes	Do not divide Venture between EVENT and SLOSB districts.Consider shifts.
5ventura_20110627_21	6272011	Bill Little	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	If anything must change with Ventura Include Thousand Oaks in it.Consider removing Oxnard.Senate seat should have Santa Clarita with Ventura instead of Malibu.Keep Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley with Santa Clarita in Senate seat.
5ventura_20110627_22	6272011	Lisa Figgins	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Ventura Assembly district should include Thousand Oaks,not coastal Oxnard.Senate should have Thousand Oaks,Simi Valley,Moorpark in it, not with Santa Barbara.East Ventura and Santa Clarita assembly districts should combine.Remove Malibu from Ventura cong.
6fresno_20110627_1	6272011	Charles L. Krugman	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	Do not use Fwy 41 as dividing line through Fresno.This division splits Hispanic and Asian communities.
6fresno_20110627_2	6272011	Cesar X. Sanchez	no			Fresno	yes	No fair opportunities for Fresno now,a split would divide city by economic richness.Poor Vs Rich.Do not split east and west on Hwy 41.
6kern_20110627_1	6272011	Lila P. Perez	no		Bakersfield	Kern	yes	View attached detailed description.Proposal for county would severly diminish opportunities for Latino political progress in the state.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110627_18	Los Angeles,Santa Barbara,Ventura	Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Moorpark,Malibu,Agoura		no	no		
5ventura_20110627_19	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Santa Clarita.		yes	yes	Library	
5ventura_20110627_21	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Camarillo, Thousand Oaks,Malibu,Santa Clarita		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110627_22	Los Angeles,Ventura,	Santa Clarita,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Malibu,Camarillo,Santa Barbara		no	yes		
6fresno_20110627_1	Fresno	Fresno		no	yes	Health care,hispanic and asian populations,social programs,	
6fresno_20110627_2	Fresno	Fresno		yes	yes	education,income,overall health	
6kern_20110627_1	Kern			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110627_18			no				
5ventura_20110627_19	Unique history,character,geography shared by area.		no				
5ventura_20110627_21	Keep inland valleys together.		no				
5ventura_20110627_22	Keep coastal communities separate from inland valley communities.		no				
6fresno_20110627_1	split would make it harder for groups to be represented.		no				
6fresno_20110627_2	A split on hwy 41 would divide Fresno into Rich and poor sides.		no				
6kern_20110627_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110627_2	6272011	Olaf Landsgaard	yes	Rosamond Municipal Advisory Council		Kern	yes	Consider moving Kern County portion of MISBK into LAAVV.This is a COI, no COI with Kern and Victor Valley.For population,move Adelanto and portions of San Bernardino out of LAAVV and into MISBK.
6merced_20110627_1	6272011	Stephanie Ocasio	yes	Newman Assistant Planner		Merced	yes	If proposed MercedMonterey district is established,Newman will not receive representation.Two very different regions.map attached.Remove bay areacentral coast portions.
7sclara_20110627_1	6272011	Beverly Miller	no			Santa Clara	yes	Do not remove Gilroy from Dist 28 and add Watsonville.
7sclara_20110627_2	6272011	Terry Christensen	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Do not split San Joses Latino eastside into multiple districts.Downtown San Jose must be kept with Eastside.Not combined with Hayward,Fremont Alameda County.
7sclara_20110627_3	6272011	Concordia Sam	yes	Coalition of Asian and Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting.	Mountain View	Santa Clara	yes	Do not split Sunnyvale from Santa Clara and join with SSNMT district.Sunnyvale,Mountain View have closer ties with Santa Clara,Cupertino than with Half Moon Bay.Support proposal by CAPAFR
8solano_20110627_1	6272011	Judy Irvin	no		Vallejo	Solano	yes	Redistrict Vallejo to give balance representation.It cannot be added to agricultural community.It should be combined with Mare Island,Napa,Sonoma Counties.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110627_2	Kern,Los Angles,Inyo, San Bernardino	Victorville,Palmdale,Lancaster		yes	yes	Aerospace industry for jobs,Shared water basin,Joint projects,joint power authorities.	
6merced_20110627_1	Merced,Monterey	Newman		yes	yes	agriculture,housing issues,	
7sclara_20110627_1	Santa Clara	Gilroy,San Benito,Watsonville		no	yes	shopping,entertainment,arts,Geographically similar and close.	
7sclara_20110627_2	Santa Clara,Alameda	San Jose,Hayward,Fremont		yes	yes		
7sclara_20110627_3	Santa Clara	Half Moon Bay,Santa Clara, Cupertino,Santa Clara,Sunnyvale,Mountain View		no	yes	businesses.	
8solano_20110627_1	Solano,Yolo,Napa,	Vallejo,Mare Island,Napa City,		yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110627_2			no				
6merced_20110627_1			yes	Merced, Monterey	Do not group these two counties.		
7sclara_20110627_1	People move between Gilroy and San Benito		no				
7sclara_20110627_2	Keep latino community together and represented.		no				
7sclara_20110627_3	Filipino population needs to be equally represented in this area.		no				
8solano_20110627_1	Very impoverished area, needs representation by other Urban areas		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110627_1	6272011	Glenn McGourty	no				yes	Redistricting seperating Napa and Lake from Mendocino and Sonoma makes no sense.Napa has nothing in common with Cental Valley.Marin County is different from all coastal counties north of it.It should be with SF bay area.use model of existing 1st district
9placer_20110627_1	6272011	Kenneth A. Delfino	yes	Mayor of Colfax	Colfax	Placer	yes	City of Colfax should be with district including Grass Valley,Nevada City,Downievill,Sierraville,Loyalton,South Lake Tahoe,Truckee,Placerville,Auburn,Loomis,Penn Valley,Rocklin
5ventura_20110627_5	6272011	Bruce Feng	yes	City Manager Camarillo			yes	Camarillo should be kept whole.Ventura County remain a whole district.If Ventura must be split,please divide West Fillmore,Ojai,Oxnard,Port Hueneme,Santa Paula,Ventura and East Camarillo,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks
5ventura_20110627_6	6272011	Stephanie Ferguson	no		Newbury Park	Ventura	yes	Do not include Simi Valley and Moorpark with Los Angeles District.These Ventura Cities will not be represented by Buck McKeon who represents Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110627_20	6272011	Bill Edwards	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley,Moorpark should be in Ventura County not LA.
1imperial_20110627_1	6272011	Bob Brown	no				yes	Please keep Imperial Valley with San Diego
1imperial_20110627_2	6272011	Bob Zweibel	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Imperial County should not be sorted in with San Diego County. It must be included in the Coachella Valley Area.
1imperial_20110627_3	6272011	Jim Borax	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego. Not Coachella Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110627_1	Mendocino,Napa,Sonoma, Marin			no	yes	Demographics,psychographics,	
9placer_20110627_1	Placer	Grass Valley,Nevada City,Downievill,Sierraville,Loyalton,South Lake Tahoe,Truckee,Placerville, Auburn,Loomis,Penn Valley,Rocklin,Colfax		no	yes	Highschool rivals	
5ventura_20110627_5	Ventura	Fillmore,Ojai,Oxnard,Port Hueneme,Santa Paula,Ventura, Camarillo,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Government Services,Infrastructure,Land use,transportation,Housing	economic development
5ventura_20110627_6	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Santa Clarita		yes	no		
5ventura_20110627_20	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark		no	yes		
1imperial_20110627_1	Imperial, San Diego	Imperial Valley		no	no		
1imperial_20110627_2	Imperial, Riverside,San Diego County			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_3	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110627_1	Coastal communities stay with similar ones and Inland ones stay with other inland communities		no				
9placer_20110627_1	Community ties		no				
5ventura_20110627_5	one COI		no				
5ventura_20110627_6			no				
5ventura_20110627_20	Similar interests with Ventura		no				
1imperial_20110627_1			no				
1imperial_20110627_2			no				
1imperial_20110627_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110627_4	6272011	Pat C. Coontz	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Include East Riverside County with Imperial County. Not with San Diego County.
1imperial_20110627_5	6272011	Efrain Silva	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Do not include Imperial County with San Diego for state and senate.Connections with Riverside County are much better.
1imperial_20110627_6	6272011	Richard Levine	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Imperial County should become part of East Riverside County. Imperial does not want to be with San Diego,and wishes to join Coachella.Coachella wishes to have Imperial, and San Diego does not want Imperial.
1imperial_20110627_7	6272011	Mary Ellen Ferguson	no				yes	Include Imperial County with East part of Riverside County.
1imperial_20110627_8	6272011	Harold Keasler	no				yes	People of the 45th district must be combined with Imperial County.
1imperial_20110627_9	6282011	John	no			Imperial	yes	Imperial has more in common with Coachella Valley.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110627_4	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_5	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	yes	Demographics, Industry, weather	
1imperial_20110627_6	Imperial, San Diego, Riverside			no	yes		
1imperial_20110627_7	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes	both agricultural, shared water issues	
1imperial_20110627_8	Imperial, Riverside.			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_9	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes	Migrant stream for labor,close to border,Prisons are similar in size,Salton Sea is shared,Shared water resource,Shared mountain range,shared medical facilities,shared tribal lands,Low educational achievement,Alternative energy pursual.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110627_4			no				
1imperial_20110627_5	Keep Imperial with Riverside because they have so much in common		no				
1imperial_20110627_6	Common interests shared.		no				
1imperial_20110627_7			no				
1imperial_20110627_8			no				Jodie Webber you were selected to be a part of this committee to be non partisan. Please follow through and fairly represent your people.
1imperial_20110627_9			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6merced_20110628_3	6282011	Kathy Halsey	no		Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Do not put Madera and Fresno in Sacramento. Do not put San Jose and Santa Cruz in Merced
6stanislaus_20110628_1	6282011	Marian Martino	no				yes	Do not include Valley and coastal areas, esp. San Jose into one district. Put Merced and Stanislaus in San Joaquin. Do not put Santa Clara, Monterey, and San Benito in San Joaquin
6stanislaus_20110628_2	6282011	Priscilla S. Peters	no		Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Stanislaus and Merced should be with San Joaquin, not San Benito or Monterey.
6tulare_20110628_1	6282011	Vianey Nunez	no		Orosi	Tulare	yes	Keep Cutler and Orosi in MM district FSEC2. Cutler, Orosi, and East Orosi should be with Orange Cove, Parlier, Selma and Reedley in Fresno
6tuolumne_20110628_1	6282011	Mark Banks, President	yes	Tuolumne County Building Industry		Tuolumne	yes	District should be East to West, not North to South. Exclude Placer, Eldorado, Fresno, and Madera
6tuolumne_20110628_2	6282011	Michael Ayala	no		Sonora	Tuolumne	yes	Keep Tuolumne, Modesto, Sonora together. Exclude Fresno, Modera, Placer, El Dorado
6tuolumne_20110628_3	6282011	Alan Haack	no				yes	Good job on the new foothill districts.
6tuolumne_20110628_4	6282011	Allan Gelber	no			Tuolumne	yes	Do not redistrict Tuolumne county.
6tuolumne_20110628_5	6282011	Allan Gelber	no			Tuolumne	yes	Do not redistrict Tuolumne county. Need new plan
7monterey_20110628_1	6282011	Roberto Lovato	no			Monterey	yes	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara should be together
7monterey_20110628_2	6282011	Valarie Davis	no				yes	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and south Santa Clara should be together in one district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6merced_20110628_3	Sacramento, Merced	Madera, Fresno, San Jose, Santa Cruz		no	yes	Latino population,	agricultual concerns
6stanislaus_20110628_1	San Joaquin, Merced, Stanisluas, Santa Clara, Monterey, San Benito			no	no		
6stanislaus_20110628_2	Stanislaus, Merced, San Joaquin, Merced			no	no		
6tulare_20110628_1	Fresno	Cutler, Orosi, Orange Cove, Parlier, Selma and Reedley		no	yes	Latino Population,	agricultural workers,
6tuolumne_20110628_1	Placer, El Dorado, Fresno, Madera, Tuolumne	Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers		no	no		
6tuolumne_20110628_2	Tuolumne, Modesto, Fresno, Modera, Sonora, El Dorado		East to West	no	yes		
6tuolumne_20110628_3				no	no		
6tuolumne_20110628_4	Tuolumne			no	no		
6tuolumne_20110628_5	Tuolumne			no	no		
7monterey_20110628_1	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara		no	yes		tourism and agriculture
7monterey_20110628_2	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6merced_20110628_3			no				Use attached map
6stanislaus_20110628_1			no			agricultural industy is different, same with air quality issues, tranportation issues, produce routes	
6stanislaus_20110628_2			no			very different concerns. Central Valley seems to get leftovers	
6tulare_20110628_1	impacted by pollution		no				
6tuolumne_20110628_1			no			geography	
6tuolumne_20110628_2	shopping, political connections, historical links		no			driving time, representation	
6tuolumne_20110628_3			no				
6tuolumne_20110628_4			no			not fair, will lose representatives	
6tuolumne_20110628_5			no			no fair representation	
7monterey_20110628_1			no				
7monterey_20110628_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7monterey_20110628_3	6282011	Carl Davis	no				yes	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and south Santa Clara should be together in one district.
7monterey_20110628_4	6282011	Barbara Rosenthal	no				yes	Do not attach Monterey to Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Merced. They belong together with Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz, S Santa Clara
7monterey_20110628_5	6282011	Beth Winters	no				yes	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and south Santa Clara should be together in one district.
7monterey_20110628_6	6282011	Andrea Capito	no				yes	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and south Santa Clara should be together in one district.
7monterey_20110628_7	6282011	Joseph T. Donahue	no				yes	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and south Santa Clara should be together in one district.
7monterey_20110628_8	6282011	Francesca Dianne Soria	no				yes	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and south Santa Clara should be together in one district.
7sbenito_20110628_1	6282011	Mike Johnson	no		Watsonville	Santa Cruz	yes	Supports commisions first draft map for SD 12
7sbenito_20110628_2	6282011	Juan Uranga, Executive director	yes	Center for Community Advocacy	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Do not place central Coast with urban centers like San Jose.
7sbenito_20110628_3	6282011	Ed Weinstein	no				yes	Nest AD 27th and 28th with Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Southern Santa Clara
8alameda_20110628_1	6282011	Bob Rodde	no				yes	Supports CCAG maps. Single district for San Joaquin. Use OaklandEast Bay hills as dividing line.
8ccosta_20110628_1	6282011	Jeff Nibert	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Keep Contra Costa and Alameda in one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7monterey_20110628_3	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara		no	yes		agriculture, education, tourism,
7monterey_20110628_4	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Merced			no	no		
7monterey_20110628_5	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara			no	yes		agriculture, education, tourism
7monterey_20110628_6	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara			no	yes		agriculture, education, tourism
7monterey_20110628_7	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara			no	yes		agriculture, education, tourism
7monterey_20110628_8	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara			no	yes		agriculture, education, tourism
7sbenito_20110628_1				no	no		
7sbenito_20110628_2	Monterey, Salinas, Merced	San Jose		no	yes	Latino population, influence	
7sbenito_20110628_3	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Southern Santa Clara			no	no		
8alameda_20110628_1	San Joaquin	Oakland		no	no		
8ccosta_20110628_1	Contra Costa, Alameda			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7monterey_20110628_3	association of governments, media markets		no				
7monterey_20110628_4			no			geographically and socially dissimilar areas	
7monterey_20110628_5	association of governments, media markets		no				
7monterey_20110628_6	association of governments, media markets		no				
7monterey_20110628_7	association of governments, media markets		no				
7monterey_20110628_8	association of governments, media markets		no				
7sbenito_20110628_1			no				Nice.
7sbenito_20110628_2	rural character of the district	enchance latino influence	no				
7sbenito_20110628_3			no				
8alameda_20110628_1			no				see maps
8ccosta_20110628_1			no				see attached pdf

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110628_2	6282011	Byron and Martha Parsons	no		Antioch	Contra Costa	yes	Assign odd number to Contra Costa district
8ccosta_20110628_3	6282011	Doria Mueller-Beilschmidt	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not put Richmond in Barbara Lees district
8ccosta_20110628_4	6282011	Bryan H. Montgomery, City Manager	no		Oakley	Contra Costa	yes	Include Oakley in Contra Costa, place in district with odd number
8ccosta_20110628_5	6282011	Christopher R. Bowen	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond. Keep in Contra Costa county, do not place with Berkeley and Oakland.
8marin_20110628_1	6282011	Kernan Jang	no				yes	Do not place Marin with SF, Del Norte. Do not Carve out Santa Rosa. Do not put Marin with Vallejo. Do not split gay population in SF.
8marin_20110628_2	6292011	Peggy Sheneman	no			Marin	yes	Separate Marin from SF county. Keep Marin and all Sonoma in one district.
8marin_20110628_3	6282011	Sondra S. Wuthnow	no				yes	Include all of Marin and all of Sonoma County together. Do not put with North Coast Counties.
8napa_20110628_1	6282011	Dianne Dillon, District Supervisor	yes	Napa County		Napa	yes	Keep Napa together in one district
8sfrancisco_20110628_1	6282011	Kristine Enea	no		San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Provide SF senate district with an odd number
8sfrancisco_20110628_2	6282011	Peggy Deras, CKD, CID	no		South San Francisco	San Mateo	yes	Do not split South San Francisco into two districts.
8sfrancisco_20110628_3	6282011	Owen Stephens	no			San Francisco	yes	Make sure Eastern SF contains an intact LGBT community

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110628_2	Contra Costa			no	no		
8ccosta_20110628_3		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110628_4	Contra Costa	Oakley		no	no		
8ccosta_20110628_5	Contra Costa	Richmond, Berkeley, Oakland.	39th st	no	yes	racially diverse,	economically, private and public employers
8marin_20110628_1	Marin, San Francisco, Del Norte	Santa Rosa, Vallejo, San Francisco		yes	yes	gay community	
8marin_20110628_2	Marin, SF, Sonoma	San Francisco		no	yes		concerns, businesses
8marin_20110628_3	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8napa_20110628_1	Napa			no	yes		wine producing community
8sfrancisco_20110628_1	San Francisco	San Francisco		no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110628_2		South San Francisco		no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110628_3		San Francisco		no	yes	LGBT community	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110628_2			no				so as not disenfranchised
8ccosta_20110628_3			no			would not work in Richmonds favor	
8ccosta_20110628_4			no				
8ccosta_20110628_5		will violate VRA, as it will dilute strenth of votes of persons of color living in West Contra Costa County	no			Richmond will be forgotten if lumped together with Alameda.	
8marin_20110628_1			no			Do not gerrymander districts	
8marin_20110628_2	suburban, farms, salmon, tax base, water, Smart Train		no				
8marin_20110628_3			no			different agriculture interests, no housing needs	
8napa_20110628_1			no				see attached map revision
8sfrancisco_20110628_1			no			would disenfranchise residents otherwise	
8sfrancisco_20110628_2	would interfere with Citys ability to advance interests		no				
8sfrancisco_20110628_3			no				attached supplemental information

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8smateo_20110628_1	6282011	Stephanie Elkins	no				yes	Do not split Menlo Park. Include MP and Atherton in San Mateo
8smateo_20110628_2	6282011	John J. Wallace	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not split Menlo Park and Redwood City.
8smateo_20110628_3	6282011	P. Gregory Conlon	no		Atherton	San Mateo	yes	Keep Menlo Park with Palo Alto and Atherton, Move district line along San Mateo line North
8smateo_20110628_4	6282011	John Boyle, former Menlo Park City Council Member	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not split Menlo Park between Santa Clara and San Mateo
8smateo_20110628_5	6282011	R. Yoschak	no			San Mateo	no	
8smateo_20110628_6	6282011	Terry Thygesen, Trustee	yes	Menlo Park City School District	Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not split West Menlo Park from Menlo Park, Atherton, Woodside, Portola Valley.
8smateo_20110628_7	6282011	Edward Moritz	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Include central Menlo Park in the congressional district.
8smateo_20110628_8	6282011	Edward Moritz	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Include central Menlo Park in the congressional district.
8smateo_20110628_9	6282011	Susan Chung	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Keep Menlo Park intact.
8sonoma_20110628_1	6282011	Carole Robinson	no				yes	Keep Santa Rosa and Sonoma with North Bay, not Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo.
8sonoma_20110628_2	6282011	Susan Robb-Wilder	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not move Santa Rosa away from Sonoma, do not throw Sonoma in with Northwest California
8sonoma_20110628_3	6282011	Helen Mader	no				yes	Santa Rosa is part of Sonoma, has COI with SF bay.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8smateo_20110628_1	San Mateo	Menlo Park, Atherton		no	no		
8smateo_20110628_2	San Mateo	Menlo Park, Redwood City		no	no		
8smateo_20110628_3	San Mateo, San Francisco	Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Atherton		no	no		
8smateo_20110628_4	San Mateo, Santa Clara	Menlo Park		no	no		
8smateo_20110628_5				no	no		
8smateo_20110628_6		West Menlo Park, Menlo Park, Atherton, Woodside, Portola Valley.		no	yes	highly integrated	
8smateo_20110628_7		Menlo Park		no	yes		
8smateo_20110628_8		Menlo Park		no	yes		
8smateo_20110628_9		Menlo Park		no	no		
8sonoma_20110628_1	Sonoma, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo.	Santa Rosa	Russian River	no	yes		Russian River, coastal preservation, SF Bay, wine production, organic gardenting
8sonoma_20110628_2	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	North Bay issues,	water use, urban sprawl,
8sonoma_20110628_3	Sonoma	Santa Rosa	Highway 101 corridor	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8smateo_20110628_1			no				
8smateo_20110628_2			no			include one city in each district	
8smateo_20110628_3			no			San Mateo does not relate to SF community	
8smateo_20110628_4			no			representation, small city, voices heard	
8smateo_20110628_5			no				United we standDivided we fall
8smateo_20110628_6	contiguous, school district		no				
8smateo_20110628_7	political issues, contiguous		no				phallic intrusion
8smateo_20110628_8	political issues, contiguous		no				phallic intrusion
8smateo_20110628_9			no				
8sonoma_20110628_1			no				
8sonoma_20110628_2	representation		no			vs. logging, rural economy	
8sonoma_20110628_3	transport, governmental requirements, medical, shopping, recreation		no				thank you

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110628_4	6282011	Janelle Aman	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not cut Santa Rosa away from Sonoma, should all be one voice
8sonoma_20110628_5	6282011	Demerus M. Lescure	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not combine Santa Rosa with inland rural areas.
8sonoma_20110628_6	6282011	Roger Carrillo	no				yes	Include in North Coast district Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Cotati, petaluma
8sonoma_20110628_7	6282011	Liz Gatley, Jim Judd, Joyce Garcia, Sally Hopkins	no				yes	Keep Sonoma and Santa Rosa connected to Mendocino, Lake, Napa. Do not remove Santa Rosa from Sonoma.
9calaveras_20110628_1	6282011	Shannan Sagewalker	no			Calaveras	yes	Keep Calaveras, Amador, Tuolumne Counties together
9dnorte_20110628_1	6282011	Gordon Pfeffer	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Add Del Norte to coastal counties district. Put Del norte with Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma and Trinity counties.
9dnorte_20110628_2	6282011	Susan Calla	yes	Focus on Nature	Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Keep Del Norte with other coastal counties
9dnorte_20110628_3	6282011	Eileen Evermore	no		Gasquet	Del Norte	yes	Keep Del Norte as part of Wild Rivers Coast.
9dnorte_20110628_4	6292011	Holly O. Austin	no			Del Norte	yes	Include Del Norte County with coastal counties
9dnorte_20110628_5	6282011	Grant Werschkull	no			Del Norte	yes	Keep Del Norte part of coastal communities.
9dnorte_20110628_6	6282011	Jon Parmentier	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Put Del Norte on the coast, do not include Marin
9edorado_20110628_1	6282011	Ray Nutting, Chairman	yes	El Dorado County Board of Supervisors		El Dorado	yes	Keep Lake Tahoe and El Dorado, Placer counties within same district.
9edorado_20110628_2	6292011	Beth Selling	no				yes	Put El Dorado Hills with Granite Bay, Folsom, Placer.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110628_4	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
8sonoma_20110628_5		Santa Rosa		no	no		
8sonoma_20110628_6		Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Cotati, petaluma		no	no		
8sonoma_20110628_7	Mendocino, Lake, Napa, Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Marin is bedroom community of SF.	wine industry
9calaveras_20110628_1	Calaveras, Amador, Tuolumne			no	no		
9dnorte_20110628_1	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Trinity		101	no	yes		tourism, fishing, logging
9dnorte_20110628_2	Del Norte		US Highway 101	no	yes		eco-tourism, visitors, redwood parks
9dnorte_20110628_3	Del Norte		mountain ranges	no	yes		financial goals, fishing, recreation, tourism, Rivers
9dnorte_20110628_4	Del Norte		101	no	yes	Yurok Native territories,	college of Redwoods, tourism industries and national parks
9dnorte_20110628_5	Del Norte			no	yes		
9dnorte_20110628_6	Del Norte, Marin			no	yes	similar interests	
9edorado_20110628_1	El Dorado, Placer	Lake Tahoe		no	yes	historic, recreational bonds	economic bonds, environmentally rich region
9edorado_20110628_2		El Dorado Hills, Granite Bay, Folsom, Placer		no	yes		fiscal values, demographics

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110628_4	one community, one voice		no				
8sonoma_20110628_5			no			will lead to bitter contests	
8sonoma_20110628_6			no			put rural counties to the north in Yuba district	
8sonoma_20110628_7	seat of sonoma county		no				
9calaveras_20110628_1			no				
9dnorte_20110628_1			no				
9dnorte_20110628_2	state and federal agencies		no				
9dnorte_20110628_3	geography, geology, flora, fauna,		no				
9dnorte_20110628_4	bioregion,		no				please stand strong in face of reactive pressure
9dnorte_20110628_5	economy, culture, geography		no				
9dnorte_20110628_6			no			Marin would sway agenda to urban priorities	
9edorado_20110628_1			no				
9edorado_20110628_2	educational, political interests		no			lines drawn to be skewed	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110628_1	6282011	Mark Lovelace, Chair	yes	Humboldt County Board of Supervisors		Humboldt	yes	Keep Humboldt linked to other coastal counties. Do not cut representation in half. Donot divide Napa and Eastern Sonoma into different district. Do not join with Marin and Southern Sonma.
9humboldt_20110628_2	6282011	Carol Taylor	no				yes	Keep Marin in North Bay, keep Humboldt in North Coast.
9humboldt_20110628_3	6282011	Jim Clark	no				yes	Keep North Coast districts coastal, Marin should be in Bay area district. Include Santa Rosa in North Coast
9mendocino_20110628_1	6282011	Maureen Martin	no			Mendocino	yes	New lines give Northern Coast a voice.
9sacramento_20110628_1	6282011	D. Alex Surette	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Supports current Sacramento county district lines.
9sacramento_20110628_2	6282011	Jeannie Bruins, Mayor	yes	City of Citrus Heights	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Keep Citrus Heights whole . Do not split between districts
9sacramento_20110628_3	6282011	Bill Van Duker	yes	All Star Printing	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not split Citrus Heights.
9sacramento_20110628_4	6282011	Ivy Kichor	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not split Citrus Heights.
9sacramento_20110628_5	6282011	Elaine Abelaye, Executive Director	yes	Asian Resources, Inc	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Keep South Sacramento and Elk Grove together. Keep South Sacramento, Elk Grove, Florin and Vineyard together.
9sacramento_20110628_6	6282011	Kathleen Harless, Asst. Vice President	yes	SAFE Credit Union	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not split Citrus Heights.
9sacramento_20110628_7	6282011	Jeannie Bruins, Mayor	yes	City of Citrus Heights	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not split Citrus Heights.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110628_1	Humboldt, napa, Sonoma, Marin			no	yes		
9humboldt_20110628_2	Marin, Humboldt		Redwood Curtain	no	no		
9humboldt_20110628_3	Marin	Santa Rosa		no	yes	common interests, diverse region	
9mendocino_20110628_1				no	no		
9sacramento_20110628_1	Sacramento			no	no		
9sacramento_20110628_2	Citrus Heights			no	yes		
9sacramento_20110628_3	Citrus Heights			no	yes		
9sacramento_20110628_4		Citrus Heights		no	yes	population	
9sacramento_20110628_5	Sacramento	South Sacramento, Elk Grove, Florin and Vineyard	Fruitridge Road	no	yes	Southeast Asian families, Asian community social services, Slavic, Latino,	
9sacramento_20110628_6	Sacramento	Citrus Heights		no	yes	population	
9sacramento_20110628_7	Sacramento	Citrus Heights		no	yes	population	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110628_1	shared interests, wine production, water issues, agriculture, not enough representaiton		no				
9humboldt_20110628_2			no			create accesible districts	
9humboldt_20110628_3			no				
9mendocino_20110628_1			no				pleaese give us our legal and rightful representative
9sacramento_20110628_1			no				your efforts appreciated
9sacramento_20110628_2	geographic integrity of cities. Representation, prop 20		no				
9sacramento_20110628_3	tight-knigt, high level of espirit		no				
9sacramento_20110628_4	will dilute ability to represent citizens		no				
9sacramento_20110628_5	ESL, citizenship services		no				
9sacramento_20110628_6	representation		no				
9sacramento_20110628_7	representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110628_8	6282011	Karen Thorson	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not split Citrus Heights.
9sacramento_20110628_9	6282011	Chris Little, President	no			Sacramento	yes	Keep East Sacramento together.
9sacramento_20110628_10	6282011	Tracey Surette	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Agree with Commissions proposed boundaries to create two Congressional Districts.
9sacramento_20110628_11	6282011	Richard Salton	no			Sacramento	yes	Add Galt and Lodi to SACEG district. Give up Davis to EEC.
9sacramento_20110628_12	6282011	Amy Springmeyer	no			Sacramento	yes	Do not split up Sacramento, do not align with far flung areas.
9sacramento_20110628_13	6282011	Jeannie Bruins, Mayor	yes	City of Citrus Heights	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Keep Citrus Heights whole . Do not split between districts
9sacramento_20110628_14	6282011	Rick Bettis	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Do not combine Sacramento and Yolo counties. Do not include portions of city in El Dorado county
9sacramento_20110628_15	6282011	Mel Turner, Council Member	yes	City of Citrus Heights	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Keep Citrus Heights whole . Do not split between districts
9sacramento_20110628_16	6282011	Del Surette	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Supports Sacramento County boundaries. Preserve unity of Sacramento County
9sacramento_20110628_17	6282011	Michael Borges	no		West Sacramento	sacramento	yes	Keep West Sacramento with Sacramento.
9sacramento_20110628_18	6282011	Christopher L Cabaldon, Mayor	yes	West Sacramento	West Sacramento	sacramento	yes	Davis and West Sacramento should be linked together.
9sacramento_20110628_19	6282011	Robert Hyland	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Keep Citrus Heights whole . Do not split between districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110628_8	Sacramento	Citrus Heights		no	yes	population	
9sacramento_20110628_9		East Sacramento	American River, Csus Campus, Capital Freeway, Hwy 50	yes	yes	single community, neighborhood cohesiveness	
9sacramento_20110628_10	Sacramento			no	no		
9sacramento_20110628_11		Galt, Lodi, Davis	Highway 99	no	yes	highway, shopping, newspaper	
9sacramento_20110628_12	Sacramento	Sacramento		no	no		
9sacramento_20110628_13		Citrus Heights		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110628_14	El Dorado, Sacramento, Yolo	Sacramento		no	yes	cuturally and socio-economically	
9sacramento_20110628_15	Citrus Heights			no	yes		
9sacramento_20110628_16	Sacramento			no	no		
9sacramento_20110628_17	Sacramento	Sacramento		no	yes	shopping, proximity, markets, restaurants, bars, movies, baseball	riverfront areas
9sacramento_20110628_18	Yolo, Sacramento	Davis, West Sacramento, Sacramento	I 80	no	yes	baseball stadium, Mondavi Center	work, commute patterns, UC Davis, media market
9sacramento_20110628_19		Citrus Heights		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110628_8	representation		no				
9sacramento_20110628_9	physical and COI boundaries, population		no			dividing neighborhoodcould cause confusion and duplicate services	
9sacramento_20110628_10	do not dismantle Sacramento County		no				
9sacramento_20110628_11	government services, CERT		no				
9sacramento_20110628_12	geography, contiguity, compactness,		no			reonsider concept of Community of Interest	
9sacramento_20110628_13	geographic integrity of cities. Representation, prop 20		no				
9sacramento_20110628_14			no			loss of two assembly members and a senator,	
9sacramento_20110628_15	geographic integrity of cities. Representation, prop 20		no				
9sacramento_20110628_16			no				
9sacramento_20110628_17	almost a suburb of Sacramento		no			Davis is milesa away over Yolo Causeway	
9sacramento_20110628_18	single statistical area, ecological boundaries		no				
9sacramento_20110628_19	geographic integrity of cities. Representation, prop 20		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110628_20	6282011	Will Green, MD, President	yes	ESP, Inc		Sacramento	yes	Do not separate East Sacramento neighborhoods
9sacramento_20110628_21	6282011	Dr. Jayna Karpinski-Costa, Councilmember	yes	City of Citrus Heights	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Keep Citrus Heights united.
9sacramento_20110628_22	6282011	Jean and Jack Duncan	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not split city into two Districts.
9sacramento_20110628_23	6282011	Mark Taylor	no				yes	Keep Sacramento county first draft map. Maintain current boundaries
9sacramento_20110628_24	6282011	Eugene Lee, Project Director	yes	Asian Pacific American Legal Center	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	no	
9sacramento_20110628_25	6282011	Diana Rodriguez, Board Member	yes	Sacramento City Unified School District	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Create additional Latino Opportunity Districts. Keep Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley together. Keep San Bernardino city together. Keep East Side San Jose Together with San Jose.
9siskiyou_20110628_1	6282011	Bryan R. Foster, Councilmember	yes	Yreka City	Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou County, do not put with coastal districts.
9siskiyou_20110628_2	6282011	Shannon Mahorney	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not group Siskiyou with Del Norte, Mendocino districts.
9siskiyou_20110628_3	6282011	Greg King, President	yes	Siskiyou Land Conservancy	Arcata	Humboldt	yes	Del Norte belongs with Coastal districts, with Humboldt and Mendocino.
9siskiyou_20110628_4	6282011	Janna Martin Gliatto, Educator	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou, do not place with coastal communities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110628_20		East Sacramento		yes	yes		business activity, development
9sacramento_20110628_21		Citrus Heights		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110628_22		Citrus Heights		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110628_23	Sacramento			no	no		
9sacramento_20110628_24				no	yes		
9sacramento_20110628_25	San Bernardino	Imperial Valley, Coachella Valley, San Bernardino, San Jose		no	yes	Latino opportunity districts	
9siskiyou_20110628_1	Siskiyou	Yreka		no	yes	close knit,	
9siskiyou_20110628_2	Siskiyou, Del Norte, Mendocino			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_3	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110628_4	Siskiyou			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110628_20	schools, higher education, hospital synergy, connectivity		no				
9sacramento_20110628_21	population, public engagements, representation		no				
9sacramento_20110628_22	one voice, one community		no				
9sacramento_20110628_23			no				
9sacramento_20110628_24		illustrate how new lines can comply with VRA	no				submitting statewide unity maps
9sacramento_20110628_25			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_1	rural, agricultrual, public interests		no			redistricting will result in division of resources	
9siskiyou_20110628_2			no			do not share values or interests. Four hour drive away	
9siskiyou_20110628_3	highways, geography, watersheds, harbors, tourism, air quality etc		no				
9siskiyou_20110628_4			no			mountain range, distatnce, different issues	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110628_5	6282011	Pat Martin, Rancher	yes	Siskiyou County Cattlewomen		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou, do not place with coastal communities
9siskiyou_20110628_6	6282011	Brandon A. Criss	no		Macdoel	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County. Do not put in coastal district. Keep with Shasta and Modoc.
9siskiyou_20110628_7	6282011	Kerry Criss (duplicate)	no		Macdoel	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split siskiyou, do not put with coastal districts
9siskiyou_20110628_9	6282011	Donna Clair	no				yes	Lump Yuba, mtcap, delmendo areas together.
9siskiyou_20110628_10	6282011	Larry Marks	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou
9siskiyou_20110628_11	6282011	Wayne Miller	yes	Xterra Industries	Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county.
9siskiyou_20110628_12	6282011	Donald L. Baird	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou to North Coast Region. Keep whole
9siskiyou_20110628_13	6282011	Veanne V. Smith	yes	Smith Ranch		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split in half Siskiyou. Scott Valley and Happy camp have nothing in common with the coast
9siskiyou_20110628_14	6282011	Herbert W. Duerr	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou, do not realign with Coast.
9siskiyou_20110628_15	6282011	Carolyn L. Duerr	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou. Do not place western Siskiyou with coastal district
9siskiyou_20110628_16	6282011	Chris Hart	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou, Scott Valley. Hold hearing in Yreka
9siskiyou_20110628_17	6282011	Steve Hart	no			Siskiyou	yes	Scott Valley is part of Siskiyou, keep district intact
9siskiyou_20110628_18	6282011	Herbert W. Duerr	no			Siskiyou	yes	Invites committee members on a drive from Etna to Eureka during winter.
9siskiyou_20110628_19	6282011	Ron Berryman	no		McCloud	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou intact, do not combine with coast.
9siskiyou_20110628_20	6282011	H.L. Fogel	no		Scotts Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Scotts Valley should be in District 17.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110628_5	Siskiyou			no	yes	common culture,	
9siskiyou_20110628_6	Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110628_7	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_9	Yuba, Delmendo			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_10	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110628_11	Siskiyou			no	yes	cultural	economic
9siskiyou_20110628_12	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_13	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Happy Camp		no	yes		one hospital, library, court house, all business
9siskiyou_20110628_14	Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110628_15	Siskiyou			no	yes	solidarity	
9siskiyou_20110628_16	Siskikyou	Yreka, Scott Valley		no	yes	historically developed	shared economic and social identities
9siskiyou_20110628_17	Siskiyou	Scott Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_18		Etna, Eureak		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_19	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_20		Scotts Valley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110628_5	interests and values, history, newspaper		no			Seperated from north coast by geography	
9siskiyou_20110628_6	living standards, transport, work, media		no			no significant Native American Polulation,	
9siskiyou_20110628_7			no			difficult travel, population	
9siskiyou_20110628_9			no				give large group of senators congressment to represent us
9siskiyou_20110628_10	small poor county		no				
9siskiyou_20110628_11	physical barrier		no				
9siskiyou_20110628_12			no			need fair representation, Native Americans are not all fisherman	
9siskiyou_20110628_13			no			agriculture. Distance	
9siskiyou_20110628_14	relationship to representatives		no			driving would be dangerous or impossible, no public meeting	
9siskiyou_20110628_15			no			driving distance, outside interests	
9siskiyou_20110628_16			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_17			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_18			no				Will supply tire chains and snow shovels. Bring Depends or changes of underwear.
9siskiyou_20110628_19			no			Far drive, votes will be diluted	
9siskiyou_20110628_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110628_21	6282011	Daralyn Reed	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou and include with North Coastal region.
9siskiyou_20110628_22	6282011	Geraldine Dittner	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou with Coast. Keep complete
9siskiyou_20110628_23	6282011	Marianne Cabot	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou, do not place with Coast.
9siskiyou_20110628_24	6282011	Shikara Thurman	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	no	
9siskiyou_20110628_25	6282011	David Harrison	no				yes	Against redistricting of Siskiyou.
9siskiyou_20110628_26	6282011	Vibeke Harrison	no			Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to redistricting of Siskiyou
cscfr_20110628_11	6282011	Brad Sariann	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_12	6282011	Brett Fairless	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_13	6282011	Carole Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_14	6282011	Nick Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110628_21	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_22	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_23	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_24				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_25	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_26	Siskiyou			no	no		
cscfr_20110628_11	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_12	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_13	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_14	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110628_21			no			little common interests, no significant Native American population, far north	
9siskiyou_20110628_22			no			Would be ineffecient, would impact ability to keep dams	
9siskiyou_20110628_23			no			terrible hardship,	
9siskiyou_20110628_24			no				Definitely voting that this is a bad idea
9siskiyou_20110628_25			no			will deprive residents of participating in local gov decisions due to distance, different ideology	
9siskiyou_20110628_26			no				
cscfr_20110628_11	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_12	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_13	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_14	representation		no				Supports CSCFR

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
cscfr_20110628_15	6282011	Brian Cork	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_16	6282011	Chavonne Rees	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_17	6282011	Christopher Kissick	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_18	6282011	Catherine Smead	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_19	6282011	Craig Smead	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_20	6282011	Patricia Verdi	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_21	6282011	Elena Saenz	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_22	6282011	Genevieve Penn	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
cscfr_20110628_15	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_16	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_17	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_18	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_19	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_20	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_21	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_22	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
cscfr_20110628_15	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_16	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_17	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_18	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_19	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_20	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_21	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_22	representation		no				Supports CSCFR

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
cscfr_20110628_23	6282011	Jill Anderson	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_24	6282011	Julie Tamayo and Family	no		Porter Ranch	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_25	6282011	Jenina Gallaway	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_26	6282011	Kari Green	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_27	6282011	Katie Crow	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_28	6282011	Molly Hunter	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_29	6282011	Kerri Pearson	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_30	6282011	Julie Gentleman	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
cscfr_20110628_23	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_24	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_25	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_26	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_27	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_28	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_29	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_30	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
cscfr_20110628_23	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_24	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_25	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_26	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_27	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_28	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_29	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_30	representation		no				Supports CSCFR

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
cscfr_20110628_31	6282011	Ann Sarian	no		Oak Park	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_32	6282011	Justin Latham	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_33	6282011	Sarah Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_34	6282011	Ann Sarian	no		Oak Park	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_35	6282011	Diana Sarian	no		Oak Park	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_36	6282011	Mellissa Carlson	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
general_20110628_1	6282011	Debra Chavez	no				no	
general_20110628_2	6282011	Robert J. Apodaca	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
cscfr_20110628_31	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_32	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_33	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_34	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_35	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_36	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
general_20110628_1				no	no		
general_20110628_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
cscfr_20110628_31	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_32	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_33	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_34	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_35	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_36	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
general_20110628_1			no				New Congressional districts are fine
general_20110628_2			no				All senate submissions from Latinos United response to CRC Draft Map 1

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110628_3	6282011	Maricela Morales, Deputy Executive Director	yes	CAUSE			no	
general_20110628_4	6282011	Marielena Castellanos	no				no	
general_20110628_5	6282011	Brian Olson	no				no	
general_20110628_6	6282011	Deanna Chavez	no				yes	Happy with new district mapping.
general_20110628_7	6282011	Myrna Escalante	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Our system belongs to America, not your political party
general_20110628_8	6282011	Adaljiza Sosa-Riddell.	no		Glendale		no	
general_20110628_9	6282011	Rosalind Gold	yes	NALEO Educational Fund	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	no	
general_20110628_10	6282011	Glenn Stoddard	no		Winnetka	Los Angeles	no	
general_20110628_11	6282011	Christopher L. Bowman	yes	CCAG			no	
general_20110628_12	6282011	Joaquin G. Avilia	yes	National Voting Rights Advocacy Initiative			yes	Monterey, Kings, Merced counties need to be modified

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110628_3				no	no		
general_20110628_4				no	no		
general_20110628_5				no	no		
general_20110628_6				no	no		
general_20110628_7				no	no		
general_20110628_8				no	yes	Latino population very important	
general_20110628_9				no	no		
general_20110628_10				no	no		
general_20110628_11				no	no		
general_20110628_12	Monterey, Kings, Merced			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110628_3		apply law and spirit of VRA	no				
general_20110628_4		strict adherence to VRA is priority	no				Follow NALEO outlines
general_20110628_5			no				maps of compact districts
general_20110628_6			no				
general_20110628_7			no				
general_20110628_8			no				endore NALEO maps
general_20110628_9			no				attached testimony regarding first draft maps
general_20110628_10		complying with VRA requires od shaped boundaries in certain neighborhoods	no			well organized special interest groups claim COI and gerrmander region	
general_20110628_11			no				Submission of Senate Plan 2c, California Conservative Action Group
general_20110628_12		Failure to create third Senate District may result in violation of inent of VRA	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110628_13	6282011		yes	Sierra Club California			yes	Environmental COIs should be kept together with their stakeholders
general_20110628_14	6282011	Michael Worley	no				yes	Assembly District in Mid Sacramento Valley and Northern Sierra and Lak Tahoe region.
general_20110628_15	6282011		no				no	
general_20110628_16	6282011		no				no	
general_20110628_17	6282011		no				no	
general_20110628_18	6282011		no				no	
sdiegosupporters_20110628_1	6282011	Lei Guang	no		San Diego	San Diego	no	
sdiegosupporters_20110628_2	6282011	Daniel Co (duplicate)	no				no	
sdiegosupporters_20110628_3	6282011	Oliver R. Onia	no				no	
5ventura_20110628_35	6282011	Audrey Vincent	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Santa Clara watershed from Ventura County line west intact. Have more in common than with Santa Barbara.
6fresno_20110628_1	6282011	Michael Evans	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	Split Fresno North-South, not East West
6fresno_20110628_2	6282011	Karen Turgeon	no				yes	Split Fresno along freeway 41
6fresno_20110628_3	6282011	Linda Garcia Traynor	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	Do not Split Fresno along Hwy 41, use Ashlan Avenue to split South-North
6fresno_20110628_4	6282011	Gary Lasky	no				yes	Proposed district for Kings County
6fresno_20110628_5	6282011	Linda Garcia Traynor	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	Maps for Fresno do not replect Latino Growth

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110628_13				no	no		
general_20110628_14	Sacramento	Sierra, Lake Tahoe	I80, Hwy 50	no	no		
general_20110628_15				no	no		
general_20110628_16				no	no		
general_20110628_17				no	no		
general_20110628_18				no	no		
sdiegosupporters_20110628_1				no	no		
sdiegosupporters_20110628_2				no	no		
sdiegosupporters_20110628_3				no	no		
5ventura_20110628_35	Santa Barbara, Ventura	Santa Clara	Santa Clara River	no	yes	common values	agriculture, economies
6fresno_20110628_1	Fresno	Fresno	Not Highway 41	no	yes	east-west split would marginalize minority communities	
6fresno_20110628_2	Fresno	Fresno	Freeway 41	no	no		
6fresno_20110628_3	Fresno	Fresno	Hwy 41, Ashlan Ave	yes	yes	Latino districts, working-class, language	agricultural background
6fresno_20110628_4	Kings			no	no		
6fresno_20110628_5		Fresno		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110628_13		VRA is binding, but is Commissions second highest priority	no				
general_20110628_14			no				attached proposal
general_20110628_15			no				Proposed Senate District Chart with parts highlighted
general_20110628_16			no				attached maps
general_20110628_17			no				attached maps
general_20110628_18			no				attached chart
sdiegosupporters_20110628_1		complies	no				supports CAPAFRs maps
sdiegosupporters_20110628_2		complies	no				supports CAPAFRs maps
sdiegosupporters_20110628_3		complies	no				supports CAPAFRs maps
5ventura_20110628_35			no				
6fresno_20110628_1	demographics, socioeconomic status, employment		no			split would reuce turnout	
6fresno_20110628_2		VRA istrict can be created	no			would not impact COIs or school districts	
6fresno_20110628_3	populations		no			difference between South and North is great	
6fresno_20110628_4			no				Percentages of Hispanic figures attached
6fresno_20110628_5			no				attached letter

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110628_1	6282011	Dolores Huerta	no		Bakersfield	Kern	yes	Kings district- remove Clovis and add East Porterville, Orange Cove, East Orosi. Add Northern Communities. Split Bakersfield along Hwy 99.
6merced_20110628_1	6282011	Cecil Russell, President CEO	yes	Modesto Chamber of Commerce	Modesto	Merced	yes	Do not combine Central Valley with San Jose. Lodi, Madera, Merced County have been compromised by the inclusion of parts of San Jose
6merced_20110628_2	6282011	Maureen McCorry	no				yes	Let the Valley be the Valley. Santa Clara County
9siskiyou_20110628_27	6282011	Mr and Mrs Jefferey Anderson	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou. Yreka is county seat
9siskiyou_20110628_28	6282011	Michael Adams	no		Horse Creek	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou county. Do not place western Siskiyou with coast
9sjoaquin_20110628_1	6282011	Toni Miller	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should stay in valley, not North Bay.
9sjoaquin_20110628_2	6282011	J. Chacka Santos, Mayor	yes	City of Lathrop	Lathrop	San Joaquin	yes	Lathrop should be included in San Joaquin district with Stockton and Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110628_3	6282011	John Jonassen	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in Solano County. Take Lodi and Galt out of solano and put in with Sacramento.
9sjoaquin_20110628_4	6282011	John Tony David	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not divide Citrus Heights.
9sjoaquin_20110628_5	6282011	Diane A. Steele	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Leave Lodi in the valley, do not link with Bay Area.
9sjoaquin_20110628_6	6282011	Roger McCarthy	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi needs to be in San Joaquin valley district, not with Santa Rosa, Benicia, vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and Woodland.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110628_1	Kings	Clovis, East Porterville, Orange Cove, Orosi, Bakersfield	Highway 99	no	yes	Latino COI	industries
6merced_20110628_1	Lodi, Madera, Merced	San Jose		no	yes		agricultural economy, water, transportation, air quality, industries
6merced_20110628_2	Santa Clara, San Joaquin			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_27	Siskiyou	Yreka		no	yes		rural with farming and ranching as economic base
9siskiyou_20110628_28	Siskiyou			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_1		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_2	San Joaquin	Lathrop, Tracy, Stockton		no	yes		stable growth and development
9sjoaquin_20110628_3	Solano, Sacramento	Lodi, Galt	Highway 99, 80,	no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_4				no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_5				no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_6	San Joaquin	Santa Rosa, Benicia, vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters and Woodland, Lodi		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110628_1	population		no				
6merced_20110628_1	representation		no				
6merced_20110628_2			no			no fan of current representation, but choose it over counties in proposal	attached editorial
9siskiyou_20110628_27	medical institutions		no				
9siskiyou_20110628_28			no			no social or economic ties with coast, long trip to coast	
9sjoaquin_20110628_1			no			different agenda and views,	
9sjoaquin_20110628_2	sherrifs contract,		no				
9sjoaquin_20110628_3			no			no COI, no reason	
9sjoaquin_20110628_4			no				
9sjoaquin_20110628_5			no			needs vary	
9sjoaquin_20110628_6			no			Bay concerns vs. Valley concerns	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110628_7	6282011	Linda Miller	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Include Galt. Lodi should not be split from stockton and San Joaquin and placed with Santa Rosa and Napa.
9sjoaquin_20110628_8	6282011	Jerry Fry	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be in San Joaquin, not Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano
9sjoaquin_20110628_9	6282011	Mark Bourget	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi with Sausalito or Antioch and Brentwood with Stockton, keep compact districts in San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110628_10	6282011	Rolf Tallberg	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be in San Joaquin, with Stockton. Maybe join Lodi with Galt in southern Sacramento district.
9sjoaquin_20110628_11	6282011	Jason Eells	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin county district. Southern Sacramento if need be.
9sjoaquin_20110628_12	6282011	Larry P. Mettler	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin county district. Southern Sacramento if need be.
9sjoaquin_20110628_13	6282011		no			San Joaquin	yes	San Joaquin County should be kept whole
9sjoaquin_20110628_14	6282011	Robert Hoag	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not redistrict Lodi with bay area.
9sjoaquin_20110628_15	6282011	Betty Robinson-Winn	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Put Lodi with San Joaquin, not Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano. Take Tracy
9yolo_20110628_1	6282011	Leanne Friedman	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	do not split Yolo County.
9yolo_20110628_2	6282011	Sherri Sandberg-Ransom and Michael Ransom	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Davis should be included with Woodland. Davis does not have connection with West Sacramento or Natomas. Include Davis with Woodland and other Yolo communities
9yolo_20110628_3	6282011	Marry Serra, M.S.	yes	Senior water Resources		Yolo	yes	Move UC Davis campus, city of Davis into NBAYECONTRA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110628_7	San Joaquin, Napa	Lodi, Stockton, Santa Rosa		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110628_8	Yolo, Napa Marin, Solano, San Joaquin			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_9	San Joaquin	Lodi, Sausalito, Antioch, Brentwood, Stockton		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_10	San Joaquin, Sacramento	Lodi, Stockton, Galt		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_11	San Joaquin, Sacramento	Lodi		no	yes		wine growers, pricing, agriculture, jobs, tourism, tax revenue, charity
9sjoaquin_20110628_12	San Joaquin, Sacramento	Lodi		no	yes		wine growers, pricing, agriculture, jobs, tourism, tax revenue, charity
9sjoaquin_20110628_13	San Joaquin			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_14		Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110628_15	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	no		
9yolo_20110628_1	Yolo			no	yes		
9yolo_20110628_2	Yolo	Davis, Woodland, West Sacramento, Natomas		no	yes		
9yolo_20110628_3		Davis		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110628_7	share schools		no			nothing in common with napa, woodland	
9sjoaquin_20110628_8			no			not enough common interests	
9sjoaquin_20110628_9			no			no geographical compactness or fair representation	
9sjoaquin_20110628_10			no			valley vs. urban	I know you have to spread the pain
9sjoaquin_20110628_11			no				
9sjoaquin_20110628_12			no				
9sjoaquin_20110628_13			no				
9sjoaquin_20110628_14			no			conservative area vs. bay	
9sjoaquin_20110628_15			no			no commuters to Santa Rosa.	
9yolo_20110628_1	land use, social services, air and water quality		no				
9yolo_20110628_2	water source, land use, public services		no			davis vs. urban area	
9yolo_20110628_3	agriculture mission of UC Davis		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110628_4	6282011	Susan Lovenburg, Trustee	yes	Davis Unified School District		Yolo	yes	Reunite Yolo County
9yolo_20110628_5	6282011	Jan Newman	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Put Davis with Woodland, not Sacramento.
9yolo_20110628_6	6282011	Matthews Williams, Jr.	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County COI whole
9yolo_20110628_7	6282011	Marilyn Schwartz	no		Woodland	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County whole including Davis
9yolo_20110628_8	6282011	Donald Morrill	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo County into numerous federal and state districts.
9yolo_20110628_9	6282011	Stella Taylor	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not divide Yolo County into several districts or place with Sacramento
9yolo_20110628_10	6282011	Cecilia Aguiar-Curry, Mayor Pro-term	no		Winters	Yolo	yes	Keep Winters with Napa, Lake, and Sonoma counties.
9yolo_20110628_11	6282011	Bob Schneider	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Maps address issues of representation in Yolo County
9yolo_20110628_12	6282011	Joseph F. Krovoza, Mayor	yes	City of Davis	Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo County into multiple districts. Keep Davis and Woodward together in Yolo
9yolo_20110628_13	6282011	Anita Reed	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo County. Do not lump any of Davis with Sacramento

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110628_4	Yolo			no	yes	cooperation, history of working together	agricultural land
9yolo_20110628_5	Yolo	Davis, Woodland, Sacramento		no	yes		agriculture, growth, water, ag research
9yolo_20110628_6	Yolo			no	yes		agriculture, research,
9yolo_20110628_7	Yolo			no	yes		
9yolo_20110628_8	Yolo			no	yes		
9yolo_20110628_9	Davis	Sacramento, Davis		no	yes		agricultural land, open space, ecosystems
9yolo_20110628_10	Napa, Lake, Sonoma	Winters	Highway 128	no	yes		wine region, rural community, recreation, tourism
9yolo_20110628_11	Yolo			no	yes		Putah and Cache Creek watersheds, interest in agriculture protection, open space, tourism
9yolo_20110628_12	Yolo	David, Woodward		no	yes		share resources, clean water agency, transportation district
9yolo_20110628_13	Yolo	Davis, Sacramento		no	yes	rural area	spend money in Yolo,

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110628_4	land preservation and open space, water, tourism, infrastructure, law enforcement, fire safety, flood control		no				
9yolo_20110628_5			no			different politically, vs. urban centers	
9yolo_20110628_6	population		no			one in six working citizens of Davis work in Sacramento	
9yolo_20110628_7			no			splitting will lead to less representation	
9yolo_20110628_8	many non profits, would present enormous burden, environmetal education		no				
9yolo_20110628_9			no			Davis is not a suburb of sacramento	
9yolo_20110628_10			no				
9yolo_20110628_11			no				maps included
9yolo_20110628_12	air quality district, preserve farmland, open space		no			may not share interests with urban districts	
9yolo_20110628_13	small population, discrete borders, active agriculture		no			do not identify with Sacramento	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110628_14	6282011	Larry Greene (duplicate)	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep all Yolo County together. Remove Davis and West Sacramento from WESTSAC and replace with Galt and Lodi.
9yolo_20110628_15	6282011	Matthew Williams	no		el Macero	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County COI whole.
cscfr_20110628_1	6282011	Ruth B. McGettigan	no		Thousand Oaks,	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_2	6282011	Marian C. Walluks	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_3	6282011	Kerry J Nelson	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_4	6282011		no				yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_5	6282011	Kathy Whitmire	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_6	6282011	Robert Bibb	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110628_14	Yolo	Davis, West Sacramento, Lodi, Galt		no	yes	common problems, share issues	
9yolo_20110628_15	Yolo			no	yes		UCD and Davis are integral to agriculturally-based COI
cscfr_20110628_1	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_2	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_3	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_4	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_5	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_6	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110628_14	water, flood planning, schools, protecting land		no			do not share with urban areas	
9yolo_20110628_15			no			is not bedroom community of Sacramento	
cscfr_20110628_1	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_2	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_3	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_4	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_5	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_6	representation		no				Supports CSCFR

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
cscfr_20110628_7	6282011	Paul Hilborn	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_8	6282011	Kathy Whitmire	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_9	6282011	Adela Oseguera	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
cscfr_20110628_10	6282011	Allyne Collins	no		Newbury Park	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks together with Santa Clarita, nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura instead of Malibu
1sdiego_20110625_1_4	6252011	Ruth Mendez	no				yes	Supports requests made by speakers who testified at the 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
1sdiego_20110625_2_4	6252011	Dolores Balane	no		Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Use CAPAFR maps; Supports requests made by speakers who testified at the 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
1sdiego_20110625_3_4	6252011	Jack Mcroskey	no			San Diego	yes	Move CSAN boundary from I-5 to HWY 805, below HWY 52 including Kearny Mesa; put RSF, Fairbanks, Del Mar in North County AD, not with city of San Diego to mex border

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
cscfr_20110628_7	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_8	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_9	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
cscfr_20110628_10	Ventura	Camarillo, Moopark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	yes	historically, like communities	
1sdiego_20110625_1_4				no	yes	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COI together; has similar socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110625_2_4				no	yes	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COI together; has similar socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
1sdiego_20110625_3_4	San Diego	Del Mar, San Diego	I-5, HWY 805, HWY 52	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
cscfr_20110628_7	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_8	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_9	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
cscfr_20110628_10	representation		no				Supports CSCFR
1sdiego_20110625_1_4			no				
1sdiego_20110625_2_4			no				
1sdiego_20110625_3_4	Decreases gerrymandering, more straightforward boundaries		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110625_4_4	6252011	Marianna Zapanta	no				yes	Supports requests made by speakers who testified at the 620 hearing 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
2riverside_20110625_1_4	6252011	Bob Edgerly	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Make AD wImperial co, Palo Verde Valley (BlythePalo VerdeRipley) eastern Coachella Valley (Palm Desert east); 2nd AD wRancho MirageCathedral CityThousand PalmsPalm SpringsBeaumontBanning Pass; Put in one SD
2riverside_20110625_2_4	6252011	Luciano Mendez	no		Coachella	Riverside	yes	Make AD wImperial co, Palo Verde Valley (BlythePalo VerdeRipley) eastern Coachella Valley (Palm Desert east); 2nd AD wRancho MirageCathedral CityThousand PalmsPalm SpringsBeaumontBanning Pass; Put in one SD
2riverside_20110625_3_4	6252011	Joaquin Uribe	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Follow majority comments from 512 hearing Do not put Rancho Mirage, Indian Wells wEastern Coachella Valley; Put Eastern Coachella Valley wImperial in AD; do not put Imperial with San Diego

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110625_4_4				no	yes	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COI together; has similar socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
2riverside_20110625_1_4	Imperial, Riverside	Blythe, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Beaumont, Banning		no	yes	Eastern RiversideImperial have populations that come there only for winter; Latino community; do not subvert this regions needs to needs of LA, Orange, San Diego counties	Eastern RiversideImperial share economies in tourism, hospitality, retail, health industry, retirement and agriculture
2riverside_20110625_2_4	Imperial, Riverside	Blythe, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Beaumont, Banning		no	yes	Eastern RiversideImperial have populations that come there only for winter; Latino community; do not subvert this regions needs to needs of LA, Orange, San Diego counties	Eastern RiversideImperial share economies in tourism, hospitality, retail, health industry, retirement and agriculture
2riverside_20110625_3_4	Imperial, San Diego	Rancho Mirage, Indian Wells		no	yes	Rancho Mirage, Indian Wells is Country Club crowd, has nothing in common weastern Coachella Valley; E. Coachella Valley shares Salton Sea issues, Latino population with Imperial	Eastern Coachella Valley and Imperial share agriculture, renewable energy interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110625_4_4			no				
2riverside_20110625_1_4			no				
2riverside_20110625_2_4			no				
2riverside_20110625_3_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110625_4_4	6252011	Randolph M. Scott	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Put Eastern Coachella Valley (Riverside) with Imperial county; Do not put Coachella Valley with Minnefee and Morongo Valley; Do not put Imperial Valley with San Diego
2sbernardino_20110625_1_3	6262011	Mark and Kathy Stirle	no				yes	Use Inland Action map for San BernadinoRedlands redistricting
2sbernardino_20110625_2_3	6252011	Donald J. Krouse	no			San Bernardino	yes	Put San BernadinoMorongo Basin wDesert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Palm Desert, NOT wMono or Inyo counties; put the rest of Coachella Valley wImperial Co; do not put 29 Palms in SD wRancho Cucamonga
2sbernardino_20110625_3_3	6252011	David Rice	no		Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split cities and counties between districts; LA should not infringe upon San Bernardino county; put Upland wRancho Cucamonga and Fontana
3orange_20110625_1_2	6252011	Kathy Berger	no				yes	Do not put Rossmoor with Long Beach; put Rossmoor wCypress, or Seal Beach and Huntington Beach
3orange_20110625_2_2	6252011	Dave Garofalo	yes	The Local News Community Newspaper, Publisher	Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Put Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Westminster, Seal Beach, and Sunset Beach together; do not put Huntington Beach wIrvine

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110625_4_4	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110625_1_3	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110625_2_3	San Bernardino, Mono, Inyo, Imperial	Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Palm Desert, 29 Palms, Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes	High desert areas are more closely linked with mountain region and low desert areas, not western regions	
2sbernardino_20110625_3_3	San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Upland, Rancho Cucamonga, Fontana		no	no		
3orange_20110625_1_2		Long Beach, Cypress, Seal Beach, Huntington Beach		no	yes	Rossmoor social, economic, political interests are dissimilar from Long Beach	
3orange_20110625_2_2		Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Westminster, Seal Beach, Irvine		no	yes	These Orange County communities share local newspaper, infrastructure, culture, schools, churches, recreation; school districts overlap; shared sports teams, socio-economics, environmental concerns; shared sanitation dist; floodplane issues	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110625_4_4			no				
2sbernardino_20110625_1_3			no				
2sbernardino_20110625_2_3			no				
2sbernardino_20110625_3_3			no				
3orange_20110625_1_2			no				
3orange_20110625_2_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110625_2_50	6262011	Gary Avrech	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide 90049 zip code between districts
4langeles_20110625_3_50	6252011	Annie Joubran	no				yes	Do not divide neighborhood; Cliffwood Drive and VA are in same COI
4langeles_20110625_4_50	6252011	Barry Greenberg	no				yes	Does not like Brentwood redistricting proposal; split would divide wealthy homeowners north of San Vicente from middle class apt renters; do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_5_50	6252011	Patricia Kouba	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood; Brentwood runs north from Wilshire Blvd to the SM mountains, and from HWY 405 to 26th Street in SM (santa monica? Comment just says SM)
4langeles_20110625_6_50	6252011	Estelle Felber	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood (zip 90049) at San Vicente into two CDs
4langeles_20110625_7_50	6252011	Maureen Kris Halikis	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood, it is a community and formally, a district, within Los Angeles
4langeles_20110625_8_50	6252011	Marcia Wheelon	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood (zip 90049) into two districts; area in the NE, from Granville and Sunset east to HWY 405 and Sunset south to Wilshire) does not share same concerns as Bel Air or Westwood
4langeles_20110625_1_50	6252011	Elizabeth Likes	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Shadow Hills with the mid-valley flatland

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110625_2_50				no	yes	This neighborhood has vibrant community, values diversity	
4langeles_20110625_3_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_4_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_5_50		Santa Monica	Wilshire Boulevard, Santa Monica Mountains, HWY 405, 26th Street	no	no		
4langeles_20110625_6_50				no	yes	Brentwood Community should be in same dist as the VA in that neighborhood	
4langeles_20110625_7_50	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110625_8_50			Granville, Sunset, HWY 405, Wilshire	no	no		
4langeles_20110625_1_50				no	yes	Shadow Hills community does not go to mid-valley flatland for shopping, school	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110625_2_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_3_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_4_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_5_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_6_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_7_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_8_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_1_50			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110625_9_50	6252011	Jim McMahon	no		Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	Do not use proposed OCLA county maps; either keep all of Cerritos wLA, or make complete break and put all of it wOrange county; Cerritos has more in common wOrange county and Irvine
4langeles_20110625_10_50	6252011	Neal Moritz	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide 90049 zip code into two different CDs
4langeles_20110625_11_50	6252011	Liebster	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood into two segments
4langeles_20110625_12_50	6252011	Teddi Berger	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Bretnwoodzip 90049
4langeles_20110625_13_50	6252011	Edith de Guzman	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide zip 90049
4langeles_20110625_14_50	6252011	David Horvitz	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_15_50		Christine Vinquist	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester (suburb just north of LAX) intact and include with South Bay; put with El Segundo and beach cities, not wInglewood and Lennox
4langeles_20110625_16_50	6252011	Susan Haskell	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Use ADs LAMWS and SAVSF to make one state SD (LASCV). These ADS connect Malibu Santa Monica Mtns cities that are gateway to SMNRA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110625_9_50	Los Angeles, Orange	Cerritos, Irvine		no	yes	Cerritos has simiar appearance, shops, as Orange county; is a master-planned city like Irvine and other OC cities, not like any LA cities; residents go to OC to shop, travel, and for recreation; Cerritos borders more OC cities than LA cities.	
4langeles_20110625_10_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_11_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_12_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_13_50				no	yes	90049 coincides wexisting community planning and management efforts	
4langeles_20110625_14_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_15_50		Inglewood, El Segundo		no	no	Westchester demographics are more similar to El Segundo and Beach Cities; Inglewood and Lennox have big socio-economic differences with Westchester. SEE TABLE	
4langeles_20110625_16_50		Malibu		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110625_9_50		Cerritos is 65 Asianimmigrant community	no				
4langeles_20110625_10_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_11_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_12_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_13_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_14_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_15_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_16_50			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110625_17_50	6252011	Barbara Gardner	no				yes	Keep South Bay together (Westchester, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes) in one ADSDCD.
4langeles_20110625_18_50	6252011	Betty and Frank Arenson	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole
4langeles_20110625_19_50	6252011	Stephen Kruger	no				yes	Do not split Santa Clarita; add Newhall into the Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley CD; do not put Santa Clarita Valley with San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110625_20_50	6252011	Karen Chong	no				yes	Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two CDs; add Newhall into the Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley CD.
4langeles_20110625_21_50	6252011	Lorna Thorner	no				yes	Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two CDs; add Newhall into the Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley CD.
4langeles_20110625_22_50	6252011	Wayne Thorner	no				yes	Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two CDs; add Newhall into the Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley CD.
4langeles_20110625_23_50	6252011	Karen Parker	no				yes	Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two CDs; add Newhall into the Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley CD.
4langeles_20110625_24_50	6252011	Naomi Thorpe	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110625_17_50		El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance		no	yes	South Bay area is a COI	
4langeles_20110625_18_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_19_50		Santa Clarita		no	yes	Newhall has historical connection wSanta Clarita; San Fernando Valley is a separate and distinct area	
4langeles_20110625_20_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_21_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_22_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_23_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_24_50				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110625_17_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_18_50			no				Opposed to redistricting; no human influence should be involved but for placing a grid over the state map to get necessary number of politicians.
4langeles_20110625_19_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_20_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_21_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_22_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_23_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_24_50			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110625_25_50	6252011	Sidney R. Rose and Leontine R. Rose	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_26_50	6252011	Nancy J. Hansen	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two CDs; add Newhall into the Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley CD.
4langeles_20110625_27_50	6252011	Norma White	no				yes	Supports map that puts Sunland Tujunga wKagel CynLake View TerraceShadow HillsLa Tuna CynLa CrescentaMontroseGlendaleBurbank
4langeles_20110625_28_50	6252011	Jay Flaherty	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_29_50	6252011	Judith Demsky	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports Santa Clarita Mayor McLeans letter; keep Newhall with Santa Clarita, not with San Fernando ValleyCalabasas
4langeles_20110625_30_50	6252011	Ericson Dunstan	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports Santa Clarita Mayor McLeans 623 letter; keep Newhall with Santa Clarita, not with San Fernando ValleyCalabasas
4langeles_20110625_31_50	6252011	Bette Harris	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_32_50	6252011	Bill and Joan Vogel	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide the Brentwood section of Los Angeles (zip 90049)
4langeles_20110625_33_50	6252011	Cindy Sanders	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Opposes proposal for Studio City; keep Studio City in Howard Berman and Brad Shermans districts; do not split Studio City along Ventura Blvd

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110625_25_50				no	yes	Brentwood90049 is a cohesive, distinct neighborhood; shares ethnic, cultural, educational, occupational, economic, religious and political diversity	
4langeles_20110625_26_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_27_50		Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110625_28_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_29_50		Santa Clarita, Calabasas		no	no		
4langeles_20110625_30_50		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110625_31_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_32_50		Los Angeles		no	yes	Brentwood shares community concerns re VA hospital	
4langeles_20110625_33_50			Ventura Blvd.	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110625_25_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_26_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_27_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_28_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_29_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_30_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_31_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_32_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_33_50			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110625_34_50	6252011	Diane Caughey	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood90049
4langeles_20110625_35_50	6252011	Ira and Sandra Riskin	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_36_50	6252011	Scott MacGillivray	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_37_50	6252011	Jim Rodriguez	no				no	Put Downey in one Dist, but not if it means being wMaxine Waters; Downey is similar to La Mirada, Artesia, Napolitano
4langeles_20110625_38_50	6252011	Ralph Ortolano	no				no	Put LawndaleHawthorne wSouth Bay, not Compton-Gardena; Do not put Santa Monica and Venice wPalos Verdes or South Bay; South Bay region appears to be drawn on racial lines in violation of VRA; do not divide San Pedro, put in same SDAD
4langeles_20110625_39_50	6252011	Linda Kaplan	no				no	Do not redistrict Brentwood
4langeles_20110625_40_50	6252011	Andrew Mukhey	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood90049
4langeles_20110625_41_50	6252011	Josh Stephens	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood90049

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110625_34_50				no	yes		Brentwood residents work together as a community and share commercialbusiness interests
4langeles_20110625_35_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_36_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_37_50		Downey, La Mirada, Artesia		no	yes	Downey is conservative, do not put in Maxine Waters district	
4langeles_20110625_38_50		Lawndale, Hawthorne, Compton, Gardena, Santa Monica, Venice, San Pedro		no	yes	San Pedro is one COI, do not divide along raceclass lines	
4langeles_20110625_39_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_40_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_41_50				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110625_34_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_35_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_36_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_37_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_38_50		Drawing lines based on race violates VRA	no				Hawthorne-Gardena-Compton label on map obscures key boundary lines, denies public due process
4langeles_20110625_39_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_40_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_41_50			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110625_42_50	6252011	Arthur Drucker	no				yes	Keep Kagel CynLake View TerShadow HillsLa Tuna CanyonSunlandTujungaLa CrescentaMontroseLa Canada-FlintridgeGlendaleBurbank together, DO NOT put them wthe mid-valley flatland areas
4langeles_20110625_43_50	6262011	George L Bennetts	no				yes	Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two CDs; add Newhall into the Antelope Valley Santa Clarita Valley CD.
4langeles_20110625_44_50	6252011	Ralph Orlotano, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110625_45_50	6262011	Craig Ward	no				no	
4langeles_20110625_46_50	6252011	Lynne Rosenberg	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood90049
4langeles_20110625_47_50	6252011	Cathy and Frank Catapano	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood90049

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110625_42_50		Glendale, Burbank, La Canada Flintridge		no	yes	These are all low-density suburban areas backed by San Gabriel and Verdugo Mtns; they go to Glendale, Burbank for shopping, business and entertainment; share watershed, water issues, and fighting high density development; 210 freeway is common corridor	
4langeles_20110625_43_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_44_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_45_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_46_50				no	yes	Brentwood is a cohesive community, shares VA-related issues	
4langeles_20110625_47_50				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110625_42_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_43_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_44_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_45_50			no				Commision is doing a great job; do not let special interests intimidate you
4langeles_20110625_46_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_47_50			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110625_48_50		The Topanga Town Council	yes	The Topanga Town Council		Los Angeles	yes	Use 19912000 plans. Keep town of Topanga united, wcontiguous communities; likes WSSM and TOSMM ADs; LASCV should not include Santa Clarita, should include Santa Monica mtn regionLA west side; use proposed AD lines for LASCV instead;
4langeles_20110625_48_50		The Topanga Town Council, continued	yes	The Topanga Town Council		Los Angeles	yes	...put Topanga wMalibuPacific PalisadesCalabasasAgoura HillsSanta MonicaPacific PalisadesWoodland Hills.
4langeles_20110625_49_50	6252011		no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood90049
4langeles_20110625_50_50	6252011	Stephen J Gilbert	no				yes	Do not divide Brentwood90049
7sclara_20110625	6252011	Robert Ekedahl	no				yes	Do not divide Menlo Park; put Menlo Park with Atherton and Palo Alto

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110625_48_50		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110625_48_50		Mailbu, Pacific Palisades, Calabasas, Santa Monica, Agoura Hills		no	yes	Topanga and listed communities share emergency issuespreparation (fire, flood, mudslide), schools, animal rescue, senior svcs, environmental issues (SMNRA park), parksrec acitivites, shopping, medical svcs, law enforcement	Topanga town residents commute to neighboring listed communities for work
4langeles_20110625_49_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110625_50_50				no	yes	Brentwood should stay in same dist as the VA, since they have a close relationship	
7sclara_20110625		Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Athreton		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110625_48_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_48_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_49_50			no				
4langeles_20110625_50_50			no				
7sclara_20110625			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110625	6252011	Anthony Norris, Myrna Abramowicz	yes	Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District	American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa in all three districts.
8sonoma_20110625	6262011	Geraldine Gauer	no				yes	Does not like proposal for Santa Rosa; put Sonoma, Napa and Marin together; do not put Santa Rosa wGlenn
9trinity_20110625	6252011	Al Saxton	no				yes	Do not put Trinity county in coast CD; put it wRedding, not Eureka
8alameda_20110623_14_19	6232011	Nagarajan Ramsundar	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole and with Tri-Cities in CD
8alameda_20110623_15_19	6232011	Linette Young	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole and with Tri-Cities in CD
8alameda_20110623_16_19	6232011	William Holmes	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole in CD
8alameda_20110623_17_19	6232011	Tim Sbranti	yes	Mayor, City of Dublin	Dublin	Alameda	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110625	Napa	American Canyon	all of city of American Canyon, adjacent unincorporated areas of Napa County bound by Napa County line to the west, south, and east as well as Hwy 12 to the north.	no	yes	American Canyon is important to Napa River watershed. Napa County Regional Park and Open Space has worked with American Canyon to build regional trails and support recreational amenities.	
8sonoma_20110625	Sonoma, Marin, Napa, Glenn	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Sonoma, Napa, and Marin Share a common history and link with San Francisco	
9trinity_20110625	Trinity	Redding, Eureka		no	yes	Trinity and nor-cal (Redding) share Emergencyambulancefire medical services; residents go to Redding for shopping and medical care; area residentes voted 5-0 to use emergency services from Redding, not Eureka.	
8alameda_20110623_14_19		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_15_19				no	no		
8alameda_20110623_16_19		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_17_19				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110625			no				
8sonoma_20110625			no				
9trinity_20110625			no				Deadline was not displayed prominently enough on website
8alameda_20110623_14_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_15_19	Adequate representation		no				
8alameda_20110623_16_19	Would be an odd, unnatural voting district		no				
8alameda_20110623_17_19			no				Request that SD representing Contra Costa County and Tri-Valley be placed in an odd-numbered district

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110623_18_19	6242011	Arvind Acharya	no			Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole and with Tri-Cities in Alameda CD
8ccosta_20110623_1_19	6232011	Patrick Jensen	no		Oakley	Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110623_2_19	6232011	Greg Feere	yes	Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council		Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110623_3_19	6232011	Tyler Hester	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole.
8ccosta_20110623_4_19	6232011	Evan Ayers	yes	Contra Costa County Elections Office, Elections Services SpecialistSupervisor		Contra Costa	yes	See 8ccosta_20110623_5_19. Submitting a few options regarding Communities of Interest in Contra Costa County.
8ccosta_20110623_5_19	6232011	Evan Ayers	yes	Contra Costa County Elections Office, Elections Services SpecialistSupervisor		Contra Costa	yes	See attached maps, statistics, and descriptions
8ccosta_20110623_6_19	6232011	Catherine Burkhart	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole
8ccosta_20110623_7_19	6222011	Cindy Silva	yes	City of Walnut Creek, Mayor	Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110623_8_19	6232011	Susy Friedman	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole within 7th district
8ccosta_20110623_9_19	6232011	Elizabeth Claman	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110623_18_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_1_19				no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_2_19				no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_3_19				no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_4_19	Contra Costa			no	yes		
8ccosta_20110623_5_19				no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_6_19		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_7_19				no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_8_19				no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_9_19				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110623_18_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_1_19			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys district represented by Mark Desaulnier an odd number
8ccosta_20110623_2_19			no				Keep Contra Costa Countys district represented by Mark Desaulnier an odd number
8ccosta_20110623_3_19	Respect a city boundary above community of interest boundaries		no				
8ccosta_20110623_4_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_5_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_6_19			no			Leave Richmond in District 7, with George Miller	
8ccosta_20110623_7_19			no				Give Walnut Creeks SD an odd number
8ccosta_20110623_8_19	Similar demographics, financial and sociological needs.		no			Keep Richmond represented under George Miller	
8ccosta_20110623_9_19			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110623_10_19	6232011	Michael Coan	no		El Cerrito	Contra Costa	yes	Keep El Cerrito, Kensington with East Bay cities Berkeley, Albany, north Oakland. Add northern section of Contra Costa (Pinole, Hercules, Crockett) to remainder of east county
8ccosta_20110623_11_19	6232011	Tiffany Gomes	yes	Classic Design Floor to Ceiling, PresidentCEO	Lodi	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Lodi in AD and SD within San Joaquin County
8ccosta_20110623_12_19	6232011	Linda Newton	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole.
8ccosta_20110623_13_19	6232011	Susie Davis	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole.
8ccosta_20110623_14_19	6232011	Norma Wallace	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole
9sjoaquin_20110623_1_4	6232011	Bill Cummins	yes	Bear Creek Church, Pastor		San Joaquin	yes	Keep Manteca, Tracy, Stockton, Lodi together. Make CD lines similar to AD lines.
9sjoaquin_20110623_2_4	6242011	Alan Nakanishi	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Include Lodi in AD and SD occupied by rest of San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110623_3_4	6232011	Rosa Harnack	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Put Lodi with San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110623_4_4	6232011	Andrea Torres	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Ideally would like Lodi to put with Stockton and Galt, but if not possibletry adding Davis to SolanoYolo AD and add Lodi and Galt to a southern Sacramento AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110623_10_19	Contra Costa	Pinole, Hercules, Crockett, El Cerrito, Kensington, Berkeley, Albany		no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_11_19	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_12_19		Richmond		no	yes	Multi-ethnic demography, liberal	
8ccosta_20110623_13_19		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_14_19		Richmond		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110623_1_4		Manteca, Tracy, Stockton, Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110623_2_4	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110623_3_4	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110623_4_4	Solano, Yolo, Sacramento	Davis, Lodi, Galt		no	yes	Lodi with Central Valley, Davis with I-80	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110623_10_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_11_19	Use local infrastructure, local services		no				
8ccosta_20110623_12_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_13_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_14_19	Splitting Richmond would further disenfranchise citizens whoa re victims are environmental injustice		no				
9sjoaquin_20110623_1_4	Need one solid representative for entire county		no				
9sjoaquin_20110623_2_4			no				
9sjoaquin_20110623_3_4			no				
9sjoaquin_20110623_4_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110623_1	6232011	Rita Montes Martin	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County whole
CSCFR_20110623_1	6232011	Josie Hirsch	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_2	6242011	James Riske	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_3	6242011	James G. Steiner	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Ventura	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_4	6242011	Diantha Ain	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_5	6242011	Karen Abbitt	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_6	6242011	Jill Delaney	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_7	6242011	Kim Hersh	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110623_1	Yolo			no	no		
CSCFR_20110623_1	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_2	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_3	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_4	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_5	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_6	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_7	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110623_1	Would be hard for senior citizens to cope with MORE agencies in distant locations to resolve problems that arise in everyday living		no				
CSCFR_20110623_1			no				
CSCFR_20110623_2			no				
CSCFR_20110623_3			no				
CSCFR_20110623_4			no				
CSCFR_20110623_5			no				
CSCFR_20110623_6			no				
CSCFR_20110623_7			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110623_8	6242011	Gary Smart	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_9	6242011	Mitch Silberman	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_10	6242011	Phyllis Melampy	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_11	6242011	Joyce C. Clark	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Newbury Park	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_12	6242011	Liann Piantino	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_13	6242011	Susan Hebert	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Paula	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_14	6242011	Alice Fiducia	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_15	6242011	David Ronald Wright	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Newbury Park	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110623_8	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_9	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_10	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_11	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_12	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_13	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_14	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_15	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110623_8			no				
CSCFR_20110623_9			no				
CSCFR_20110623_10			no				
CSCFR_20110623_11			no				
CSCFR_20110623_12			no				
CSCFR_20110623_13			no				
CSCFR_20110623_14			no				
CSCFR_20110623_15			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110623_16	6242011	Clell and Hal Goldstein	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_17	6242011	Carol Sherman	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_18	6242011	Elizabeth Priedkalns	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_19	6242011	Rosemary Swenson	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_20	6242011	Marcia Smart	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_21	6242011	Maria Holmes	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_22	6242011	Buren L. Blackwelder	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_23	6242011	Vincent Vartanian	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110623_16	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_17	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_18	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_19	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_20	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_21	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_22	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_23	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110623_16			no				
CSCFR_20110623_17			no				
CSCFR_20110623_18			no				
CSCFR_20110623_19			no				
CSCFR_20110623_20			no				
CSCFR_20110623_21			no				
CSCFR_20110623_22			no				
CSCFR_20110623_23			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110623_24	6242011	Jane Blackwelder	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_25	6242011	Sonja Todd	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Moorpark	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_26	6242011	Ardelle Bahl	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_27	6242011	John Hannon	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_28	6242011	Sabrina L. Williams	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_29	6242011	Tamara Howard	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_30	6242011	Barbara Elaine Dowler	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_31	6242011	Joyce Sihler	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110623_24	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_25	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_26	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_27	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_28	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_29	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_30	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_31	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110623_24			no				
CSCFR_20110623_25			no				
CSCFR_20110623_26			no				
CSCFR_20110623_27			no				
CSCFR_20110623_28			no				
CSCFR_20110623_29			no				
CSCFR_20110623_30			no				
CSCFR_20110623_31			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110623_32	6242011	Debra Tash	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Somis	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_33	6242011	Stephanie Ferguson	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Newbury Park	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_34	6242011	Geraldine M. Cowley	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_35	6242011	James William Little	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_36	6242011	Susan D. Tanner	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
8ccosta_20110623_15_19	6232011	Luciana Messina	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole, return to 7th CD and to Contra Costa Count
8ccosta_20110623_16_19	6232011	Millie Conarrow	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110623_17_19	6232011	Trey Wafer	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Reconsider lines drawn in first draft maps that impact District 23 in East San Jose

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110623_32	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_33	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_34	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_35	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_36	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
8ccosta_20110623_15_19	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes	Address serious racial issues	Address serious economic issues
8ccosta_20110623_16_19				no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_17_19		San Jose		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110623_32			no				
CSCFR_20110623_33			no				
CSCFR_20110623_34			no				
CSCFR_20110623_35			no				
CSCFR_20110623_36			no				
8ccosta_20110623_15_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_16_19			no				Assign an odd number to draft Senate district EALAM containing Contra Costa.
8ccosta_20110623_17_19	Fragmenting the district into three parts will create a situation where San Jose is significantly underrepresented at state and national levels		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110623_18_19	6232011	Pat Lewandowski	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not make changes to Contra Costa. Do not include Oakland and Berkeley, which both belong to Alameda
8ccosta_20110623_19_19	6232011	Cynthia Vogel	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole in CD.
8marin_20110623_1_2	6232011	Ann Thomas	no		Corte Madera	Marin	yes	Approve of keeping Del Norte, Mendocino, Humboldt, North Coast counties together. Support lines drawn for North Coastal AD, CD, SD.
8marin_20110623_2_2	6232011	Michael Linvill	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma together.
8napa_20110623_1_6	6232011	Susan Ford-Bennett	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110623_2_6	6232011	Thomas Cornes	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110623_3_6	6232011	Susan Ford-Bennett	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110623_4_6	6232011	Imedla Matel	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110623_5_6	6242011	Kalan	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8napa_20110623_6_6	6242011	Stefan Jezycki	no			Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa
8sonoma_20110623_1_2	6232011	Jon Stiffler	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma as a whole, including Santa Rosa, with Marin.
8sonoma_20110623_2_2	6242011	Geraldine Gauer	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma County as a whole with Marin and Napa

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110623_18_19	Alameda, Contra Costa	Berkeley, Oakland		no	no		
8ccosta_20110623_19_19				no	no		
8marin_20110623_1_2	Del Norte, Mendocino, Humboldt			no	no		
8marin_20110623_2_2	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8napa_20110623_1_6	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8napa_20110623_2_6	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes	Kids from American Canyon participate insporting events in Napa	
8napa_20110623_3_6	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8napa_20110623_4_6	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8napa_20110623_5_6	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8napa_20110623_6_6	Napa	American Canyon		no	yes		Work, investment, personal, business, public funds
8sonoma_20110623_1_2	Sonoma, Marin	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Similar lifestyles, coastal	
8sonoma_20110623_2_2	Sonoma, Marin, Napa			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110623_18_19			no				
8ccosta_20110623_19_19	Would have to deal with two congresspersons who may not have interests of City as a whole		no				
8marin_20110623_1_2			no				
8marin_20110623_2_2	Water, suburban development, employers, etc.		no				
8napa_20110623_1_6			no				
8napa_20110623_2_6			no				
8napa_20110623_3_6	American Canyon should vote with rest of Napa County		no				
8napa_20110623_4_6			no				
8napa_20110623_5_6			no				
8napa_20110623_6_6			no				
8sonoma_20110623_1_2			no				
8sonoma_20110623_2_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110623_1_5	6242011	Eileen Cooper	yes	Friends of Del Norte, Vice President		Del Norte	yes	Approve of keeping Del Norte within a coastal district
9dnorte_20110623_2_5	6232011	Wendell Wood	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Approve of keeping Del Norte with other northern coastal counties such as Humboldt
9dnorte_20110623_3_5	6232011	Chad Roberts	no			Yolo	yes	Approve of putting Del Norte with other coastal counties
9dnorte_20110623_4_5	6232011	April Quigley	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Approve of putting Del Norte with Humboldt and Mendocino
9dnorte_20110623_5_5	6232011	Janet Haley	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Approve of keeping Del Norte within a coastal region
9mendocino_20110623_1_7	6232011	Mary Jane Cummings	no			Mendocino	yes	Supports first draft lines for North Coastal District. Keep western Siskiyou within this district, also.
9mendocino_20110623_2_7	6242011	Debra B. Levy	no			Mendocino	yes	Supports first draft lines for North Coastal District. Keep western Siskiyou within this district, also.
9mendocino_20110623_3_7	6232011	Dennis O Brien	no			Mendocino	yes	Supports first draft lines for North Coastal District

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110623_1_5	Del Norte			no	no		
9dnorte_20110623_2_5	Del Norte. Humboldt			no	no		
9dnorte_20110623_3_5	Del Norte			no	no		
9dnorte_20110623_4_5	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino			no	no		
9dnorte_20110623_5_5				no	no		
9mendocino_20110623_1_7	Siskiyou			no	no		
9mendocino_20110623_2_7	Siskiyou			no	no		
9mendocino_20110623_3_7				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110623_1_5	Coastal		no				Keep up the good work, and stand strong to your principles
9dnorte_20110623_2_5	Coastal		no				
9dnorte_20110623_3_5	Coastal		no				
9dnorte_20110623_4_5	Jobs, tourism, river systems, government agencies, coastal		no				Hopes that the Commission will continue to rise above political pressure
9dnorte_20110623_5_5	Tourism, fishing		no				Commissions work important because it prevents political aprties from using people to enhance their particular agendas
9mendocino_20110623_1_7	Rivers which flow to coast that support at-risk salmon and steelhead, oceanshoreline protection concerns, harbor problems, redwood park, 101 corridor		no				
9mendocino_20110623_2_7	Coastal		no				
9mendocino_20110623_3_7			no				Work of Commission gives hope for a truly representative democracy

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110623_4_7	6232011	Joel Clark	no			Mendocino	yes	Do not consolidate north coast into one district, which means redistricting Mike Thompsons current area
9mendocino_20110623_5_7	6242011	Edward Lasker	no			Mendocino	yes	Approve of first draft lines for Mendocino CD
9mendocino_20110623_6_7	6232011	Paul Dolan	yes	California Wine Institute, Board member		Mendocino	yes	Appreciates Mike Thompson. Maintain integrity of north coast wine appellation as a single district, ideally District 1.
9mendocino_20110623_7_7	6232011	Jim Mayfield	no			Mendocino	yes	Do not split Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma counties.
9mendocino_20110623_8	6232011	John Dickerson	no			Mendocino	yes	Do not split Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma.
9sacramento_20110623_1_5	6232011	Terry and Heidi Leveille	yes	TL and Associates, President		Sacramento	yes	Keep Fair Oaks, located next to American River, within Sacramento County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110623_4_7				no	no		
9mendocino_20110623_5_7				no	no		
9mendocino_20110623_6_7				no	no		
9mendocino_20110623_7_7	Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma			no	no		
9mendocino_20110623_8	Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma		The Wall, a steep mountain ridge- Sacramento Valley to east, North Coast ranges to west.	no	no		
9sacramento_20110623_1_5	Sacramento			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110623_4_7	Geographic, economic ties. Putting everything in one district will only produce one north coastal vote.		no				
9mendocino_20110623_5_7	Coastal, rivers which flow to coast that support at-risk salmon and steelhead, oceanshoreline protection concerns, harbor problems, redwood park, 101 corridor		no				
9mendocino_20110623_6_7	Wine business		no				
9mendocino_20110623_7_7	Tied together geographically and economically		no				
9mendocino_20110623_8	Would weaken wine and winegrape industries		no				
9sacramento_20110623_1_5	Workers from Fair Oaks commute to downtown Sacramento on light rail. Always has been an integral part of Sacramento County		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110623_2_5	6232011	Michael Minnick	yes	Tallac Village Neighborhood Association, President		Sacramento	yes	Place Tallac Village neighborhood (southeastern Sacramento, with boundaries north to 21st Ave, south to Fruitridge Rd, east to 65th St, west to 58th St) with city of Sacramento
9sacramento_20110623_3_5	6232011	Cyndi Kettmann	no			Sacramento	yes	Keep City of Sacramento in one CD
9sacramento_20110623_4_5	6232011	Barbara Payne	yes	City of Galt, Mayor	Galt	Sacramento	yes	See attached map. Keep Galt together.
9sacramento_20110623_5_5	6232011	Jannay Hughes	no			Sacramento	yes	Keep Fair Oaks with Sacramento
9siskiyou_20110623_1_7	6232011	Michael Stapleton	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Scott Valley and rest of western Siskiyou County into Del Norte-Mendocino and North Coast districts
9siskiyou_20110623_2_7	6232011	Paul and Margaret Boos	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou with Del Norte and Humboldt. Keep Siskiyou with Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter
9siskiyou_20110623_3_7	6232011	Dawn and Dave Black	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou intact. Make no changes.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110623_2_5		Sacramento	21st Ave, Fruitridge Road, 65th Street, 58th Street	no	no		
9sacramento_20110623_3_5		Sacramento		no	no		
9sacramento_20110623_4_5		Galt		no	yes	Rural, attend same schools, go to same churches in Galt	Shop in Galt
9sacramento_20110623_5_5		Sacramento		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110623_1_7	Siskiyou, Del Norte, Mendocino	Scott Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110623_2_7	Siskiyou, Del Norte, Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110623_3_7	Siskiyou			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110623_2_5	First draft lines cut across City Council districts, school board areas		no				
9sacramento_20110623_3_5	If Sacramento split, voice in Washington, D.C. will be diluted		no				
9sacramento_20110623_4_5			no				
9sacramento_20110623_5_5	Same concerns include American River Trails and Parkways, wildlife, lake and dam, schools, small community mentality		no				
9siskiyou_20110623_1_7			no				
9siskiyou_20110623_2_7	Economic base is agricultureranching, timber, mining which is different from Del NorteHumboldt economic base		no				
9siskiyou_20110623_3_7	If split, negative effect on school districts, fire district, property, parks		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110623_4_7	6232011	Jack and Carolyn Pimentel	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole with Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter
9siskiyou_20110623_5_7	6232011	Kathy Bergeron	no			Siskiyou	yes	Place Etna, Fort Jones, Scott Valley, Happy Camp in coastal district
9siskiyou_20110623_6_7	6232011	Harry Lake	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou County whole
9siskiyou_20110623_7_7	6232011	Christopher Liles	yes	City of Etna, former Mayor	Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou County whole
CSCFR_20110623_37	6242011	Verna Mandel	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_38	6242011	Suzan Van Keulen	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_39	6242011	David and Doreen Mazur	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_40	6242011	Cathi Scheurn	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_41	6242011	Dean Kunicki	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110623_4_7	Siskiyou, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter			no	yes	Agriculture, I-5, Highway 99, shared public transportation, shared access to same communication media, water resources	shared living standards
9siskiyou_20110623_5_7		Etna, Fort Jones, Scott Valley, Happy Camp		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110623_6_7	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110623_7_7	Siskiyou			no	no		
CSCFR_20110623_37	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_38	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_39	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_40	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_41	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110623_4_7			no				
9siskiyou_20110623_5_7	The lines Commission has drawn encompass too large a district		no				
9siskiyou_20110623_6_7			no				
9siskiyou_20110623_7_7		This probably smells like a violation of the Voting Rights Act	no				
CSCFR_20110623_37			no				
CSCFR_20110623_38			no				
CSCFR_20110623_39			no				
CSCFR_20110623_40			no				
CSCFR_20110623_41			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110623_42	6242011	Robert Baker	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_43	6242011	Douglas Wieben	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_44	6242011	Mary M. Little	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_45	6242011	Judy Gobble	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_46	6242011	Janice Kunicki	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
CSCFR_20110623_47	6242011	Sandra Lee Palmer	yes	Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	In AD, include entire Thousand Oaks, consider moving Oxnard into coastal district. Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura for SD.
general_20110623_1	6232011	Rick Deming	no		Fresno	Fresno	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110623_42	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_43	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_44	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_45	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_46	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
CSCFR_20110623_47	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Inland suburban	
general_20110623_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110623_42			no				
CSCFR_20110623_43			no				
CSCFR_20110623_44			no				
CSCFR_20110623_45			no				
CSCFR_20110623_46			no				
CSCFR_20110623_47			no				
general_20110623_1			no				Commission can return democracy to the people. Do not allow special interests to take this most basic right of citizenship from people. Maps still look geographically convoluted.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110623_2	6232011	Erica Teasley Linnick, Stewart Kwoh, Maricela P. Morales, Janis R. Hirohama, Thomas A. Saenz, Arturo Vargas	yes	AARC, APALC, CAUSE, MALDEF, NALEO Educational Fund			yes	Please read letter
general_20110623_3	6232011	DeWayne Guimond	no				no	
general_20110623_4	6232011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110623_2				no	no		
general_20110623_3				no	no		
general_20110623_4				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110623_2		Long letter RE Commissions Application of Sections 2 and 5 of VRA.	yes				
general_20110623_3			no				Redistricting should be left out of politics. Each county should be its own district. Help stop excess spending.
general_20110623_4			no				Start numbering at northeast corner of state as stated in Constitution, then proceed west and south. Any attempt to preserve current numbering will lead to a suspicion that Commission is preserving incumbents position. Assign numbers last on final maps.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110623_5	6232011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
general_20110623_6	6232011	David Pacheco, John Kim, Rob Lapsley, Maricela P. Morales, Doug Johnson, Kathay Feng, Jim Mayer, Janis R. Hirohama, Orson Aguilar	no	AARP, Advancement Project, California Chamber of Commerce, CAUSE, Rose Institute, California Common Cause, California Forward, League of Women Voters of CA, Greenlining Institute			yes	Please read letter

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110623_5				no	no		
general_20110623_6				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110623_5			no				See email concerning what should be included in reports. When any more than two Commissioners are working together on preparing for any report, they must do so in an open session under Bagley-Keene.
general_20110623_6		Long letter RE Commissions Application of Sections 2 and 5 of VRA.	yes				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110623_7	6232011	Erica Teasley Linnick, Stewart Kwoh, Maricela P. Morales, Janis R. Hirohama, Thomas A. Saenz, Arturo Vargas DUPLICATE	no	AARC, APALC, CAUSE, MALDEF, NALEO Educational Fund			yes	Please read letter
5sbarbara_20110623_1	6232011	Bob Forinash	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110623_2	6232011	Donald D. Rowland	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110623_3	6232011	Sue and Paris Couplan	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in SD or AD.
5sbarbara_20110623_4	6232011	Brandon Banner	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110623_5	6232011	Frank Grube	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110623_6	6232011	Carlos Yanez	no		Solvang	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc. Keep Ventura County in one district, Santa BarbaraSan Luis Obispo as a separate district. Do not include Monterey, Salinas, Santa Cruz with Central Coast.
5sbarbara_20110623_7	6232011	Camillo and Patricia H. Wilde	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc, Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills in same districts
5sbarbara_20110623_8	6232011	Nicholas Gonzales Jr.	yes	HighTech Lending, Inc.	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110623_7				no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_1	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		yes	no	59,000 people should be maintained as a block in new redistricting.	
5sbarbara_20110623_3	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_4	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_5	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_6	Ventura, Santa Barbara, Monterey, Salinas, Santa Cruz	Lompoc		no	yes	Would not work together due to divergent political views	
5sbarbara_20110623_7	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_8	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110623_7		Long letter RE Commissions Application of Sections 2 and 5 of VRA.	yes				
5sbarbara_20110623_1			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_2			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_3			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_4			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_5			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_6			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_7			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_8			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110623_9	6232011	Joseph Heuring	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc Valley
5sbarbara_20110623_10	6232011	Emily Adelmann	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110623_11	6232011	Carolyn Jones	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110623_12	6232011	S.A. Strong	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc in AD or SD.
5sbarbara_20110623_20	6232011	Patricia Gill	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	See attached maps. Do not split Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110623_13	6232011	Tom Butt	yes	City of Richmond, Councilman	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in Contra Costa County.
5sbarbara_20110623_14	6232011	Gaila Anderson	yes	Lee Central Coast Newspapers, Advertising Account Executive	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole in AD.
5sbarbara_20110623_15	6232011	Fran Clow	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_16	6232011	Rebecca Work	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole in AD and SD.
5sbarbara_20110623_17	6242011	Karin Marie Hauenstein	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_18	6232011	Gary Williams	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole in AD and SD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110623_9	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_10	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes	Lompoc has mutual concerns with northern Santa Barbara County.	Agriculturally based
5sbarbara_20110623_11	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes	Hard to be a business owner in separate counties or districts	
5sbarbara_20110623_12	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_20	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes	Air Force Base, need a unified representation of valley.	
5sbarbara_20110623_13	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110623_14		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_15		Lompoc		no	yes		Lompoc already negatively impacted by recession, need strong government voice.
5sbarbara_20110623_16		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_17		Lompoc		no	yes	High crime rates, large illegal immigrant population, wholesome recreational activities for youth	ill-funded nonprofits, 3 FCIs
5sbarbara_20110623_18		Lompoc		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110623_9			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_10			no				Do not count inmates of federal prison as active community members of Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110623_11			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_12			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_20			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_13			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_14			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_15			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_16			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_17			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_18			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110623_19	6232011	Tonya R. Schultz, Ph.D.	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole in AD and SD.
5sbarbara_20110623_21	6232011	Donna Vordale	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_22	6242011	Edwin Key	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_23	6232011	Roberta S. Taylor	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_24	6232011	Colodia Owens	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_25	6242011	Lee Sulis	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_26	6242011	Robert J. Forinash	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_27	6232011	Roy Belluz	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_28	6232011	Angela Brooks	yes	Century 21 Hometown Realty, Short Sale and Foreclosure Specialist	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_29	6232011	Cindy McCall	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole in AD and SD.
5sbarbara_20110623_30	6232011	Linda Everly	yes	Lompoc Valley Medical Center, Director of Quality, Risk, Infection Control	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole in AD and SD.
5sbarbara_20110623_31	6232011	Peter Shoemaker	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110623_19		Lompoc		no	yes	Work for common causes, form core of community charitable giving	
5sbarbara_20110623_21		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_22		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_23		Lompoc		no	yes	Rural, do not need constant political bickering	
5sbarbara_20110623_24		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_25		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_26		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_27		Lompoc		no	yes	Not a prison system, but a town of 42000 people	
5sbarbara_20110623_28		Lompoc		no	yes	Not just a prison system. One valley.	
5sbarbara_20110623_29		Lompoc		no	yes		Need to be united to fight economic struggles
5sbarbara_20110623_30		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_31		Lompoc		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110623_19			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_21			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_22			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_23			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_24			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_25			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_26			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_27			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_28			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_29			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_30			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_31			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110623_32	6232011	Dan Schroeder	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_33	6232011	Kim Costa	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_34	6232011	Anthony M. Durham	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_35	6242011	Eric Ayala	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_36	6242011	Frank Grube	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_37	6232011	Deni Overton	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_38	6242011	Kathryn Baillargeon	yes	UC Santa Barbara, Professor	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole.
5sbarbara_20110623_39	6242011	Donna Vordale	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_40	6242011	Charlotte Grube	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5sbarbara_20110623_41	6242011	Kathleen A. Griffith	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole in AD and SD.
5sbarbara_20110623_42	6232011	Marie Linda De Maria	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Keep Lompoc whole
5slo_20110623_1	6232011	Paso Robles	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110623_32		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_33		Lompoc		no	yes	Splitting Lompoc will divide voter stregnth	Splitting Lompoc will cause undue hardship due to the money outlaw needed to conduct a state election
5sbarbara_20110623_34		Lompoc		no	yes		Lompoc has just been hit very hard with recession
5sbarbara_20110623_35		Lompoc		no	yes	Small city	
5sbarbara_20110623_36		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_37		Lompoc		no	yes		Federal Correctional Facility is located outside of Lompoc
5sbarbara_20110623_38		Lompoc		no	yes	Similar interests	
5sbarbara_20110623_39		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_40		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_41		Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110623_42		Lompoc		no	yes	Stand-alone community	
5slo_20110623_1	San Luis Obispo			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110623_32			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_33			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_34			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_35			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_36			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_37			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_38			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_39			no				
5sbarbara_20110623_40	Need fair representation, elections will cost Lompoc more money to have separate ballots		no				
5sbarbara_20110623_41	As Santa Barbara Countys third largest city, Lompoc residents deserve a single voter representation		no				
5sbarbara_20110623_42			no				
5slo_20110623_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5slo_20110623_2	6232011	Steve and Debbie Arnold	no		Santa Margarita	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_3	6232011	Adrienne	no		Templeton	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_4	6232011	Clifford Smith	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_5	6232011	John and Dee Lacey	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_6	6232011	Donald and Jacqueline Weber	no		Pismo Beach	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_7	6232011	Peggy Strickland	no		Templeton	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_8	6232011	Sean Baird	no		Grover Beach	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_9	6232011	Anthony Stronetta	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_10	6232011	Virge Perelli-Minetti	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_11	6232011	Christine Robinson	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_12	6232011	Bob Martz	no		Atascadero	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_13	6232011	Angela Mitchell	yes	Mitchella Vineyard and Winery	Paso Robles	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_14	6232011	Sue Rodeck	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole
5slo_20110623_15	6232011	Smith Held	no		Cayucos	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5slo_20110623_2				no	yes		Agriculture, tourism economy
5slo_20110623_3				no	no		
5slo_20110623_4				no	no		
5slo_20110623_5				no	yes		Keep economic bases strong
5slo_20110623_6				no	no		
5slo_20110623_7				no	no		
5slo_20110623_8				no	yes		Coastal agriculture and tourism
5slo_20110623_9				no	no		
5slo_20110623_10				no	no		
5slo_20110623_11				no	no		
5slo_20110623_12				no	no		
5slo_20110623_13				no	no		
5slo_20110623_14				no	no		
5slo_20110623_15				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5slo_20110623_2			no				
5slo_20110623_3			no				
5slo_20110623_4			no				
5slo_20110623_5			no				
5slo_20110623_6			no				
5slo_20110623_7	Want to have a voice in state and federal government		no				
5slo_20110623_8			no				
5slo_20110623_9			no				
5slo_20110623_10			no				
5slo_20110623_11			no				
5slo_20110623_12	Business, agricultural, residential aspects balanced and well-distributed		no				
5slo_20110623_13			no				
5slo_20110623_14			no				
5slo_20110623_15			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5slo_20110623_16	6232011	Jackie Crabb	yes	San Luis Obispo County Farm Bureau, Executive Director	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole and with north Santa Barbara County
5slo_20110623_17	6232011	Henry Stanton McDonald	no		Atascadero	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo County whole and with north Santa Barbara County
5ventura_20110623_2_19	6242011	Roseann Mikos	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Keep Moorpark in Ventura County
5ventura_20110623_3_19	6232011	Mary A. Land	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Vally and Moorpark within Ventura County
5ventura_20110623_4_19	6232011	Sharon L. Harman	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley with Ventura County
5ventura_20110623_5_19	6232011	Barbara Bowlds	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Moorpark and Simi Valley with Ventura
5ventura_20110623_6_19	6232011	Marya Krestyn	no		Fillmore	Ventura	yes	Do not put Fillmore and Santa Paul in same SD as Santa barbara
5ventura_20110623_7_19	6232011	Harold Tipton	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark in Ventura
5ventura_20110623_8_19	6232011	Anne Walton	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark in Ventura
5ventura_20110623_9_19	6232011	Florence Kriz	no			Ventura	yes	Do not put Ventura with LA
6merced_20110623_2_2	6232011	Michele Gabriault-Acosta	yes	Merced City Council Member	Merced	Merced	yes	In SD, Keep Merced separate from Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties
6merced_20110623_3	6232011	Ricci Thoreson	no			Merced	yes	Keep coast and valley districts separate. Lines should follow natural borders of valley and stop at coast range.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5slo_20110623_16	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara			no	yes		Agricultural
5slo_20110623_17	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara			no	yes	Sociologically, politically similar	economically similar
5ventura_20110623_2_19	Ventura	Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_3_19	Ventura	Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_4_19	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_5_19	Ventura	Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_6_19		Santa Barbara, Fillmore, Santa Paula		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_7_19	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_8_19	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_9_19	Ventura, Los Angeles			no	no		
6merced_20110623_2_2	Santa Clara, Santa Cruz			no	yes	Small rural area	
6merced_20110623_3			Natural borders of valley, stop at coast range	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5slo_20110623_16			no				
5slo_20110623_17			no				
5ventura_20110623_2_19	Putting Moorpark with Santa ClaritaSan Fernando Valley will disenfranchise Moorpark		no				
5ventura_20110623_3_19	Taxes go to Ventura County		no				
5ventura_20110623_4_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_5_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_6_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_7_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_8_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_9_19			no				
6merced_20110623_2_2			no				
6merced_20110623_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6tulare_20110623_1	6232011	Kathryn Black	no			Tulare	yes	Approve of first draft districts, but do not split AD in Tulare in SD maps
6tuolumne_20110623_1	6232011	Domenic Torchia	no			Tuolomne	no	
7sclara_20110623_1_8	6232011	Anonymous	no			Santa Clara	yes	Proposed SD 15 map attached.
7sclara_20110623_2_8	6232011	Anonymous	no			Santa Clara	yes	Proposed SD 15 map attached.
7sclara_20110623_3_8	6232011	Anonymous	no			Santa Clara	yes	Proposed SD 15 map attached.
7sclara_20110623_4_8	6252011	Timothy Tom	yes	Oganization of Chinese Americans, Silicon Valley Chapter (OCA-SV)	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Approve of unifying Berryessa area. Unite Evergreen area. Put Santa Clara County Cities (Santa Clara, Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Mountain View) into a Santa Clara County district
7sclara_20110623_5_8	6232011	Frank Biehl	no			Santa Clara	yes	Do not divide East San Jose.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6tulare_20110623_1	Tulare			no	no		
6tuolumne_20110623_1				no	no		
7sclara_20110623_1_8				no	no		
7sclara_20110623_2_8				no	no		
7sclara_20110623_3_8				no	no		
7sclara_20110623_4_8	Santa Clara	Santa Clara, Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Mountain View	Consider effects of manmade boundaries, such as railroad tracks, highways, freeways, etc. which change interests and concerns of different groups	no	no		
7sclara_20110623_5_8	San Jose	San Jose	Use urban service area boundary rather than city limits.	no	yes	Latino, urban	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6tulare_20110623_1			no				Proposed districts for San Joaquin Valley are far better than anything voters have seen in past several decades, thanks the Commission for listening.
6tuolumne_20110623_1			no				In a Union Democrat Poll about new political redistricting plans, 111 people voted. 75, or 67.6 preferred the newly proposed foothill districts; 23, or 20.7, want to see an alternative plan, and 13, or 11.7 like existing political districts.
7sclara_20110623_1_8			no				
7sclara_20110623_2_8			no				
7sclara_20110623_3_8			no				
7sclara_20110623_4_8			no				
7sclara_20110623_5_8			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110623_6_8	6232011	Jamie L. Matthews, Jennifer Sparacino	yes	City of Santa Clara, Mayor and City Manager	Santa Clara	Santa Clara	yes	Approve of new district boundaries
7sclara_20110623_7_8	6232011	Joshua Barousse	yes	East San Jose Democrats	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Adopt a Central and East San Jose AD that includes Mckee Rd as a nothern boundary, all of East San Jose or at least up to urban service area boundary line; W-Hwy 87. Keep San Jose Hall
7sclara_20110623_8_8	6232011	Carol Martin	no			Santa Clara	yes	Keep AD 23 (east and central San Jose) as whole as possible
8alameda_20110623_1_19	6232011	Aditi Sharma	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont as a whole within Alameda County
8alameda_20110623_2_19	6232011	Manish Sharma	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont as a whole within Alameda County
8alameda_20110623_3_19	6232011	Manju Sharma, Surendra Kunwar, Manish Sharma, Aditi Sharma	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont as a whole within Alameda County
8alameda_20110623_4_19	6232011	Yogini Thanawala	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole
8alameda_20110623_5_19	6232011	Shirley Jacob	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep all of Fremont with Tri-Cities in Alameda County CD
8alameda_20110623_6_19	6232011	James and Connie Gholson	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont as a whole within Alameda County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110623_6_8				no	yes	A single school district, own electric and water utilities	City-wide Chamber of Commerce
7sclara_20110623_7_8	San Jose	San Jose	Mckee Road, Hwy 87	no	yes	Latino	
7sclara_20110623_8_8				no	yes		
8alameda_20110623_1_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_2_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_3_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_4_19		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_5_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_6_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110623_6_8			no				Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the redistricting proces
7sclara_20110623_7_8		Based on VRA, should keep Communities of Interest together.	no				
7sclara_20110623_8_8	Quality voice at state and federal level		no				
8alameda_20110623_1_19	Well-being and fair political representation		no				
8alameda_20110623_2_19	Well-being and fair political representation		no				
8alameda_20110623_3_19	Well-being and fair political representation		no				
8alameda_20110623_4_19	Government is already slow in dealing with complaints, do not want to have to deal with 2 sets of county government		no				
8alameda_20110623_5_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_6_19			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110623_7_19	6232011	Anand Shankar	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep all of Fremont with Tri-Cities in Alameda County CD
8alameda_20110623_8_19	6232011	James Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
8alameda_20110623_9_19	6232011	Nicholas Buscovich	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro as a whole with southern neighbors of Hayward, Castro Valley and not with Oakland
8alameda_20110623_19_19	6242011	Jean Holmes	no			Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Newark, Union City (Tri-Cities) together and whole.
8alameda_20110623_10_19	6232011	Valerie Stewart	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole and with other Tri-Cities
8alameda_20110623_11_19	6232011	Betty Dutina	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole.
8alameda_20110623_12_19	6242011	Anantha Sudhakar	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole and with Tri-Cities in CD
8alameda_20110623_13_19	6232011	Manju Sharma	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont as a whole within Alameda County
5ventura_20110623_1_19	6232011	Robert Wall	no			Ventura	yes	Do not include Simi Valley and other parts of Ventura County with neither Santa Clarita nor L.A. County
5ventura_20110623_10_19	6232011	Robert F. Walton	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley, Moorpark with L.A.
5ventura_20110623_11_19	6232011	Bill Waters	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks with Ventura and not with L.A.
5ventura_20110623_12_19	6232011	Andrew Seeley	no		Santa Paula	Ventura	yes	Put Santa Paula not with Santa Barbara, but with Ventura, Oxnard, Camarillo

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110623_7_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_8_19				no	no		
8alameda_20110623_9_19		San Leandro, Castro Valley, Hayward, Oakland		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_19_19		Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_10_19		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_11_19		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_12_19		Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110623_13_19	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_1_19	Ventura, Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Simi Valley	mountains	no	no		
5ventura_20110623_10_19	Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_11_19	Ventura, Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_12_19	Ventura, Santa Barbara	Santa Paula, Oxnard, Camarillo		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110623_7_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_8_19			no				Use an arbitrary and mechanical process of assigning district numbers, Can even use a bingo-ball technique wherein a chosen district would receive the number on the next randomly selected ball.
8alameda_20110623_9_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_19_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_10_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_11_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_12_19			no				
8alameda_20110623_13_19	Well-being and fair political representation		no				
5ventura_20110623_1_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_10_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_11_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_12_19			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110623_13_19	6242011	Ronna Throgmorton Chezem	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Put Simi Valley with Ventura
5ventura_20110623_14_19	6232011	Judy Kissick	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep all of Ventura County in a Ventura CD
5ventura_20110623_15_19	6242011	Alexander See	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	CD EASTVENT-keep Ventura together, take out Malibu, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village. SBEVENTnest EASTVENT and Santa Clarita Ads, Santa Clarita should be with Simi Valley, not with Malibu
5ventura_20110623_16_19	6222011	Vern Orth	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark with Ventura, not with Los Angeles
5ventura_20110623_17_19	6232011	Mary Fernandes	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Moorpark and Simi Valley with Ventura, not with LA
5ventura_20110623_18_19	6232011	Colleen Mattoon	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark with Ventura
5ventura_20110623_19_19	6232011	Debra Tash	yes	GT Water Products, Inc., Vice President	Somis	Ventura	yes	AD-reunite Wood Ranch with Simi Valley, remove Oxnard to coastal cities district. SD-keep inland communities together, but separate from coastal communities. CD-put Simi Valley and Moorpark with Ventura
6merced_20110623_1_2	6232011	Michele Gabriault-Acosta	yes	Merced City Council Member	Merced	Merced	yes	See letter concerning SD MERCEDMONT found at 6merced_20110623_2_2
6kern_20110623_1	6232011	Bruce Auld	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Keep draft maps
9sjoaquin_20110627_1	6272011	Suzan Ali	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
9sjoaquin_20110627_2	6272011	R.M. Jones	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110623_13_19	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	yes	Low crime rates, less people, less traffic	
5ventura_20110623_14_19	Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110623_15_19	Ventura	Malibu, Santa Clarita, Simi Valley, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes	similar issues, connected school districts, shared infrastructure	
5ventura_20110623_16_19	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_17_19	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_18_19	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110623_19_19	Ventura	Oxnard, Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
6merced_20110623_1_2				no	no		
6kern_20110623_1	Kern			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110627_1	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work
9sjoaquin_20110627_2	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110623_13_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_14_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_15_19			no				Thank you for work and time
5ventura_20110623_16_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_17_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_18_19			no				
5ventura_20110623_19_19			no				
6merced_20110623_1_2			no				
6kern_20110623_1	Efficient for operations of all local education agencies		no				Thank you for all hard work
9sjoaquin_20110627_1			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110627_3	6272011	Rosie Bachand	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Stockton in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
9sjoaquin_20110627_4	6272011	Mark Wallace	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
9sjoaquin_20110627_5	6272011	Joy and Alan Freeman	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
9sjoaquin_20110627_6	6272011	William E. Anderson	yes	FHA and VA Loan Specialist, Ascent Home Loans	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
9sjoaquin_20110627_7	6272011	Brett Diede	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
9sjoaquin_20110627_8	6272011	Corinne Norton	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
9sjoaquin_20110627_9	6272011	Eugene Stoddart	no		Linden	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Linden in San Joaquin County and San Joaquin County together
4langeles_20110628_10	6282011	Wendy W. Huang	no		Westminster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westminster, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mes and Garden Grove together, do not lump with LA County or Santa Ana
4langeles_20110628_11	6282011	Josh P. Given	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood.
4langeles_20110628_12	6282011	Guy Heston	no		Long Beach,	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Long Beach
4langeles_20110628_13	6282011	Chris Rowe	yes	West Hills Neighborhood Council	West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide West Hills Neighborhood. Keep West San Fernando Valley Whole
4langeles_20110628_14	6282011	Regine Verougstraete	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena
4langeles_20110628_15	6282011	Robert and Doris S. Ruvelson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood in half

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110627_3	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, Merced, Fresno	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa, Stockton		no	yes	Effective political voice	
9sjoaquin_20110627_4	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work
9sjoaquin_20110627_5	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work
9sjoaquin_20110627_6	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work
9sjoaquin_20110627_7	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work
9sjoaquin_20110627_8	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work
9sjoaquin_20110627_9	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi, Tracy, Davis, Santa Rosa, Linden		no	yes	Effective political voice	Commuting within County for work
4langeles_20110628_10	Los Angeles	Westminster, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Garden Grove, Santa Ana.		no	yes	Asian community	
4langeles_20110628_11	Los Angeles	Brentwood	San Vincente Boulevard	no	yes	Veterens Aministration	
4langeles_20110628_12	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_13	Los Angeles	West Hills	West of 405	yes	yes	transportation corridors	
4langeles_20110628_14		South Pasadena		no	yes	shared issues, suburban	
4langeles_20110628_15		Los Angeles		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110627_3			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_4			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_5			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_6			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_7			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_8			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_9			no				
4langeles_20110628_10	schools, leagues, church		no			Nothing in common with Santa Ana	
4langeles_20110628_11			no			VA should not be districted away from Brentwood	
4langeles_20110628_12			no				
4langeles_20110628_13			no				
4langeles_20110628_14			no			will make it hard to get involved	
4langeles_20110628_15			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_16	6282011	Diana Nave, President	yes	NWSPNC	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split San Pedro, do not divide from Port of Los Angeles
4langeles_20110628_17	6282011	Steve Katinsky	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood in one district, do not split
4langeles_20110628_18	6282011	Kris Calvin, CEO	yes	AAP-CA	South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena, do not put in LA district.
4langeles_20110628_19	6282011	Marie Miller	no		South Pasadena		yes	Do not split South Pasadena, do not put in LA district.
4langeles_20110628_20	6282011	Jeanine Birong	no		Long Beach		yes	Do not split Long Beach. Orange county has little concern or knowledge
4langeles_20110628_21	6282011	Cheryl Ackermannn	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Do not put Moorpark and Simi Valley in Antelope-Santa Clarita, put with Thousand Oaaks and Camarillo
4langeles_20110628_22	6282011	Maxine Mills	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester with El Segundo, Playa del Rey, Manhattan Beach and Palos Verdes
4langeles_20110628_23	6282011	Sue Stamberger	no			Los Angeles	yes	District should include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada, Glendale, Burbank
4langeles_20110628_24	6282011	Dan Pressburg	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together. Do not place with Compton
4langeles_20110628_25	6282011	Scott Schaidld	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach whole.
4langeles_20110628_26	6282011	Sandra Perez	no		Diamond Bar	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Diamond Bar with Los Angeles county, not Orange or San Bernardino
4langeles_20110628_27	6282011	Raul Felix	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep W San Fernando Valley with 101 corridor. Take out of Beverly Hills, Universal City, entertainment Community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_16	San Pedro	Los Angeles		no	yes	historic community	
4langeles_20110628_17	Brentwood	Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_18	LA	Pasadena		no	yes	politics, concerns	
4langeles_20110628_19	LA	Pasadena		no	yes	politics, concerns	
4langeles_20110628_20		Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_21		Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_22	Los Angeles	Westchester with El Segundo, Playa del Rey, Manhattan Beach and Palos Verdes		no	yes	beach cities	
4langeles_20110628_23	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	alligned	
4langeles_20110628_24	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Compton		no	yes	melting pot that needs single representation	
4langeles_20110628_25		Long Beach		no	yes	large city	
4langeles_20110628_26	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino			no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_27		Beverly Hills, Universal City	101 corridor	no	yes		patent reform, tax credit, defense and aerospace jobs

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_16	important relationship		no				
4langeles_20110628_17			no				
4langeles_20110628_18			no			very different concerns	
4langeles_20110628_19			no			very different concerns	
4langeles_20110628_20			no			constituently has nothing in common, crooks	
4langeles_20110628_21	tight bonded communities		no				
4langeles_20110628_22			no			not with Inglewood, Lennox	
4langeles_20110628_23			no				
4langeles_20110628_24			no			nothing in common with Compton	
4langeles_20110628_25	one point of contact for concerns		no				
4langeles_20110628_26	education, economic, property taxes, schools		no			nothing to do with other counties	
4langeles_20110628_27			no			no COI with entertainment community	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_28	6282011	Xianni Yao	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not put WestlakeAgoura Hills with entertainment communities.
4langeles_20110628_29	6282011		no				yes	Keep W San Fernando Valley and 101 corridor intact from Westlake Village, Woodland hills, Chatsworth, Granada Hills, Northridge.
4langeles_20110628_30	6282011	Mr. and Mrs. Curtis Clark	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City, do not place with LASCV or LADNT. Keep with 101 corridor.
4langeles_20110628_31	6282011	Randi Johnson	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Mountains, do not link with Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110628_32	6282011	John Stammreich, Board Member	yes	Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council	San Pedro	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110628_33	6282011	Ernestine Mansour	no			Los Angeles	yes	Remove Bellflower, Downey, keep SE Vernon City, Huntington Park, Maywood, Bell, Cudahy, South Gate, Bell Gardens, Boyle Heights E LA, Commerce, Pico Union, China Town
4langeles_20110628_34	6282011	John Newell	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Long Beach
4langeles_20110628_35	6282011	Cary Iaccino, Chair (duplicate)	yes	Reseda Neighborhood Council	Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Reseda whole, Tarzana, Northridge together
4langeles_20110628_37	6282011	Lisa Kalem	no				yes	Do not split South Pasadena
4langeles_20110628_38	6282011	Mindy J. Blum	no		S. Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split S. Pasadena.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_28		Westlake, Agoura Hills		no	yes		aerospace and high technology, research and defense
4langeles_20110628_29	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Woodland hills, Chatsworth, Granada Hills, Northridge.		no	yes		economy, technology companies
4langeles_20110628_30	Los Angeles	Studio City	101 corridor	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_31		Santa Monica, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_32				no	no		
4langeles_20110628_33	Los Angeles	Bellflower, Downey, keep SE Vernon City, Huntington Park, Maywood, Bell, Cudahy, South Gate, Bell Gardens, Boyle Heights E LA, Commerce, Pico Union, China Town		no	yes	worked to stay together	
4langeles_20110628_34		Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_35		Reseda, Tarzana Northridge		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_37		South Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_38		South Pasadena		no	yes	value system	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_28			no			no COI with entertainment community	
4langeles_20110628_29			no				
4langeles_20110628_30	schools, shopping, education, parks, institutions		no			no COI with LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles_20110628_31			no			environmental policies, watersheds, park budgets, time consuming	
4langeles_20110628_32			no				attached letter regarding San Pedro
4langeles_20110628_33	needs, representatives		no				
4langeles_20110628_34	need single official		no				
4langeles_20110628_35			no				look to Neighborhood Council
4langeles_20110628_37			no				
4langeles_20110628_38	lose voice		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_39	6282011	Harry Schwartz	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills in Santa Monica MountainsBay-Westside district. Do not place with Malibu to Kern County line
4langeles_20110628_40	6282011	David Plenn, Owner	yes	The Dinosaur Farm	South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split S. Pasadena, keep with Pasadena
4langeles_20110628_41	6282011	Rosi Dagit	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Monica Mountains district. Keep Topanga Creek watershed in one district.
4langeles_20110628_42	6282011	Tracy Green and Henry Moravec	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena into two districts
4langeles_20110628_43	6282011	Peter Manzo, President CEO	yes	United Ways of California	South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Pasadena whole within one district
4langeles_20110628_44	6282011	R. Leddy	no				yes	Do not split South pasadena.
4langeles_20110628_45	6282011	Marian Sunabe	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena in half.
4langeles_20110628_46	6282011	Deb McCurdy	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena in half, do not put with other cities.
4langeles_20110628_47	6282011	Lauren Black	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split South Pasadena
4langeles_20110628_48	6282011	Kathy Hassett	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City. Keep with 101 corridor. Nest TOSMM and WSSM
4langeles_20110628_49	6282011	Allan and Lisa Sarkin	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City in one district and place with COIs
4langeles_20110628_50	6282011	Jerry Clebanoff	no			Los Angeles	yes	Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley district
4langeles_20110628_51	6282011	Marylin Krell, president	yes	SBRA	Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood and VA in same district whole
4langeles_20110628_52	6282011	Unai Montes-Irueste	yes	Alliance for a Better Community	Pico Union	Los Angeles	yes	Redraw lines for Pico Union
4langeles_20110628_53	6282011	Ann Telling	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not split Thousand Oaks, do not put with LA county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_39	Kern	Agoura Hills, Santa Monica, Malibu	County Line	no	yes	history, planning	conservation
4langeles_20110628_40		South Pasadena, Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_41		Topanga, Santa Monica,		no	yes		functional watershed
4langeles_20110628_42		South Pasadena		no	yes	small town	work
4langeles_20110628_43		South Pasadena		no	yes	tight knit	
4langeles_20110628_44		South Pasadena		no	yes	small community	
4langeles_20110628_45		South Pasadena		no	yes	small community	
4langeles_20110628_46		South Pasadena		no	yes	small community	
4langeles_20110628_47		South Pasadena		no	yes	small community	
4langeles_20110628_48		Studio City	101	no	yes	schools, shopping, parks, institutions	education, parks, highways
4langeles_20110628_49		Studio City		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_50		Aguora Hills, Westlaake Village		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_51		Brentwood		no	yes	VA	
4langeles_20110628_52		Pico Union		no	yes	Latino population, populations, housing	housing, small businesses, work opportunities
4langeles_20110628_53	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_39	cultural and educational COI, compact, coastal		no			no shared school, transport corridors, water, heritage, interests	
4langeles_20110628_40			no				
4langeles_20110628_41	transport corridors, schools, water, cultural, Parks		no				
4langeles_20110628_42	geographical proximity, schools		no				
4langeles_20110628_43	school district, housing, 710 freeway		no				
4langeles_20110628_44			no				
4langeles_20110628_45	representative		no				
4langeles_20110628_46			no				
4langeles_20110628_47			no				
4langeles_20110628_48			no				
4langeles_20110628_49			no				
4langeles_20110628_50	schools,		no				
4langeles_20110628_51			no				
4langeles_20110628_52		VRA prohibits disenfranchisement	no				
4langeles_20110628_53			no			nothing in common with SFV	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_54	6282011	Mr and Mrs Selwyn Joffe and Family	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split 90049 in two.
4langeles_20110628_55	6282011	Irene Tovar	no		Mission Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Remove Sunland, Tujunga, Las Tuna Cyn from San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110628_56	6272011	Charlie Woo, Chair	yes	CAUSE			yes	Expand east the SD LAWSG. Keep South Bay Cities together
4langeles_20110628_57	6282011	David M. Brown	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Draw districts for Ventura County with Freeway in mind. Las Virgenes area is COI. Do not separate Calabasas
4langeles_20110628_58	6282011	Arlene E. Bernholtz	yes	Calabasas Historical Society	Westhills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Calabasas, Agoura hills, Malibu and Woodland Hills together, not Santa Clarita and Kern County
4langeles_20110628_59	6282011	Larry Van Norstran, Mayor	yes	City of Lakewood	Lakewood	Los Angeles	yes	Put Lakewood in Downey-Lakewood Assembly District
4langeles_20110628_60	6282011	Marta Evry, Community Organizerr	no				yes	Do not separate Marina del Rey from Ballona wetlands
4langeles_20110628_61	6282011	Nancy Eisenhart	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Give San Fernando Valley its own district
4langeles_20110628_62	6282011	Larry Bowman	no				yes	ESFVC should stay together and not be with Sherman OaksEncino.
4langeles_20110628_63	6282011	Susan Bukowski	no			Los Angeles	yes	Go with VICA plan for districts, but add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to WSFVC distrtict
4langeles_20110628_64	6282011	Michael J. Kaiser	no		Porter Ranch	Los Angeles	yes	Go with VICA plan for districts, but add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to WSFVC distrtict
4langeles_20110628_65	6282011	June Burlingame Smith	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split San Pedro and Wilmington, LA Harbor

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_54	Los Angeles			no	yes	VA	
4langeles_20110628_55	Los Angeles	Sunland, Tujunga, Las Tunas Canyon		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_56	Los Angeles			no	yes	Asian population	
4langeles_20110628_57	Ventura	Calabasas, Las Virgenes	Ventura Freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_58	LA, Kern	Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Malibu, Woodland Hills		no	yes	historical continuity	
4langeles_20110628_59		Lakewood		no	yes	bedroom communities,	lower densities, local economic and transportation interests
4langeles_20110628_60		Marina Del Rey		no	yes		water issues
4langeles_20110628_61		Woodland Hills		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_62		Sherman Oaks, Encino	405 freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_63		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes	small cities	
4langeles_20110628_64		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes	small cities	
4langeles_20110628_65	Los Angeles	San Pedro, Wilmington, LA Harbor		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_54			no				
4langeles_20110628_55		MALEF and CAA maps best reflect VRA critera	no			rural vs. Latino area	
4langeles_20110628_56	geographic essence		no				
4langeles_20110628_57	water, school, districts		no				other attached comments
4langeles_20110628_58	water, schools		no				
4langeles_20110628_59			no				attached proposal
4langeles_20110628_60	water quality concerns		no				
4langeles_20110628_61	geography, weather, industry, university, shopping		no				
4langeles_20110628_62	Schools, Hospital, Airport		no				cannot read pdfs
4langeles_20110628_63	schools		no				VICA
4langeles_20110628_64	schools, 101 corridor		no				VICA
4langeles_20110628_65	economic, social, political nexus		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_66	6282011	Richard Bloom, Mayor	yes	City of Santa Monica	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Use West Side -Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks- Santa Monica Mountains as a nest for senate districts
4langeles_20110628_67	6282011	Carol Gilbergt	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Put Brentwood Glen and Brentwood in same district
4langeles_20110628_68	6282011	Elisa de Dios	no			Los Angeles	yes	District 30 should include Lynwood, Downey, Paramount, Bellflower, Maywood, Vernon, Monterey park, not South El Monte, Whittier and La Mirada
4langeles_20110628_69	6282011	Renne and Bruce Bilson	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City. Keep with 101 freeway. Use West Side -Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks- Santa Monica Mountains as a nest for senate districts
4langeles_20110628_70	6282011	Diane Wallace	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Include Westwood and Brentwood in LAPVB district. Include wetlands, and Marina Del Rey in PVBCAD.
4langeles_20110628_71	6282011	Steve Hirsh	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City whole
4langeles_20110628_72	6282011	Anita Hirsh	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City whole, Nest Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains with West Side santa Monica districts
4langeles_20110628_74	6282011	Judy Jordan	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not cut Las Virgenes in half.
4langeles_20110628_75	6282011	Roberto Uranga	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110628_76	6282011	D. Wong	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide LA chinatown into three districts
4langeles_20110628_77	6282011	Kimberly and Derek Gustafson	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not combine Calabasas with Santa Clarita Valley. Keep SMMNRA in same district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_66		Santa Monica, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	quality of life	
4langeles_20110628_67		Brentwood Glen, Brentwood		no	yes	identity, interests,	Veterans Administration
4langeles_20110628_68	Los Angeles	Lynwood, Downey, Paramount, Bellflower, Maywood, Vernon, Monterey park, not South El Monte, Whittier and La Mirada		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_69		Studio City, Santa Monica		no	yes	shopping	schools, education, parks, institutions
4langeles_20110628_70		Westwood, Brentwood, Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_71		Studio City	Ventura Boulevard	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_72		Studio City, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_74		Las Virgenes		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_75				no	yes	Latino population, Asian population	
4langeles_20110628_76		Los Angeles	Chinatown	yes	yes	Ethnic groups	
4langeles_20110628_77		Calabasas, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_66	environnmental, traffic, Light Rail project, eployment, advocacy		no			Malibu, etc too far	
4langeles_20110628_67			no				
4langeles_20110628_68			no				
4langeles_20110628_69			no				
4langeles_20110628_70	environmental issues, wetlands, pollution		no				
4langeles_20110628_71	history, parks, schools, shopping		no				
4langeles_20110628_72	schools, shopping, parks, education		no				
4langeles_20110628_74	school district, water, Santa Monica Mountains		no			do not put with Santa Clarita Valley	
4langeles_20110628_75		current bounndaries violate section 2 of VRA	no				
4langeles_20110628_76			no				
4langeles_20110628_77			no			do not align school systems, water districts, geo corridors, mountain communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_78	6282011	Chris Applequist, PE	yes	Port of Long Beach	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Long Beach
4langeles_20110628_79	6282011	Janet Turner, Chairman	yes	Pacific Palisades Community Council	Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Use West Side Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains as a nest for Senate District.
4langeles_20110628_80	6282011	Sue Castillo	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep LA waterfront, port of LA, and San Pedro together
4langeles_20110628_81	6282011	George I Thompson	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pedro intact
4langeles_20110628_82	6282011	Peter R. Danckert	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not join Calabasas with Santa Clarita. Keep SMM together.
4langeles_20110628_83	6282011	Anne-Marie Jones, Director	yes	Center for Healthy Communities	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Include all of Chinatown LA in one district
4langeles_20110628_84	6282011	Debbie Neal	no				yes	Do not split Glendora, do not place with Baldwin Park
4langeles_20110628_85	6282011	Sandy Hathcock	no				yes	Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando District
4langeles_20110628_86	6282011	Wayne Kerbaugh	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Keep westchester intact and with other South Bay Cities
4langeles_20110628_87	6282011	Patricia Verdi	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Chatsworth with Santa Clarita. Shift district to like communities of Santa Clarita Valley, Ventura County, San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110628_88	6282011	Munir Jojo-Verge	no				yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley together with 101 corridor
4langeles_20110628_89	6282011	Christopher Kissick	no		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Do not connect Santa clarita with Malibu. Include Thousand Oaks wholly
4langeles_20110628_90	6282011	Guoqing Wang	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley together with 101 corridor.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_78		Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_79		Santa Monica, Thousand Oaks	405, 101	no	yes	close knit community	
4langeles_20110628_80	Los Angeles	LA Waterfront, Port of LA, San Pedro		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_81		San Pedro		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_82		Calabasas, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_83		Los Angeles		yes	yes	Asian population, history, health outcomes	
4langeles_20110628_84		Glendora, Baldwin Park		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_85		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_86		Westchester		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_87	Ventura	Chatworth, Santa Clarita,		no	yes	suburban cities,	
4langeles_20110628_88		San Fernando Valley	101	no	yes		high tech research and develoment, aerospace
4langeles_20110628_89		Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_90		San Fernando Valley	101	no	yes		aerospace and technology

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_78			no				
4langeles_20110628_79	councils, challenges		no				attached map
4langeles_20110628_80	interest in port affairs, projects, geography, nearby		no				
4langeles_20110628_81			no				
4langeles_20110628_82			no			divergent educational, environmental, socio-cultural concerns	
4langeles_20110628_83			no				
4langeles_20110628_84			no			Crime vs. no crime, no commonalities	
4langeles_20110628_85			no				
4langeles_20110628_86	neighborhood council, educational levels, age, incomes		no				
4langeles_20110628_87			no				
4langeles_20110628_88			no				
4langeles_20110628_89			no				
4langeles_20110628_90			no			different from fashionable industries	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_91	6282011	Martin A. C. EnriquezMarquez	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena and Altadena together preserving 210 freeway
4langeles_20110628_92	6282011	Varoujan Sarkissian	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley with Agoura hills and Westlake Village
4langeles_20110628_93	6282011	Alberto Lopez	no			Los Angeles	yes	Agoura hills and Westlake Village should be with Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Chatworth, Northridge, Granada Hills
4langeles_20110628_94	6282011	Norman and Cynthia Harris	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Newhall in Santa Clarita Valley
4langeles_20110628_95	6282011	Linda Wah	no		San Marino	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split San Marino and South Pasadena
4langeles_20110628_96	6282011		yes	Torrance Police Officers Association	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Torrance whole and with other beach cities
4langeles_20110628_97	6282011	Kellie Kozonis	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Kagel Canyon - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - La Tuna Canyon - Sunland-Tujunga, Crescenta - Montrose - La Canada-Flintridge - Glendale - Burbank together.
4langeles_20110628_98	6282011	Judy Heredia	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley together with Agoura Hills and Westlake village, do not include entertainment communities.
4langeles_20110628_99	6282011	Demian Casey	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley together with Agoura Hills and Westlake village
4langeles_20110628_100	6282011	Mia Locks	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide LA Chinatown
4langeles_20110628_101	6282011		yes	Torrance Police Officers Association	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Torrance whole and with other beach cities, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_91		Pasadena, altadena	210 fwy	no	yes	Latino population,	economical dominant
4langeles_20110628_92		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes		aerospace and technology jobs, defense jobs
4langeles_20110628_93		Agoura hills and Westlake Village, Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Chatworth, Northridge, Granada Hills		no	yes		aerospace, defense, technology companies
4langeles_20110628_94		Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	yes	strong community ties	
4langeles_20110628_95		San Marino, South Pasadena		no	yes	mis of ethnic and economic communities	
4langeles_20110628_96		Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_97		Kagel Canyon - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - La Tuna Canyon - Sunland-Tujunga, Crescenta - Montrose - La Canada-Flintridge - Glendale - Burbank		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_98		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes		aerospace technology, tax credits
4langeles_20110628_99		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes		aerospace defense, high technology jobs,
4langeles_20110628_100	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes	historical, vibrant	
4langeles_20110628_101		Torrance, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_91			no			do not split	
4langeles_20110628_92			no			do not put with entertainment based communities	
4langeles_20110628_93			no				
4langeles_20110628_94			no				
4langeles_20110628_95			no				
4langeles_20110628_96			no				
4langeles_20110628_97	income, education, housing, tranport, history, environment, wildlife, watershed, 210, colleges, shopping, jobs		no				
4langeles_20110628_98			no			entertainment communities will be distraction to congress	
4langeles_20110628_99			no				
4langeles_20110628_100	cohesive voice		no				
4langeles_20110628_101			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_102	6282011	John Stinson	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up San Pedro and the harbor
4langeles_20110628_103	6282011	Jerry Orelmann	no		Hollyglen	Los Angeles	yes	Put Hollyglen, Hawthorne with El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Torrance
4langeles_20110628_104	6282011	Gil Dembo	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Use West Side Santa Monica and Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains as a nest for Senate District.
4langeles_20110628_106	6282011	Laurence Hilliard	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Place Carson, Compton, Signal Hills, and Long beach regions west to Port of Long Beach in same district
4langeles_20110628_107	6282011	Ophelia Hilliard	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Place Carson, Compton, Signal Hills, and Long beach regions west to Port of Long Beach in same district
4langeles_20110628_108	6282011	Nancy and Gary Freedman	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood from Mullholland to Wilshire and the 405 together.
4langeles_20110628_109	6282011	Eduardo Duran	no		Santa Fe Springs	Los Angeles	yes	Put Santa Fe Springs, Los Nietos, Montebello and Pico Rivera together
4langeles_20110628_110	6282011	Sue Herbers, CMC	yes	City of Torrance	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Torrance.
4langeles_20110628_111	6282011	Andrea Callanta	no			Los Angeles	yes	Omit Sherman oaks and Studio City from San Fernando Valley, keep with 101
4langeles_20110628_112	6282011	Alexandria Martin	no			Los Angeles	yes	Omit Sherman oaks and Studio City from San Fernando Valley, keep with 101
4langeles_20110628_113	6282011	Tim Kenny	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include with San Fern, Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_102		San Pedro		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_103		Hollyglen, Hawthorne with El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Torrance	405 freeway	no	yes	everything in common	
4langeles_20110628_104		Santa Monica, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	mountains and parks	
4langeles_20110628_106		Carson, Compton, Signal Hills, Long Beach, Port of Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_107		Carson, Compton, Signal Hills, Long Beach, Port of Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_108		Brentwood	Mulholland, Wilshire, 405	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_109		Santa Fe Springs, Los Nietos, Montebello and Pico Rivera		no	yes	historical value,	
4langeles_20110628_110		Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_111		Sherman Oaks, Studio City, San Fernando	101	no	yes		aerospace and tech companies, R and D tax credit
4langeles_20110628_112		Sherman Oaks, Studio City, San Fernando	101	no	yes		aerospace and tech companies, R and D tax credit
4langeles_20110628_113		San Fern, Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake	101	no	yes		tech companies

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_102			no				
4langeles_20110628_103			no			nothing in common with east of 405	
4langeles_20110628_104	homeowner assns, community and neighborhood councils		no				
4langeles_20110628_106	truck traffic, Rail traffic, pollutants, health		no				
4langeles_20110628_107	transportation, employment		no				
4langeles_20110628_108	community connection		no				
4langeles_20110628_109	schools, parks, libraries, centers		no				
4langeles_20110628_110			no			representation, voting	
4langeles_20110628_111			no				
4langeles_20110628_112			no				
4langeles_20110628_113			no			do not put with entertainment communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_114	6282011	Kim Bodner Drobny	no		Mar Vista	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Marina del Rey from Ballona Creek
4langeles_20110628_115	6282011	Kara McLeod	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split San Pedro in half.
4langeles_20110628_116	6282011	James Johnson, Councilmember	yes	7th district	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach together
4langeles_20110628_117	6282011	Charles Michel Deemer	no				yes	Assembly seat should include Catalina Island, Palos Verdes, El Segundo, Gardena, Hermosa Beach, Lawndale, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach and Torrance.
4langeles_20110628_118	6282011	Paul H. Johnson	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Malibu finger should be in Thousand Oaks santa Monica Mtn, Cut Westlake Village from EASTVENT
4langeles_20110628_119	6282011	Julie H. Kim	no		La Palma	Orange	yes	Place La Palma into district with Orange county
4langeles_20110628_105	6282011	Charles Sie	no				yes	Bring together cities of Souuth Bay, Expand SD LA West San Gabriel East, including Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, Chino Hills, Walnut
4langeles_20110628_120	6282011	Gemma Jimenez	no				yes	Put Pico Union, Koreatown, Harvard heights in own Latino district
4langeles_20110628_121	6282011	Bob Holmes	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Place Beach Cities, El Segundo and Westchester, Playa del Rey in same district, not with Gardena, etc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_114		Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_115		San Pedro	Gaffey, Pacific	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_116		Long Beach		no	yes	shopping, parks,	professional life
4langeles_20110628_117		Catalina Island, Palos Verdes, El Segundo, Gardena, Hermosa Beach, Lawndale, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach and Torrance.		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_118		Thousand Oaks, Malibu		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_119	Orange	La Palma		no	yes	small city, common interests	
4langeles_20110628_105		Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, Chino Hills, Walnut, San Gabriel		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_120	Los Angeles	Pico Union, Koreatown, Harvard Heights		no	yes	Latino population	
4langeles_20110628_121		Beach Cities, El Segundo, Westchester, Gardena		no	yes		LA international airport

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_114	water quality issues, treatment plant, pollutions		no				
4langeles_20110628_115	housing projects, damaging to historic district		no				
4langeles_20110628_116	common identity,		no				
4langeles_20110628_117			no				
4langeles_20110628_118			no				
4langeles_20110628_119	school districts, bonds		no				
4langeles_20110628_105			no				
4langeles_20110628_120		maps do not provide sufficient opportunities for Latinos	no				
4langeles_20110628_121			no			other cities have different issues	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_122	6282011	Gita Temelkova	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include with San Fern, Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake
4langeles_20110628_123	6282011	Dianne C. Barker	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Calabasas with Santa Clarita Valley
4langeles_20110628_124	6282011	Marc Saltzberg	no		Marina del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Do not exclude Wimington from PVEBC.Do not split Ballona wetlands. Do not put Torrance with Inglewood
4langeles_20110628_125	6282011	Dirk L. Hudson	no				yes	Arcadia, Monrovia, Sierra Madre, San Marino and Pasadena all together
4langeles_20110628_126	6282011	John Wesley Powell	no				yes	Keep Tujunga Watershed district together.
4langeles_20110628_127	6282011	Marta Evry, Community Organizer	no				yes	Incorporate all of Marina del Ray in the 53rd
4langeles_20110628_128	6282011	Vince Yu, Mayor	yes	Temple City	Temple City	Los Angeles	yes	Maintain lines for CD E San Gabriel Valley Diamond Bar and AD West San Gabriel Valley. Expland east SD LA W San Gabriel. Keep boundaried for CD Palos Verdes Estates Beach Cities
4langeles_20110628_129	6282011	Lynne Haigh	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Supports SMMBay-Westside Senate district
4langeles_20110628_130	6282011	Maria Norvell	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Carson, Compton and Long Beach to Port together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_122		San Fern, Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake	101	no	yes		tech companies
4langeles_20110628_123		Calabasas, Santa Clarita	405, 5	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_124		Torrance, Inglewood, Wilmington		no	yes		LAX,
4langeles_20110628_125		Arcadia, Monrovia, Sierra Madre, San Marino and Pasaden		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_126		Tujunga	watershed	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_127		Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_128		San Gabriel, LA, Palos Verdes, Beach Cities		no	yes	Asian Pacific Islander Americans	
4langeles_20110628_129		Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_130		Carson, Compton, Long Beach		no	yes	ehnic communities, Samoan, Cambodians, African Americans, Latinos	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_122			no				
4langeles_20110628_123	watershed, transportation with Malibu and Santa Monica		no			no issues with inland	
4langeles_20110628_124	proximity, tourist based economies, jobs, transit, air and water quality of port of LA		no				
4langeles_20110628_125	geographic		no			do not divide cities, or use ethnic categories as communities	
4langeles_20110628_126	watershed is own community		no				see attached plan and maps
4langeles_20110628_127	water quality, pollution problems,		no				
4langeles_20110628_128			no				
4langeles_20110628_129	geographically succinct, coastal, tranport corridors		no			no shared interests with Malibu, Santa Clarita, Kern County	
4langeles_20110628_130			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_131	6282011	George Maranon and Melanie Gullett	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110628_132	6282011	Vicki Sanchez	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not include W LA with East
4langeles_20110628_133	6282011	Ava Spam	no			Los Angeles	yes	WestlakeAgoura Hills should be with Northridge.
4langeles_20110628_134	6282011	Garrett Gary Maynard	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Carson, Compton, Long Beach, Port, together
4langeles_20110628_135	6282011	Andy Raymond	yes	South Brentwood Residents Association	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood at San Vicente.
4langeles_20110628_136	6282011	Aide Castro, Mayor	yes	City of Lynwood	Lynwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Lynwood
4langeles_20110628_137	6282011	Marta Evry (duplicate)	no				yes	Incorporate all of Marina del Ray in the 53rd
4langeles_20110628_139	6282011	Alastair Shearman	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Put all of Studio City in one district
4langeles_20110628_140	6282011	Jessica Li	no				yes	Maintain lines for CD E San Gabriel Valley Diamond Bar and AD West San Gabriel Valley. Expland east SD LA W San Gabriel. Keep boundaried for CD Palos Verdes Estates Beach Cities
4langeles_20110628_141	6282011	Virgia Wade	no				yes	Keep Carson, Compton, Long Beach, Port of Long Beach together
4langeles_20110628_142	6282011	Garland Byrum	no		Claremont	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Claremont with La Canada, not San Bernardino

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_131		Brentwood		no	yes		VA
4langeles_20110628_132		Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_133		Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Northridge	101	no	yes		r and d tax credit, aerospace and tech companies
4langeles_20110628_134		Carson, Compton, Long Beach, Port		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_135		Brentwood	San Vincente	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_136		Lynwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_137		Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_139		Studio City		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_140		San Gabriel, LA, Palos Verdes, Beach Cities		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_141		Carson, Compton, Long Beach, Port of Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_142	San Bernardinno	Claremont, La Canada	210 fwy	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_131			no				
4langeles_20110628_132			no			would disenfranchise, include with high crime, poverty area	
4langeles_20110628_133			no				
4langeles_20110628_134	transportation mode, corridor ties, cargo trucks		no				
4langeles_20110628_135	VA		no				
4langeles_20110628_136	schools,		no				
4langeles_20110628_137	water quality, pollution problems,		no				
4langeles_20110628_139			no				
4langeles_20110628_140			no				
4langeles_20110628_141	freeway and railway tranportation corridors, traffic		no				
4langeles_20110628_142	high PHD numbers	would me VRA for heavily asian american	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_143	6282011	Joyce Brody, President	yes	Democrats for Neighborhood Action		Los Angeles	yes	City Terrace and E LA should not be in 43rd district
4langeles_20110628_144	6282011	Roy Yamamoto	no			Los Angeles	yes	Take out Sherman Oaks, Universal City, Put Agoura Hills and Westlake village with W SFV.
4langeles_20110628_145	6282011	Jim Cohen, Mayor	yes	City of Hidden Hills	Hidden Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Put together Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu and Westlake Village.
4langeles_20110628_146	6282011	Cliff Numark, Councilman	yes	City of Torrance	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Torrance in two, keep Torrance whole in one CD.
4langeles_20110628_147	6282011	Kevin P. McGuan, CFM, VP	yes	Merril Lynch	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach should be one district only
4langeles_20110628_148	6282011	Andrew Chiang	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include Westlake Village Agoura Hills with Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas
4langeles_20110628_149	6282011	Howard Marsden	no				yes	Keep Newhall with Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110628_150	6282011	Tiffany Limtanakool	no			Los Angeles	yes	Take SE San fernando valley out of W San Fernando Valley. Add Agoura Hills, Westlake Village
4langeles_20110628_151	6282011	Edward Pevzner	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley together with 101. Take out Beverly Hills, Universal City.
4langeles_20110628_152	6282011	Maureen Sie	no				yes	Maintain lines for CD E San Gabriel Valley Diamond Bar and AD West San Gabriel Valley. Expland east SD LA W San Gabriel. Keep boundaried for CD Palos Verdes Estates Beach Cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_143		City Terrace, East LA	sunset blvd, 101 fwy	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110628_144		Sherman Oaks, Universal City, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	no		aerospacedefense
4langeles_20110628_145		Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu and Westlake Village.		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_146		Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_147		Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_148		Westlake Village Agoura Hills with Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas		no	yes		aerospace, high technology, similar interests, defense
4langeles_20110628_149		Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_150		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village	up to county line	no	yes		technology, aerospacedefense, high technology
4langeles_20110628_151		Beverly Hills, Universal City		no	yes		technology, aerospacedefense, high technology
4langeles_20110628_152		San Gabriel, LA, Palos Verdes, Beach Cities		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_143			no			too far away to be COI	
4langeles_20110628_144			no			vs. entertainment	
4langeles_20110628_145	public safety, water quality, emergency, education, transport, traffic		no				
4langeles_20110628_146	city together, representation, geographic integrity		no				
4langeles_20110628_147			no				
4langeles_20110628_148			no				job market is tough
4langeles_20110628_149			no				
4langeles_20110628_150			no			not entertainment	
4langeles_20110628_151			no			not entertainment	
4langeles_20110628_152			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_153	6282011	Mike Bonin	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Ballona, keep with Marina Del Rey
4langeles_20110628_154	6282011	Rene Bobadilla, PE, City Manager	yes	City of El Monte	El Monte	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide El Monte, keep in one district
4langeles_20110628_155	6282011	Kyle Hamilton Orlemann	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Place Hawthone with other Beach Cities
4langeles_20110628_156	6282011	Raul Tano, President	yes	Latino Coalition of Los Angeles		Los Angeles	yes	
4langeles_20110628_157	6282011	Laura Santos	no		Bassett	Los Angeles	yes	Move Avocado Heights into district with rest of BUSD. Put Santa Ana and Anaheim together. Remove Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills and La Tuna Canyon
4langeles_20110628_158	6282011	Brian	no			Los Angeles	yes	Include Granada Hills and Northridge with Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills and Westlake Village
4langeles_20110628_159	6282011	Daniel Zhu	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep W San Fernnando Valley together with 101 Corridor and take out Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Beverly Hills
4langeles_20110628_160	6282011	Peter Chen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake, together with 101 corridor. Do not include with entertainment COI.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_153		Marina del Rey, Ballona	Washington Boulevard	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_154		El Monte		no	yes	historic, hispanic,diverse	
4langeles_20110628_155		Hawthorne, Beach Cities	105, 405	no	yes		aerospace, entertainment
4langeles_20110628_156				no	yes	Latino groups, ethnic groups, historical similarities	socio economics
4langeles_20110628_157		Sunland, Santa Ana, Anaheim, Tujunga, Shadow Hills and La Tuna Canyon		no	yes	Latino communities	
4langeles_20110628_158		Granada Hills and Northridge with Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills and Westlake Village	101	no	yes		R and D tax credit, patent reforms, defense and aerospace jobs
4langeles_20110628_159		Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City, Beverly Hills	101	no	no		
4langeles_20110628_160		Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake,	101	no	yes		aviation, tech, defense

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_153	ecosystem, wastewater treatment plant, water quality, pollution		no				
4langeles_20110628_154	residential, industrial, size, land use,		no				
4langeles_20110628_155	schools, police, LAX		no				
4langeles_20110628_156	public school districts, colleges, Cal states, hiring		no				supports first draft map, supports map submitted by Latino coalition of Los Angeles
4langeles_20110628_157		commision is not following, would diminish Latino political progress	no				
4langeles_20110628_158			no				
4langeles_20110628_159			no			do not want congress distracted by allure of entertainment	
4langeles_20110628_160			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_161	6282011	Stephen Damko	no				yes	Keep Torrance together, do not take out of Palos Verdes, Beach Cities
4langeles_20110628_162	6282011	Lynn Parkinson	no				yes	Keep all SCV in Antelope Valley Santa Claita Valley district, nest SCV with E Ventura county senate
4langeles_20110628_163	6282011	John Wurtz	no			Los Angeles	yes	Take Sherman Oaks and studio City out of CD with SFV. Keep W SFV with 101 corridor.
4langeles_20110628_164	6282011	Fengling Zhuo	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep W SFV and 101 corridor intact.
4langeles_20110628_165	6282011	David L. Horne, Ph.D	yes	COBPO			yes	Return Gardena to USC 33.
4langeles_20110628_166	6282011	Glenn Bailey, VP	yes	FPSSA	Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Extend NW boundary along LAVentura county line of Santa Susana Mountains.
4langeles_20110628_167	6282011	Jason Kogan	no		Brentwood Glenn	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood at San Vincente
4langeles_20110628_168	6282011	James Johnson, Councilmember	yes	7th district	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep long beach together
4langeles_20110628_169	6282011	John Seeley	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Include Santa Monica, Venice, Marina del Rey. San Pedro and Palos Verdes are linked to Long Beach
4langeles_20110628_170	6282011	Bob Guitierrez	yes	Latino Policy Forum			yes	Re nest SLOSB and SBWVE and EVENT and LASCV
4langeles_20110628_171	6282011	Julian D. Burger	no		Wilmington	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Wilmington. Congressional district should take out Carson, include Palos Verdes and Beach Communities, Westchester

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_161		Torrance, Palos Verdes, Beach Cities	405, 110	no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_162	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_163		Sherman Oaks, Studio City, SFV,	101	no	yes		Companies in WSFV share interests with Northridge companies; aerospace and techology, economy, tax credit
4langeles_20110628_164			101	no	no		aerospace, defense, technology
4langeles_20110628_165		Gardena		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_166	LA, Ventura		santa susana mountains	no	no		
4langeles_20110628_167		Brentwood	San Vicente	no	yes	VA	
4langeles_20110628_168		Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_169		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina del Rey, San Pedro, Palos Verdes, Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_170	Ventura			no	yes	Latino population	
4langeles_20110628_171		Wilmington, Carson, Palos Verdes, Westchester		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_161	political, economic, social issues, schools, home values		no				
4langeles_20110628_162			no				
4langeles_20110628_163			no				
4langeles_20110628_164			no			not with allegedly sexier communities	
4langeles_20110628_165	common contiguity		no				
4langeles_20110628_166			no				
4langeles_20110628_167			no				
4langeles_20110628_168	work, shop, common identity		no				
4langeles_20110628_169			no				
4langeles_20110628_170			no				
4langeles_20110628_171	geography		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_172	6282011	Sean Arian (duplicate)	no		Mar Vista	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina del Rey with Ballona wetlands
4langeles_20110628_173	6282011	Lula Davis-Holmes, Councilwoman	yes	Carson	Carson	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Compton, Carson, North Long Beach and Port of Long Beach connected
4langeles_20110628_175	6282011	Rachael Stanley	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains and West Side Santa Monica districts
4langeles_20110628_176	6282011	Betty Tom Chu	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate West San Gabriel Valley From East San Gabriel Valley in SD and CD. Supports Chinese American Citizens Alliance maps.
4langeles_20110628_1	6282011	Jackie Contreras, District Director	yes	LULAC	Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Maps do not provide opportunities for Latinos in Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110628_2	6272011	James R. Bozajian, Mayor	yes	City of Calabasas	Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Include Las Virgenes-Malibu COG within district. Include Topanga in LA. Do not inlcude Santa Clarita Valley with LVM Council.
4langeles_20110628_3	6282011	Lisa Sarkin, VP	yes	Studio City Neighborhood Council Board Member	Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Studio city in same districts.
4langeles_20110628_4	6282011	Jack Neff	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area together, Keep Topanga together and group with Malibu
4langeles_20110628_5	6282011	Kim Lamorie, President	yes	LVHF		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountains together, do not put through Santa Clarita and Kern

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_172		Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_173		Compton, Caron, N Long Beach, Port of Long Beach.		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_175		Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica		no	yes	101 corridor	
4langeles_20110628_176		San Gabriel Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_1	Los Angeles	Antelope Valley		no	yes	Latino population	
4langeles_20110628_2	Los Angeles	Las Virgenes, Malibu, Topanga, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_3	Los Angeles	Studio City		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_4		Santa Monica, Topanga, Malibu		no	yes	environmental COI	
4langeles_20110628_5	Kern	Santa Monica, Santa Clarita		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_172	watersheds, water quality concerns, pollution problems		no				
4langeles_20110628_173	truck and rail traffic impacts minority communities		no				
4langeles_20110628_175	transport corridors, environmental, L.A. River, Santa Monica Mountains		no				
4langeles_20110628_176	voting, cultural, social, economic, medical, employment, education, dining, grocery, professional interests		no				
4langeles_20110628_1		maps must comply with VRA	no				
4langeles_20110628_2			no			No COI with Santa Clarita Valley	map attached
4langeles_20110628_3			no				Supports John Walker
4langeles_20110628_4	water, fire, valley vs. beach, most beautiful community in LA		no				
4langeles_20110628_5	mountains		no			No COI with Santa Clarita	attached maps

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_6	6282011	Sandra Perez	no		Diamond Bar	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Diamond Bar with Orange, keep with LA.
4langeles_20110628_7	6282011	Carole Miller	no		Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Pasadena and Altadena district.
4langeles_20110628_8	6282011	Nancy Cochran	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood
4langeles_20110628_9	6282011	Linda Ivers	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach should not be split up.
1sdiego_20110603_2	632011	Mark Skok	no			San Diego	yes	Do not split North County of San Diego into N and S or inland and costal; rather use an east-west division
1sdiego_20110605_2	652011	Murtaza H. Baxamusa	yes	VoiceOfSanDiego.org; healthcity.org		San Diego	no	
1sdiego_20110606	622011	Gary S. Rotto	yes	Director of Public Heath of the National Medical Association		San Diego	yes	Keep the neighborgoods served by the SD NMA clinic together
3orange_20110603_2	632011	Robert J. Apodaca	yes	United Latinos Vote		Orange	yes	Reconsider the joining of Santa Ana and Newport as a coastal city
3orange_20110607	682011	Thuy Hoang	yes			Orange	yes	Do not divide voting block for Vietnamese community with new map. Keep Little Saigon whole as it is in June 2 map.
4langeles_20110606	662011	Scott Wilk	no			LA	yes	Aqua Dulce needs to be added to the AD to keep the SCV whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_6	Orange, Los Angeles	Diamond Bar		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_7	LA, San Bernardino	Pasadena, Altadena		no	yes	bus, metro line,	
4langeles_20110628_8		Brentwood		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_9		Long Beach		no	yes	large and diverse city	
1sdiego_20110603_2	North SD County, Riverside, Orange	Oceanside, San Marcos, Escondido and Vista		no	yes	Cultural and economic ties among the 78 corridor; agriculture	
1sdiego_20110605_2				no	no		
1sdiego_20110606	San Diego	Mt. Hope, Mountainview, Southcrest, Shelltown, Chollas View, Ridgeview, Webster, Oak Park, Lincoln Park, Emerald Hills, Broadway Heights, Valencia Park, Alta Vista, O Farrell Park, Skyline, North and South Encanto, North and South Bay Terrace, Jamacha		yes	yes	The uniqueness of this medical community	
3orange_20110603_2		Santa Ana and Newport	405	no	no		
3orange_20110607				yes	yes		
4langeles_20110606				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_6	taxes,		no			NO COI with orange, different schools, water, utilities, economics, interests	
4langeles_20110628_7	churches, p.o., shopping plaza, supermarketks		no				
4langeles_20110628_8			no				
4langeles_20110628_9	representation		no				
1sdiego_20110603_2			no				
1sdiego_20110605_2			no				
1sdiego_20110606			no				
3orange_20110603_2			no				
3orange_20110607			no				
4langeles_20110606			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110607	672011	Gina Peterson	no			LA	yes	Aqua Dulce needs to be added to the Santa Clarita AD to keep SCV whole
5ventura_20110605_2	652011	Greta Haggerty	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep E Ventura County in one district
5ventura_20110607	672011	Mary Ann Lockhart	no			E Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks in Ventura not LA
6stanislaus_20110604	642011	Sharon Silva	yes	CEO Turlock Chamber of Commerce	Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Same SD, AD, and CD as those communities along the Hwy 99 corridor
6stanislaus_20110607	682011	Clark Hulbert	no			Stanislaus	yes	Keep Turlock within the SD 12 region
7monterey_20110606	672011	Vicki Williams	no			Monterey	yes	Do not include Santa Barbara and Ventura in Monterey
7sclara_20110606	662011	Judith	no			S Clara	yes	Do not separate Los Gatos and Saratoga
7sclara_20110607	672011	William Becker	no			S Clara	yes	Districtt 15 should be more compact to avoid gerrymandering
8alameda_20110604_2	642011	Catherine Kavasch	no		San Lorenzo	Alameda	yes	Keep the TriCities together
8alameda_20110605	652011	William Spicer	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont with San Jose not Oakland
8alameda_20110605_2	652011	Drag Dutina	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Do not change current district boundaries
8alameda_20110606	652011	Rob Wilcox	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont Whole
8alameda_20110607	672011	Aref Aziz	no			Alameda	yes	Keep Tri-Cities together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110607				no	no		
5ventura_20110605_2	Ventura	E Ventura County, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks and Camarillo		no	no		
5ventura_20110607	Ventura, LA	Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
6stanislaus_20110604	Stanislaus	Turlock	Hwy 99	no	yes	Transportation and business ties along Hwy 99	
6stanislaus_20110607	Stanislaus	Turlock		no	yes	Transportation, jobs, commerce, and goods and services	
7monterey_20110606				no	yes	Protect Monterey Sanctuary interests	
7sclara_20110606				no	yes	Share joint eventsactivities and competing high schools	
7sclara_20110607				no	no		
8alameda_20110604_2		Fremont, San Jose, Haward, Newark, and Union City	I-880	no	yes	South Asian community	
8alameda_20110605	Alameda	Fremont, San Jose, Oakland		no	no		
8alameda_20110605_2	Alameda			no	no		
8alameda_20110606	Alameda, Santa Clara	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110607	Alameda	Fremont, Union City, Newark, Hayward, Castro Valley, Ashland, Castro Valley, and San Lorenzo	I-880	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110607			no				
5ventura_20110605_2			no				
5ventura_20110607			no				
6stanislaus_20110604			no				
6stanislaus_20110607			no				
7monterey_20110606			no				
7sclara_20110606			no				
7sclara_20110607			no				
8alameda_20110604_2		Moving Fremont would violate the VRA	no				
8alameda_20110605			no				
8alameda_20110605_2			no				
8alameda_20110606			no				
8alameda_20110607			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110607	682011	Arlene Reed	no			C Costa	yes	Diablo should become combined with the areas of Orinda, Lafayette, Walnut Creek, and San Ramon
8marin_20110603	632011	Rita Johnson	no			Marin	yes	Do not lump Marin with SF or any other E Bay community; if needed place with Sonoma or Napa
8marin_20110607	672011	Robert Smoke	no			Marin	yes	Put Marin and Sonoma in one district but not Mendocino
8napa_20110605_2	652011	Bella Ramos Bennett	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep Napa County intact
8napa_20110607	672011	Honeylou Madayag	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Keep American Canyon in Napa
8smateo_20110606	662011	Mike Sullivan	no			San Mateo	no	
8sonoma_20110604_2	642011	Barbara Ritter	no			Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma and Marin together
8sonoma_20110605	652011	Mike Healy	yes	Petaluma Councilmembet	Petaluma	Sonoma	yes	Move Lake County and place it in the North Coast district rather than Santa Rosa- Napa
9edorado_20110606	662011	Brenda Bailey	yes	El Dorado County Board of Supervisors		El Dorado	no	
9humboldt_20110603_2	632011	John Gaffin	no			Humboldt	yes	Do not change district boundaries along Hwy 101 to the E-W orientation
9humboldt_20110604	642011	Timonthy Howard	no			Humboldt	yes	Keep Humboldt County the same
9humboldt_20110606	662011	Aaron Newman	no			Humboldt	yes	Do not combine Humboldt with Marin
9sacramento_20110605	662011	Nina Weiler-Harwell	no		Rosemont	Sacramento	yes	Keep Rosemont with the rest of Sac Co
9yolo_20110606	662011	Rebecca Challender	no		Woodland	Yolo	yes	Do not subdivize Woodland

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110607				no	no		
8marin_20110603			Bay and Golden Gate bridges	no	no		
8marin_20110607	Mendocino, Marin, and Sonoma			no	no		
8napa_20110605_2		American Canyon		no	yes		Wine industry
8napa_20110607	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8smateo_20110606				no	no		
8sonoma_20110604_2				no	no		
8sonoma_20110605				no	no		
9edorado_20110606				no	no		
9humboldt_20110603_2	Humboldt	Eureka	Hwy 101	no	no		
9humboldt_20110604	Humboldt			no	no		
9humboldt_20110606		Fort Bragg, Eureka, Crescent City		no	yes	Fishing and different coastal needs	
9sacramento_20110605	Sacramento	Rosemont, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova		no	yes	School district	
9yolo_20110606	Yolo	Woodland		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110607			no				
8marin_20110603		Sierra Club plan violates VRA	no				
8marin_20110607			no				
8napa_20110605_2			no				
8napa_20110607			no				
8smateo_20110606			no				
8sonoma_20110604_2			no				
8sonoma_20110605			no				
9edorado_20110606			no				
9humboldt_20110603_2			no				
9humboldt_20110604			no				
9humboldt_20110606			no				
9sacramento_20110605			no				
9yolo_20110606			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110601	612011	Peter Van Meter	yes	Former Sausalito Councilmember	Sausalito	Marin	no	
20110601	612011	James Wright	no		San Jose	S Clara	no	
20110601	612011	Allen Payton	yes	Chairman Contra Costa Redistricting Taskforce		C Costa	yes	Do not split Walnut Creek; No need for Hayward AD to cross the Alameda-C Costa line; Keep Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Discovery Bay together
20110601	612011	Robert M. Neff	no		Culver City	Los Angeles	yes	Concern with Section 5 and Section 2 districts treated the same (VRA); Historic African-American districts
20110602	622011	Patty O Day	yes	California Conservative Action Group	Walnut Creek	C Costa	yes	Do not split Walnut Creek
20110602	622011	Bonnie Krupp	yes	California Conservative Action Group		Sonoma	yes	Keep natural boundaries in Berkeley-Oakland hills; Not to cross Golden Gate or Bay Bridge; do not split latino community in San Jose

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110601				no	no		
20110601				no	no		
20110601	C Costa, Alameda, Solano	Walnut Creek, Hayward, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Oakley, Martinez, Pacheco, Vine Hill, Mountainview	I-680, Bay Bridge	no	no		
20110601	Los Angeles			no	yes		
20110602	C Costa	Walnut Creek, Lamorinda, Alamo, Danville	I-680	no	no		
20110602				no	no	Gerrymandering issues with other proposals from groups	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110601			no			Direction for Cohesiveness violates constitutional requirement to not include relationships with political parties when drawing the districts	
20110601			no				Meetings should be clear about what they will discuss. Meetings after final draft should only be for explanation.
20110601			no				
20110601		Section 5 and Section 2 being treated the same; Historic African-American community needs to be considered	yes				
20110602			no				
20110602			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110602_2	622011	Kerri Pearson	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Tim Plotkin	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Calabasa	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Kari Green	yes	The Coaltion of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Elaine Lin	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Ann Sarian	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Oak Park	Ventura	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Janice Gassman	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Canyon Country	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Melissa Carlson	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Dianna Boon	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110602_2	622011	Beverly J. Donley	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Westlake Village	Ventura	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_2	622011	Mary E. Toplian	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110602_3	622011	Douglas Johnson	yes	Fellow Rose Institute of State and Local Government			no	
20110603	632011	Evelyn Taibi-Richards	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Canyon County	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110603	632011	Mary Helen Martin	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110603	632011	Janice Cunningham	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110603	632011	Diana Palagyi	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representaion	Canyon Country	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110603_2	632011	Kathay Feng	yes	Exec Director, California Common Cause			no	
20110603_2	632011	Matt Munson	no		Ontario	San Bernadino	no	
20110603_2	632011	Richard D. Reddick	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_2				no	no		
20110602_3				no	no		
20110603				no	no		
20110603				no	no		
20110603				no	no		
20110603				no	no		
20110603_2				no	no		
20110603_2				no	no		
20110603_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110602_2			no				
20110602_2			no				
20110602_3			no				Please release shape, GIS files of maps not just pdfs.
20110603			no				
20110603			no				
20110603			no				
20110603			no				
20110603_2			no				
20110603_2			no				
20110603_2			no				Please keep up the transparency

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110604	642011	Adela Oseguera	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110604	642011	Bonnie Hood	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Canyon Country	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110604	642011	Jennifer Wells	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110604_2	642011	William and Bernadine Hansell	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Del Norte, Mendocino, and Humboldt share coastal interests
20110605	652011	Bonnie Mathisen	yes	California Conservative Action Group			yes	Keep natural boundaries in Berkeley-Oakland hills; Not to cross Golden Gate or Bay Bridge; do not split latino community in San Jose
20110605	652011	Polly Meyer	yes	California Conserative Action Group			yes	Keep natural boundaries in Berkeley-Oakland hills; Not to cross Golden Gate or Bay Bridge; do not split latino community in San Jose
20110605_2	652011	Barbara Drake	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation			yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110605_2	652011	Laura King	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110604				no	no		
20110604				no	no		
20110604				no	no		
20110604_2				no	no		
20110605				no	no		
20110605				no	no		
20110605_2				no	no		
20110605_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110604			no				
20110604			no				
20110604			no				
20110604_2			no				
20110605			no				
20110605			no				
20110605_2			no				
20110605_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110606	662011	Roger Horning	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110606	662011	Michele Horning	yes	The Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CSCFR; keep communities compact
20110606_2	662011	James Walters	no				no	
20110607	672011	Judy Mathat	yes	American Heritage Realty Professionals			yes	Draw lines across the state EW and use only equal population from Census tracts, taking the politics out of
20110602_4	622011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	S Clara	yes	Draw for equal populations; draw functionally contiguous districts; minimize objective geographic boundaries and communities of interest; focus on VRA 2 and 5
20110602_4	622011	Kathay Feng	yes	Exec. Director of California Common Cause			no	
20110602_4	622011	Douglas Johnson	yes	Fellow of the Rose Institute			no	
20110602_4	622011	Inoljt	no				yes	Attached maps of personal California redistricting proposal
20110602_4	622011	Carol Beswick	yes	President of Inland Action	San Bernadino	Los Angeles	no	Attached maps
20110602_4	622011	James Wright	no		San Jose	S Clara	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110606				no	no		
20110606				no	no		
20110606_2				no	no		
20110607				no	no		
20110602_4				no	no		
20110602_4				no	no		
20110602_4				no	no		
20110602_4				no	no		
20110602_4				no	no		
20110602_4				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110606			no				
20110606			no				
20110606_2			no				Transcripts from April are not on the website.
20110607			no				
20110602_4			no				
20110602_4			no				
20110602_4			no				
20110602_4			no				
20110602_4			no				
20110602_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110602_4	622011	John W. Kopp	no				no	CRC should record each time someone comments about the VRA concerning a district and make a pdf available of all comments together.
20110606_2	662011	Tony Quinn	no				no	
general_20110622_1a	6232011	Tyler Briggs	no				no	
general_20110623_1a	6232011	Devin Lavelle	no				no	
general_20110623_2a	6232011	L. Thompson	no				no	
general_20110625_1a	6252011	Warren Conklin	no				no	
general_20110627_1a	6272011	Robert Chandler	no		Ventura	Ventura	no	
general_20110627_2a	6272011	Dean Andal, Former Board of Equalization	no				yes	Do not move Ventura county into LA district, or San Fernando Valley into District 2
4langeles_20110628_1a	6292011	Ebed Corredor	no			Los Angeles	yes	keep Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, 101, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110602_4				no	no		
20110606_2				no	no		
general_20110622_1a				no	no		
general_20110623_1a				no	no		
general_20110623_2a				no	no		
general_20110625_1a				no	no		
general_20110627_1a				no	no		
general_20110627_2a				no	yes	agricultural vs urban	
4langeles_20110628_1a		Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, 101, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village	101	no	yes		patent reform, R and D tax credit, defense and aerospace jobs

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110602_4			no				CRC should record each time someone comments about the VRA concerning a district and make a pdf available of all comments together
20110606_2			no				editorial blog about first draft maps
general_20110622_1a			no				draft map looks good, hope you succeed
general_20110623_1a			no				line up with existing numbering
general_20110623_2a			no				Do not draw districts to favor specific ethnic economic groups. Also maps are small.
general_20110625_1a		work seeks to comply with the VRA and equalizing the districts,	no				no legal precedence for up to 3 percent variance
general_20110627_1a			no				Why not use a straight-edge and draw the lines where they fall
general_20110627_2a			no			violates agricultural vs. urban COI.	
4langeles_20110628_1a			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_2a	6292011	Mark Urist	no		Agoura Hills	Ventura	yes	Agoura Hills, Westlake Village should be in W San Fernando Valley district. Take out Beverly Hills, Universal City, Studio City.
4langeles_20110628_3a	6292011	Lorraine Urist	no		Agoura Hills	Ventura	yes	Agoura Hills, Westlake Village should be in W San Fernando Valley district. Take out Beverly Hills, Universal City, Studio City.
4langeles_20110628_4a	6292011	Ben Cruz	no				yes	Take out Beverly Hills, Universal City from San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110628_5a	6292011	Mark Litzer	no				yes	Do not split Reseda. Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to W San Fernando Valley.
7scruz_20110628_1a	6292011	Tom Purdy (duplicate)	no		Ben Lomond	Santa Cruz	yes	San Lorenzo Valley is part of Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110628_3a	6292011	David Keenan	no				yes	Make State senate district include Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara
7scruz_20110628_5a	6292011	Barri Boone	no				yes	Keep Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito in one district, plus San Mateo
7scruz_20110628_6a	6292011	Robert Williamson (duplicate)	no				yes	Nest 27th and 28th in with Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara
general_20110628_1a	6282011	Tim Snipes	yes	Peoples Advocate			yes	Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, nest it with East Ventura. Keep Santa Barbara County.
general_20110628_2a	6282011	Vianey Nunez, President	yes	Goldman School Latino Speaker series	Berkeley	Alameda	no	
general_20110628_3a	6282011	James B Tank	no		Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Include Davis and West Sacramento in urban district with Sacramento.
general_20110628_4a	6282011	Jeff Nibert	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	SF Bay Area

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_2a		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Beverly Hills, Universal City, Studio City, Sherman Oaks	101	no	yes		high tech and defense industry
4langeles_20110628_3a		Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Beverly Hills, Universal City, Studio City, Sherman Oaks	101	no	yes		high tech and defense industry
4langeles_20110628_4a		Beverly Hills, University City		no	yes		aerospace and technology jobs
4langeles_20110628_5a		Reseda, Agoura Hills, Westlake		no	yes		
7scruz_20110628_1a	Santa Cruz	San Lorenzo Valley		no	yes		
7scruz_20110628_3a	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Crux, Santa Clara			no	no		
7scruz_20110628_5a	Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito, San Mateo			no	no		
7scruz_20110628_6a	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and South Santa Clara			no	yes		agricultural, educational, and tourism sectors,
general_20110628_1a	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Santa Clarita		no	yes		farm worker issues
general_20110628_2a				no	yes	Latino, Latina population	
general_20110628_3a		Davis, West Sacramento		no	yes	the Delta	
general_20110628_4a				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_2a			no			do not want congress distracted by entertainment industry	
4langeles_20110628_3a			no			do not want congress distracted by entertainment industry	
4langeles_20110628_4a			no			do not want congress distracted by entertainment industry	
4langeles_20110628_5a	school districts, neighborhoods		no				Go with VICA plan for districts
7scruz_20110628_1a	most associate with		no				cannot tell from maps on website
7scruz_20110628_3a			no				
7scruz_20110628_5a			no				
7scruz_20110628_6a	governments, local media markets		no				
general_20110628_1a			no				Peoples Advocate
general_20110628_2a		place a stronger weight on VRA	no				
general_20110628_3a	water, environmental		no				
general_20110628_4a			no				pdf chart attached

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110628_5a	6282011	David Salaverry	no				no	
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_1a	6292011	Nanci B. Cowsill	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_2a	6292011	James W. Wrenn	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_3a	6292011	Suzanna Wood	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110628_5a				no	no		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_1a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_2a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_3a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110628_5a			no				
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_1a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_2a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_3a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_4a	6282011	Martha Coolidge	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_5a	6282011	Diane Dennis	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_6a	6282011	Benita Wallraff	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_4a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_5a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_6a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_4a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_5a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_6a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_7a	6282011	Kaarin Axelsen	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_8a	6282011	Michael Forester	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_9a	6282011	Deidra Vierra	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_7a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_8a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_9a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_7a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_8a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_9a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_10a	6282011	Timothy E. Vierra	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_11a	6282011	Alan Wolfson	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_12a	6282011	Judith Crown	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_10a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_11a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_12a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_10a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_11a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_12a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_13a	6282011	John Rigney	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_14a	6282011	Veronica Kelly Allen	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_15a	6282011	James Spencer	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_13a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_14a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_15a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_13a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_14a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_15a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_16a	6282011	Jo Anne McArthy	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_17a	6282011	Charles Ponce Zabalaga	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_18a	6282011	Ann Masterson	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_16a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_17a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_18a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_16a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_17a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_18a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_19a	6282011	Suzan Murphy	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_20a	6282011	Judith R. Anderson	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_21a	6282011	Mike Loperfito	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_19a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_20a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_21a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_19a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_20a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_21a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_22a	6282011	Julia K. Tarnawski	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_23a	6282011	Jill Richardson	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_24a	6282011	Carol Bingaman	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_22a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_23a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_24a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_22a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_23a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_24a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_25a	6282011	Stacey Rigney	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_26a	6282011	Ruth Stern	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_27a	6282011	Victoria Sampson	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_25a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_26a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_27a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_25a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_26a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_27a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_28a	6282011	Linda Fullerton	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_29a	6282011	Sheryl Jeffery	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_30a	6282011	Raymond Jeffery	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_28a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_29a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_30a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_28a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_29a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_30a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_31a	6282011	Debby Beck	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_32a	6282011	Melvin Murphy	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_33a	6282011	Dan Kronstadt	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_31a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_32a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_33a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_31a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_32a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_33a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_34a	6282011	Jean Traubner	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_35a	6282011	Jeanne Ouellette	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_36a	6282011	Ulla Parivar	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_34a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_35a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_36a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_34a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_35a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_36a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_37a	6282011	Ray Miller	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_38a	6282011	Janaka Perera	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_39a	6282011	Luke Manke, Victoria Colff	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_37a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_38a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_39a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_37a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_38a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_39a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_40a	6282011	Carlos George	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_41a	6282011	Roger Klemmm	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_42a	6282011	Jo Anne McArthy	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_40a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_41a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_42a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_40a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_41a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_42a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_43a	6282011	Terre Lane	no		Lake View Terrace	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_44a	6282011	Tamara Loperfito	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_45a	6282011	Ralph A. Razze	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_43a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_44a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_45a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_43a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_44a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_45a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_46a	6282011	Hoshang Parivar	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_47a	6282011	Kara Hansen	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_48a	6282011	Susan Leonard	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_46a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_47a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_48a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_46a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_47a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_48a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_49a	6282011	Michael Leonard	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_50a	6282011	Martha Blessington-Padilla	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_51a	6282011	Louis Wheeler	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_49a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_50a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_51a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_49a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_50a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_51a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_52a	6282011	Ruth Stern	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include in same district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
1imperial_20110628_7	6282011	Mary Ann LaFleur	no		Rancho Moraga	Imperial	yes	Keep Imperial county with San Diego, not with Coachella Valley.
1sdiego_20110628_56	6282011	Arlie Ricasa	yes	Sweetwater Union High School District, Board Member		San Diego	yes	Requests that the CRC adopt the maps drawn by the Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting for the San Diego area.
2riverside_20110628_51	6252011	George Miraga	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Opposes the draft maps for Coachella Valley. Concerned that draft maps disenfranchise Hispanic population. Proposes that Coachella Valley district be included with Imperial County like-communities (remove Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Hemet, San Jacinto).

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_52a		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
1imperial_20110628_7	Imperial	San Diego, Coachella		no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_56	San Diego	San Diego		no	no		
2riverside_20110628_51	Imperial	Coachella Valley, Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Hemet, San Jacinto		no	yes	Coachella Valley and Imperial County share similar jobs (solar energy, tourism), access to the Salton Sea (needs one representative due to its problematic nature), cultures of commerce, transportation infrastructures, and mediainformation systems.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110628_52a	income, education, housing, transport, historic preservation, environment, open space, rim, forest, san gabriel mountains, wildlife, watershed, hiking, colleges, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-valley flatland area	attached map
1imperial_20110628_7			no				
1sdiego_20110628_56		The maps made by CAPAFR follow the VRA.	no				Supports the following commenters at the hearing in San Diego on June 20 number 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
2riverside_20110628_51		When considering the VRA, it makes no sense to include Hemet in the Coachella Valley and not the large populations of Spanish-speaking residents in Imperial County with the Spanish-speaking communities of east and south Coachella Valley.	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_38	6282011	Zeke Hernandez	yes	League of United Latin American Citizens	Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Submits commentary and redistricting maps regarding how to properly redistrict southern California districts.
4langeles_20110628_262	6282011	Mary Ann Webster	yes	Santa Monica Mountains Task Force, Angeles Chapter, Sierra Club, Chair	Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	The Santa Monica Mountains Natioanl Recreation Area should be kept together as much as possible and not split into multople districts. Areas with larger number of park users (West LA, Santa Monica, Malibu, West San Fernando Valley) should be together.
4langeles_20110628_263	6282011		yes	Filipino American Community Coalition of San Fernando Valley	San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Reconsider the draft map of assembly district LASFE in order to keep the Filipino American community in Panorama City wholly within any final district. Submits an alternative map that adjusts this district.
4langeles_20110628_264	6282011	Lana Ford	yes	Actress and Corresponding Secretary of the Studio City Neighborhood Council	Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Consider the testimony the CRC received at the hearing, and reorganize Los Angeles to create Entertainment Industry Districts that protect the needs and interests of workers within the entertainment industry.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_38	Orange			no	yes	Orange County is united by common interests in media, television and radio, businesses and major markets, tourist attractions workforce, culture and heritage, healthcare needs, and language and housing.	
4langeles_20110628_262	Los Angeles	West LA, Santa Monica, Malibu, West San Fernando Valley	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	Because the Santa Monica Mountains Natioanal Recreation Area is a unit of the National Park System, it requires a unified base from which to elect representatives to secure federal funding.	
4langeles_20110628_263	Los Angeles	Panorama City		no	yes	Panorama City shares a common parish, school districts, cultural backgrounds, and more.	
4langeles_20110628_264	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Studio City		no	yes	Collected more than 1092 signatures that demonstrates the strength of the community of interest in the entertainment industry in Los Angeles.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_38			no				
4langeles_20110628_262			no				
4langeles_20110628_263			no				
4langeles_20110628_264			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_265	6282011	petition submitted in support of comment 7 above	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Signatures to support the creation of Entertainment Districts in Los Angeles
4langeles_20110628_266	6282011	Elaine H Klock	no		Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	Submits maps to support keeping PasadenaArcadia and BurbankGlendale interconnected and nested within a senate district.
5ventura_20110628_36	6282011	Linda Parks	yes	County of Ventura, Supervisor for the 2nd district	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Keep the entirety of Thousand Oaks with Ventura County. Supports the maps created by the Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy, which keeps Oxnard and Thousand Oaks together.
5ventura_20110628_37	6272011	Robert O Huber	yes	City of Simi Valley, Mayor	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Submits two alternative maps for Simi Valley and Moorpark within the East Ventura Congressional District. Requests that the boundaries of Simi Valley (and, to the extent possible, Ventura County) be maintained.
7sclara_20110628_1	6272011	Jacquelyn Maruhashi	yes	Asian Law Alliance, Staff Attorney	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Milpitas should not be placed by itself in an Alameda County district. San Jose should not share a district with Livermore.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_265	Los Angeles	Sherman Oaks, Studio City, North Hollywood, Universal City, Hollywood, West Hollywood, Beverly Hills.		yes	no		
4langeles_20110628_266	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Arcadia, Burbank, Glendale		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_36	Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Oxnard		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_37	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
7sclara_20110628_1	Santa Clara, Alameda	San Jose, Livermore, Milpitas		no	yes	If Milpitas is placed with Alameda County, and if San Jose is placed with Livermore, then there should be a shared and balanced interest overlap - and there is not.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_265			no				
4langeles_20110628_266			no				
5ventura_20110628_36			no				
5ventura_20110628_37			no				Concerned that one commissioner on the CRC is not neutral with respect to line-drawing.
7sclara_20110628_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110628_7	6292011	Holly O Austin	no			Del Norte	yes	Del Norte should be included with other coastal counties.
9dnorte_20110628_8	6292011	Grant Werschkull	no			Del Norte	yes	Del Norte should be included with other coast communities.
9dnorte_20110628_9	6292011	Jon Parmentier	no		Crescent City	Del Norte	yes	Pleased that Del Norte is included with other coastal counties. Concerned, however, that Marin County could be include with Del Norte districts.
9humboldt_20110628_4	6222011	Rudolph and Judith Santsche	no		Eureka	Humboldt	no	Urges CRC to change the district delineation to an EastWest configuration. Unlikely that Humboldt can be represented in a district where over half the constituents reside in urban communities.
9sacramento_20110628_26	6232011	Barbara Payne	yes	City of Galt, Mayor	Galt	Sacramento	yes	Concerned that the proposed boundaries of Galt do not respect Galt as a community of interest. Proposed boundary for the congressional district should be extended past interstate 5. Senate and Assembly districts should be extended north, east, and west.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110628_7	Del Norte			no	yes	Del Norte and other coastal communities share geography, rivers, salmon, harbors, redwood parks, tourism industries, transportation routes and Caltrans districts, cultures, educational zones, and more.	
9dnorte_20110628_8	Del Norte			no	yes	Del Norte is coastal, and there is no logical reason to include Del Norte in a district that reaches into the Central Valley.	
9dnorte_20110628_9	Del Norte, Marin			no	no		
9humboldt_20110628_4	Humboldt			no	yes	Del norte, Humboldt, and Mendocino are rural and primarily agricultural. They do not share these interests wqith Sonoma and Marin counties.	
9sacramento_20110628_26	Sacramento	Galt	Interstate 5	no	yes	Galt community is largely rural, and needs to maintain its school, chamber of commerce, historical society, and pastoral boundaries.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110628_7			no				
9dnorte_20110628_8			no				
9dnorte_20110628_9			no				
9humboldt_20110628_4			no				
9sacramento_20110628_26			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110628_27	6272011	Jeannie Bruins	yes	City of Citrus Heights, Mayor	Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Important to maintain Citrus Heights within a single Assembly and Senate district, which is mandated by Proposition 20. Current maps do not accomplish this.
9sacramento_20110628_28	6262011	Nancy Cornelius	yes	McKinley East Sacramento Neighborhood Association, President	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Concerned that the East Sacramento neighborhood has several blocks in the eastern assembly district and several in the western assembly district. Keep the neighborhood unified. Changing the line to south of Folsom and 65th street should permit this.
9siskiyou_20110628_29	6152011	Jon Lopey	yes	County of Siskiyou, Sheriff-Coroner		Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to the redistricting of Siskiyou County. Maps will result in the split of several key cities within Siskiyou, and will negatively impact the ability of residents to attend legislative hearings in the newly included coastal communities.
9siskiyou_20110628_30	6272011	Pauline Cramer	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Opposes the redistricting of Siskiyou county because it will negatively impact the keeping of dams along the Klamath River.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110628_27	Sacramento	Citrus Heights		no	yes	Citrus Heights has many common interests like unified representation and the ability to advance its interests in a cohesive and efficient manner. This is why Citrus Heights sbould be kept together in Assembly and Senate districts.	
9sacramento_20110628_28	Sacramento	Sacramento	Folsom Street, 65th Street	yes	yes	Critical that McKinley East Sacramento Neighborhood is kept with adjacent neighborhoods with similar interests.	
9siskiyou_20110628_29	Siskiyou	Fort Jones, Etna		no	yes	Siskiyou should be kept together under assembly and legislative maps because coastal communities do not understand the specific issues caused by agriculture, water rights, dam removal, endangered species, foresting, mining, recreation, and land use.	
9siskiyou_20110628_30	Siskiyou		Klamath River	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110628_27			no				
9sacramento_20110628_28			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_29			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_30			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110628_31	6282011	Theresa Naylor	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Opposes the redistricting of Siskiyou County because it has nothing in common with Humboldt.
9siskiyou_20110628_32	6252011	Earl Joling	no			Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to the redistricting of Siskiyou county. It is too far from Humboldt to be feasibly included in those districts.
9siskiyou_20110628_33	6252011	Dolores L Tozier	yes	Harold B Tozier Ranch	Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to moving the Fort Jones area of Siskiyou into the North Coast district. It is an agricultural area and should remain that way.
9siskiyou_20110628_34	6242011	Pauline Cramer	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to the redistricting of Siskiyou County to be placed with west coast communities.
9siskiyou_20110628_35	6242011	illegible signature	no		Yuka	Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to separating Siskiyou county into two separate voting districts. The districts in the I-5 corridor are vastly different from the coastal region of northern California. Do not change our voting district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110628_31	Siskiyou, Humboldt			no	yes	Siskiyou should be kept distinct from Humboldt because it has a unique way of life that centers on particular cultural attitudes regarding food, dam regulation, and its location close to Oregon.	
9siskiyou_20110628_32	Siskiyou, Humboldt			no	yes	Siskiyou is a farming and timber-oriented community that has little in common with the west coast.	
9siskiyou_20110628_33	Siskiyou	Fort Jones		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110628_34	Siskiyou			no	yes	Siskiyou has little in common with the coastal communities and residents of Siskiyou rarely travel to those communities. There are very different regulations that bind the separate communities.	
9siskiyou_20110628_35	Siskiyou		Interstate 5	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110628_31			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_32			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_33			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_34			no				
9siskiyou_20110628_35			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110628_19	6272011	James Vanderveen	no		Carmichael	Sacramento	yes	Encloses a set of proposed redistricting maps based on the 2010 census results that let 90 percent of the counties remain intact and less than 4 percent of split counties.
general_20110628_20	6252011	Bea E Gunn Phillips	no		South San Francisco	San Mateo	yes	Appreciates that the draft maps are largely contiguous with counties, zip codes, and waterschool districts. Do not draw lines by party lines.
general_20110628_21	6242011	Charles Day	yes	Toulumne County Republican Central Committee, Chairperson	Jamestown	Toulumne	yes	Recommends that the commission draw maps that recognize six major areas of California, such that they are in accordance with cultural, business, and transportation preferences. These districts can then be broken up into sub-districts.
2riverside_20110628_21	6282011	Alex Mercado(Duplicate)	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Eastern Coachella Valley with Imperial County in assembly.Indio,Indian Wells have nothing in common.Imperial has nothing in common with San Diego.
2riverside_20110628_24	6282011	Eduardo Hernandez	no				yes	Norco and Eastvale should be removed from congressional map,Perris Included in Riv-Moval district.Part of Woodcrest removed,new map include Jurupa Valley,Riverside,Moreno Valley,Perris.
2riverside_20110628_25	6282011	Luisa Uribe	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Eastern Cochella Valley with Imperial County.Indio should not be attached to cities to the west
2riverside_20110628_29	6282011	Emmanuel Marquez	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep East Coachella Valley with Imperial County.Do not attach East Coachella with West Coachella and add Imperial with San Diego. This will split Latino community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110628_19				no	no		
general_20110628_20				no	no		
general_20110628_21				no	no		
2riverside_20110628_21	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego	Indio,Indian Wells		no	yes		
2riverside_20110628_24	Riverside,Imperial	Corona,Lake Elsinore,Temecula,Riverside,Jurupa Valley,Perris		yes	yes		
2riverside_20110628_25	Riverside, Imperial	Indio		no	no		
2riverside_20110628_29	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110628_19			no				
general_20110628_20			no				
general_20110628_21			no				
2riverside_20110628_21	Keep latino population together		no				
2riverside_20110628_24	Much more in common with each other		no				
2riverside_20110628_25			no				
2riverside_20110628_29			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110628_30	6282011	Tizoc Deaztlan	no				yes	Comment contains link concerning Do not put Imperial Valley with San Diego County.
2riverside_20110628_31	6282011	Samuel H. Medrano	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Riverside with Coastal areas.RiversideImperial should not be used to fill out San Diego,Orange,Los Angeles Counties.Combine Riverside with Imperial.Create district with Imperial C.,Palo Verde Valley(Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley)and Eastern
2riverside_20110628_31	6282011	Samuel H. Medrano	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley from Palm Desert East.Second assembly district start at boundaries btw Rancho MiragePalm Desert,move west,include Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Banning,Beaumont Pass area.
2riverside_20110628_32	6282011	Elizabeth R. Toledo	yes	Riverside County Board of Education	Thermal	Riverside	yes	Do not combine Riverside with Coastal areas.RiversideImperial should not be used to fill out San Diego,Orange,Los Angeles Counties.Combine Riverside with Imperial.Create district with Imperial C.,Palo Verde Valley(Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley)and Eastern
2riverside_20110628_32	6282011	Elizabeth R. Toledo	yes	Riverside County Board of Education	Thermal	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley from Palm Desert East.Second assembly district start at boundaries btw Rancho MiragePalm Desert,move west,include Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Banning,Beaumont Pass area.
2riverside_20110628_33	6282011	Gabriel Perez	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Eastern Coachella Valley is disenfranchised.It must be included with Imperial County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110628_30	Imperial,San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_31	Imperial,Riverside,San Diego,Orange,Los Angeles	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,Banning,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley,		yes	yes	Job growth challenges,Latino Community,tourism,Agriculture,Salton Sea issues.	
2riverside_20110628_31	Imperial,Riverside,San Diego,Orange,Los Angeles	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,Banning,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley,		yes	yes	Job growth challenges,Latino Community,tourism,Agriculture,Salton Sea issues.	
2riverside_20110628_32	Imperial,Riverside,San Diego,Orange,Los Angeles	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,Banning,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley,		yes	yes	Job growth challenges,Latino Community,tourism,Agriculture,Salton Sea issues.	
2riverside_20110628_32	Imperial,Riverside,San Diego,Orange,Los Angeles	Rancho Mirage,Cathedral City,Thousand Palms,Palm Springs,Banning,Blythe,Palo Verde,Ripley,		yes	yes	Job growth challenges,Latino Community,tourism,Agriculture,Salton Sea issues.	
2riverside_20110628_33	Imperial,Riverside	Rancho Mirage		no	yes	Salton Sea issues,clear geographic continuity.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110628_30			no				
2riverside_20110628_31	These areas must be kept together to survive		no				
2riverside_20110628_31	These areas must be kept together to survive		no				
2riverside_20110628_32	These areas must be kept together to survive		no				
2riverside_20110628_32	These areas must be kept together to survive		no				
2riverside_20110628_33	areas must be combined as to not disenfranchise community of Coachella Valley.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110628_34	6282011	Barbara deBoom	yes	Palm Desert Area Chamber of Commerce	Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Support first draft maps for Coachella Valley.Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon with Coachella makes sense.
2riverside_20110628_35	6282011	Monica Vasquez	no				yes	Support first draft maps for Coachella Valley.Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon with Coachella makes sense.
2riverside_20110628_36	6282011	Eddie Ollmann	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Support first draft maps for Coachella Valley.Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon with Coachella makes sense.
2riverside_20110628_37	6282011	Robin L. Calder	yes	Desert Commercial Bank	Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Support first draft maps for Coachella Valley.Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon with Coachella makes sense.
2riverside_20110628_38	6282011	Hope Susan Lapham	no		Indian Wells	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego.Not with Coachella Valley.Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside County
2riverside_20110628_39	6282011	Ruth Cottingame	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego.Not with Coachella Valley.Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside County
2riverside_20110628_40	6282011	Barry Marine	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	in proposed maps,senate and assembly districts for latinos in Riverside Coachella Valley and Imperial County are split.They should be united.Congress district 45 should also include Coachella and Imperial together.
2riverside_20110628_41	6282011	Doris Updyke	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley connected to Riverside County.Imperial county should be part of San Diego County.
2riverside_20110628_43	6282011	Karen Darras	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, Not Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110628_44	6282011	Janice Ricotta	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, not Coachella Valley.Keep Coachella with Riverside County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110628_34	Riverside	Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon		no	yes	Tourist regions	
2riverside_20110628_35	Riverside	Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon		no	yes	Tourist regions	
2riverside_20110628_36	Riverside	Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon		no	yes	Tourist regions	
2riverside_20110628_37	Riverside	Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon		no	yes	Tourist regions	
2riverside_20110628_38	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego,Coachella			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_39	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego,Coachella			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_40	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes	Latino Communities	
2riverside_20110628_41	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_43	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_44	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110628_34	Being grouped together will improve tourism.		no				
2riverside_20110628_35	Being grouped together will improve tourism.		no				
2riverside_20110628_36	Being grouped together will improve tourism.		no				
2riverside_20110628_37	Being grouped together will improve tourism.		no				
2riverside_20110628_38			no				
2riverside_20110628_39			no				
2riverside_20110628_40	Must be together to keep Latino voice together and give them fair representation.	VRA states that Latino representation must be fair.	no				
2riverside_20110628_41			no				
2riverside_20110628_43			no				
2riverside_20110628_44			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110628_45	6282011	Dennis Lopez	yes	Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund(MALDEF)		Riverside	yes	Support MALDEFs RiversideSan Bernardino districts support VRA section 2 and fairly represent Latinos.
2riverside_20110628_46	6282011	Avie Donovan	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	East Riverside and Imperal,Palo Verde Valley should be in same congressional district.Do not use these areas to fill out San Diego,Orange,Los Angeles Counties.
2riverside_20110628_47	6282011	Jean Gilchrist	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	La Quinta should be with Imperial Valley instead of Hemet.Maps should go horizontal rather than vertical.
2riverside_20110628_48	6282011	David and Adrianne Doyle	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Desert cities and spheres of influence should remain districted with Riverside County as proposed.
2riverside_20110628_49	6282011	Robert Youssef,Larry Smith,Linda Krupa	yes	Hemet City Council,Hemet San Jacinto Action Group			yes	Hemet City Council approves maps propsed by Hemet San Jacinto Action Group for COACH,PRS,RVMVN,NESAN(1st draft) congressional districts.
2riverside_20110628_50	6282011	Patrick R. Richardson	yes	Director of Planning and Redevelopment City of Temecula		Riverside	yes	Support maps proposed by City of Temecula.Temecula should be with Riverside County in Congressional district,not with San Diego.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110628_45	Riverside,San Bernardino			no	yes	need for spanishenglish education,health care,jobs,affordable housing,higher ed,civil rights protection.Spanish speaking,high poverty,more children,lower income,high unemployment,fewer college degrees.	
2riverside_20110628_46	Los Angeles,Riverside,Imperial,San Diego,Orange			no	yes	Salton Sea issues,Lower income,largely Spanish speaking	
2riverside_20110628_47	Riverside,Imperial	La Quinta,Hemet		no	yes	Desert	
2riverside_20110628_48	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_49	Riverside,Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_50	Riverside,San Diego	Temecula		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110628_45	Together these areas can be equally represented.	please adhere to Section 2 which includes protection of the voting rights of growing ChicanoLatino population.	no				
2riverside_20110628_46			no				
2riverside_20110628_47	Much more closely related to Imperial Valley.		no				
2riverside_20110628_48			no				
2riverside_20110628_49			no				
2riverside_20110628_50			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110628_1	6282011	Stephen Dunn	yes	City Manager,Upland		San Bernardino	yes	View attached maps.Keep Upland entirely with San Bernardino County,Revise Assembly,Senate Maps SBUCA,SBBAN to accurately represent San Bernardino.
2sbernardino_20110628_2	6282011	Conrad Guzkowski	no				yes	Redlands should not be split.Yucaipa and Westerly should be part of San Bernardino.East of Yucaipa is different and should be with desert areas
2sbernardino_20110628_3	6282011	Eric R. Shamp	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Redlands should not be split into two congressional districts.
2sbernardino_20110628_4	6282011	Stephen Chapman	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	AD SBCUC should include Mentone,Yucaipa,Crafton Hills,San Bernardino.Everything westnorth of Lytle Creek removed,then placede in a west valley district with Upland,Montclair,Claremont,Ontario.Central San Bernardino district should be modified by removal

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110628_1	San Bernardino,Los Angeles	Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,La Verne,San Dimas,Glendora,Azusa,Duarte,Sierra Madre,La Canada Flintridge,San Fernando Valley,Pasadena,South Pasadena,Burbank,Glendale.		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110628_2	San Bernardino	Redlands,Yucaipa,		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_3	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_4	San Bernardino,Inyo,Mono,	Ontario,Rancho Cucamonga,Redlands,Highland,Loma Linda,Yucaipa,San Bernardino,Mentone,Crafton Hills,Chino,Chino Hills,Pomona,Diamond Bar,Walnut,La Verne,San Dimas,Colton,Grand Terrace,Rialto,Fontana	Rochester Ave	yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110628_1	Upland has no interests with these other areas.Los Angeles County voices will drown out Upland		no				
2sbernardino_20110628_2			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_3			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110628_4	6282011	Stephen Chapman	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	of West San Bernardino City.New west line will be Rochester Ave.Rancho Cucamonga split around Rochester Ave.CD 41 modified to keep Redlands,High desert together.Dist 25,rest of San Bernardino in south,extending north to InyoMono.View attached maps
2sbernardino_20110628_5	6282011	Fabian Paredes	no				yes	Support of Petition in support of First draft maps for San Gabriel Mountain Foothill and State senate LASGF.Maintain Upland in San Gabriel Mountain Foothill and LASGF.Upland COI with Claremont,Laverne,San Dimas,Rancho Cucamonga.
2sbernardino_20110628_8	6282011	Manny Saucedo	no		Chino	San Bernardino	yes	Pleased with maps for Pomona Valley area maps.Chino,Montclair,Ontario,Pomona must continue to be in same districts.
2sbernardino_20110628_9	6282011	Mirella Trujillo	no		Rialto	San Bernardino	yes	Stick to first draft maps.Rialto has more in common with Fontana and Redlands.Keep them intact.San Bernardino should not get leftovers of Riverside or Los Angeles Counties.
2sbernardino_20110628_10	6282011	Jean Otis	no		Highland	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Highland area with Jerry Lewis and representative.Do not put Highland with Rialto,San Bernardino. Also, do not divide Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110628_11	6282011	Jim Bagley	no		Twentynine Palms	San Bernardino	yes	Please add my attached revised maps for MORONGOBAN assembly district map for San Bernardino County to comments.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110628_4	San Bernardino,Inyo,Mono,	Ontario,Rancho Cucamonga,Redlands,Highland,Loma Linda,Yucaipa,San Bernardino,Mentone,Crafton Hills,Chino,Chino Hills,Pomona,Diamond Bar,Walnut,La Verne,San Dimas,Colton,Grand Terrace,Rialto,Fontana	Rochester Ave	yes	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_5	San Bernardino	Upland,Claremont,Laverne,San Dimas,Rancho Cucamonga		yes	yes	Library system,Colleges,Shopping,Hospitals,Geographic connections,Shared watersheds	
2sbernardino_20110628_8	San Bernardino	Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Pomona		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110628_9	San Bernardino,Riverside, Los Angeles	Fontana,Redlands,Rialto		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_10	San Bernardino	Highland,Rialto,San Bernardino,Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_11	San Bernardino			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110628_4			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_5	Closely tied communities,need each other.		no				
2sbernardino_20110628_8	Strong COI, bound together by four freeways I 10, I 15, SR 60, SR 71		no				
2sbernardino_20110628_9			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_10			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_11			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110628_12	6282011	Bill Ruh	no				yes	Visualization Option 2 for Pomona Valley is the best. Pomona,Claremont,Montclair,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Ontario,Chino have strong ties.
2sbernardino_20110628_13	6282011	Norma Leon	no		Chino	San Bernardino	yes	Pleased with first draft maps.Chino,Montclair,Ontario,Pomona must stay in same district. Geographically bound by four freeways.
2sbernardino_20110628_14	6282011	Brett Matthew	no		Arcadia	Los Angeles	yes	Arcadia should be grouped with Monrovia,Sierra Madre,Glendora.Vastly different from San Gabriel,Alhambra,Monterey Park.Keep Arcadia with the Foothills district.
2sbernardino_20110628_15	6282011	Elissa Buckles	no				yes	Objection to split of Chino Hills.This will negatively impact city by not providing representation.It will negatively impact funding.
2sbernardino_20110628_16	6282011	Jim Bagley	no		Twentynine Palms	San Bernardino	yes	Please submit my attached comment maps for SBBAN Senate maps.Attached.
3orange_20110628_1	6282011	Jacob F. Rems	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine is no COI with West of Fwy55.But,South and East of 55,is COI.All south County should be with Orange.The Dewane map makes sense.Keep Orange with San Clemente area.Nothing in common with Seal Beach,Huntington,Costa Mesa.
3orange_20110628_2	6282011	Greg Diamond	no				yes	View Attached Maps.Consider map 2.Place Orange districts together.June 22 Visualization is an improvement.My additions curve Western have of North Orange,down around West Anaheim to Westminster,Uniting Asian COIs.Chino Hills could go with Diamond Bar

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110628_12	San Bernardino	Pomona,Claremont,Montclair,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Ontario,Chino		no	yes	Social,demographic,educational ties	Economic Ties
2sbernardino_20110628_13	San Bernardino	Pomona,Claremont,Montclair,Upland,Rancho Cucamonga,Ontario,Chino		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_14	Los Angeles,San Bernardino	Monrovia,Sierra Madre,Glendora,San Gabriel,Alhambra,Montere y Park,		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_15	San Bernardino	Chino Hills		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110628_16	San Bernardino			no	no		
3orange_20110628_1	Orange	San Clemente,Seal Beach,Irvine,Huntington Beach,Costa Mesa.		no	no		
3orange_20110628_2	Orange,San Bernardino,Riverside,	Chino Hills,Diamond Bar,La Palma,Los Alamitos,Cerritos,Artesia,Cypress,Buena Park,Westminster,Santa Ana,Garden Grove,Anaheim	View attached maps.	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110628_12			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_13			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_14			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_15	If split,representation will be cut, and funding negatively impacted.		no				
2sbernardino_20110628_16			no				
3orange_20110628_1			no				
3orange_20110628_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_2	6282011	Greg Diamond	no				yes	and San Bernardino,or with Riverside.Do not combine one or two parts of cities and place them with other counties.In northwest Orange,put Cypress,La Palma,Buena Park in half and Cerritos,Artesia in other half.
3orange_20110628_3	6282011	Petti Van Rekom	no			Orange	yes	Assembly dist 73 is good except for cutting of Dana Point.In Senate dist 38,Cong dist 44, San Clamente,Dana Point,San Juan Capistrano should not be with San Diego County.Include Aliso Viejo,Irvine.
3orange_20110628_4	6282011	Marcos Costas	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Support Dana Point City council proposal.Dana Point should be with south Orange.
3orange_20110628_5	6282011	Jim Kramer	no				yes	Dana Point,San Clemente,San Juan Capistrano,Mission Viejo,Rancho Santa Margarita,Laguna Hills,etc,all belong together.Do not split Dana Point.Do not add half to San Diego.Dana PointSan Clemente must remain intact,part of south Orange.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_2	Orange,San Bernardino,Riverside,	Chino Hills,Diamond Bar,La Palma,Los Alamitos,Cerritos,Artesia,Cypress,Buena Park,Westminster,Santa Ana,Garden Grove,Anaheim	View attached maps	no	no		
3orange_20110628_3	Orange,San Diego	Aliso Viejo,Irvine,Dana Point,San Clemente,San Juan Capistrano.		no	yes		
3orange_20110628_4	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Strong relationships,business matters,ocean water quality concerns,regional transportation,regional land use planning,affordable housing.	
3orange_20110628_5	Orange,San Diego	Dana Point,San Clemente,San Juan Capistrano,Mission Viejo,Rancho Santa Margarita,Laguna Hills,Laguna Woods,El Toro,Aliso Viejo,Laguna Niguel,San Clemente,		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_2			no				
3orange_20110628_3	Keep area together because it has very much in common. Shared interests		no				
3orange_20110628_4			no				
3orange_20110628_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_6	6282011	Anonymous	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Huntington Beach,Seal Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa are COI. No COI with South County such as Irvine,Laguna Beach.
2riverside_20110628_22	6282011	Don Smith(Duplicate)	no		Banning	Riverside	yes	Consider adding Morongo Basis29 Palms section of Riverside to district covering San Bernardino County.Population from Redlands Area added to district including Pass Area of Riverside.Apple Valley section added to that district.PassArea stay with Riversid
2riverside_20110628_23	6282011	John Kopp(Duplicate)	no		Eastvale	Riverside	no	
2riverside_20110628_42	6282011	Karen Darras	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley with San Diego County,Not with Coachella Valley(Riverside)
2sbernardino_20110628_6	6282011	Tracy Fisher	yes	Inland Action			yes	Support of Inland Action map related to Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110628_7	6282011	Eriverto Vargas	no				yes	Support of POMVAL map as is. Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Pomona should stay together.
3orange_20110628_7	6282011	Rosalia Pinon	no		Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Keep Santa Ana, Flatlands of Anaheim(west of 57fwy,south of 91fwy) together in districts.If needed,add South Fullerton(South of Chapman Ave)East Garden Grove(East of BrookhurstEuclid Ave)Southwest Orange(west of 55)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_6	Orange	Huntington Beach,Seal Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa,Laguna Beach,Irvine,Fountain Valley		no	yes	Malls,schools,405 connection,	
2riverside_20110628_22	Riverside,Imperial,San Bernardino	Yucaips,Redlands,Loma Linda,Banning,		no	no		
2riverside_20110628_23				no	no		
2riverside_20110628_42	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_6	San Bernardino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110628_7	San Bernardino	Ontario,Montclair,Chino,Pomona		no	no		
3orange_20110628_7	Orange	Sana Ana,Anaheim	57 Fwy,91 fwy,Chapman Ave,Brookhurst ave,Euclid ave, 55fwy.	yes	yes	high numbers of people without health insurance,medical services,Spanish speaking,Vietnamese population,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_6			no				
2riverside_20110628_22			no				
2riverside_20110628_23			no			Good work so far with redistricting.	
2riverside_20110628_42			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_6			no				
2sbernardino_20110628_7			no				
3orange_20110628_7			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_8	6282011	Joanne Ahmadi,Jenny Jenson,Kacey Gill,Jason Gill,Mike Ahmadi,Jeannie Ahmadi,Behroz Admadi,Vale and Pete Palmer	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Support congress district map presented by Shawn Dewane.Keeps Huntington Beach with Westminster,Fountain Valley.No commonality with Irvine.
3orange_20110628_9	6282011	Albert E. Ross	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Support congress district map presented by Shawn Dewane.Keeps Huntington Beach with Westminster,Fountain Valley.No commonality with Irvine.
3orange_20110628_10	6282011	Angela Soss	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Remove Irvine from Huntington Beach and keep with Newport.
3orange_20110628_11	6282011	Mike Johnson	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Do not split city of Orange apart.
3orange_20110628_12	6282011	Ray Grangoff	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Keep City of Orange whole.
3orange_20110628_13	6282011	Sarah Soss	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Do not put Huntington Beach with Irvine and south county.We are coastal,they are not.nothing in common.
3orange_20110628_14	6282011	Jon Dumitru	yes	City of Orange,City Council	Orange	Orange	yes	Do not split City of Orange into three congressional districts.If you must,please split city using Santa Ana River or 57 Fwy.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_8	Orange	Irvine,Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa,Westminster		yes	yes	school districts,hopes for airport,shopping,health Care,Water district	
3orange_20110628_9	Orange	Irvine,Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa,Westminster		yes	yes	school districts,hopes for airport,shopping,health Care,Water district	
3orange_20110628_10	Orange	Irvine,Newport,Huntington Beach.		no	yes	Shopping,recreation,Healt h Care	
3orange_20110628_11	Orange	Orange		no	yes		
3orange_20110628_12	Orange	Orange		no	yes	Community college district,medical services	
3orange_20110628_13	Orange	Huntington Beach,Irvine		no	no		
3orange_20110628_14	Orange	Orange	Santa Ana River,57 Freeway	no	yes	Community college district,medical services,Old Towne,intertwined community	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_8			no				
3orange_20110628_9			no				
3orange_20110628_10			no				
3orange_20110628_11	Very diverse community that needs to stay together.		no				
3orange_20110628_12	strong,diverse community that needs to stay together.		no				
3orange_20110628_13			no				
3orange_20110628_14	Strong community,do not divide it.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_15	6282011	Anna Bryson	yes	Capistrano Unified School District.	Laguna Niguel	Orange	yes	Do not place South Orange with different northern cities.Laguna Niguel should be with South County Lake Forest,Aliso Viejo,Laguna Hills,Laguna Woods,Irvine.
3orange_20110628_16	6282011	Kermit D. Marsh	yes	Westminster City Council	Westminster	Orange	yes	Do not separate Westminster from Huntington Beach.Not with Santa Ana.No Interaction with Los Angeles County.Consider map drawn by Shawn Dewane.
3orange_20110628_19	6282011	Kathy Barnum	yes	Kathy Barnum Agency	Dan Point	Orange	yes	Do not split Dana Point and place in another district.Keep with Similar south Orange county Cities.
3orange_20110628_20	6282011	Anonymous	yes	Casa De La Familia			yes	Keep Santa Ana and Anaheim(west of 57,South of 91 fwy) together in Congressional,senate,assembly districts.If Needed,add South Fullterton(south of Chapman Ave) East Garden Grove(east of BrookhurstEuclid Ave)Southwest Orange(west of 55 Fwy)
3orange_20110628_21	6282011	Yvette Ollada	yes	El Toro Reuse Planning Authortiy	Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine must stay with South Orange.Not with North Orange.Must stay with Lake Forest,Laguna WoodsHills.This is the El Toro COI.Support Shawn Dewane Maps.
3orange_20110628_22	6282011	Michelle Alipio	yes	El Toro Reuse Planning Authortiy	Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine must stay with South Orange.Not with North Orange.Must stay with Lake Forest,Laguna WoodsHills.This is the El Toro COI.Support Shawn Dewane Maps.
3orange_20110628_23	6282011	Gene Soss	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Do not lump Huntington Beach with Irvine.Keep Huntington Beach with other West Orange Cities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_15	Orange	Lake Forest,Aliso Viejo,Laguna Hills,Laguna Woods,Irvine,Laguna Niguel		yes	yes	Climate,topography,water and land use,educational issues	
3orange_20110628_16	Orange,Los Angeles	Santa Ana,Westminster,Huntington Beach.		yes	yes	Shared traffic,school districts,work between two cities.	
3orange_20110628_19	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	shared transportation districts,Water quality board,a variety of state agencies.Collective interests	
3orange_20110628_20	Orange	Santa Ana,Anaheim	57 freeway,91 freeway,chapman Ave,Brookurst ave,Euclid Ave,55freeway	yes	yes	high crime rates,shared crime fighting forces,	
3orange_20110628_21	Orange	Irvine,Lake Forest,Laguna Beach,Laguna WoodsHills.		no	yes	same organizations,school district,water infrastructure,	
3orange_20110628_22	Orange	Irvine,Lake Forest,Laguna Beach,Laguna WoodsHills.		no	yes	same organizations,school district,water infrastructure,	
3orange_20110628_23	Orange	Irvine,Huntington Beach		no	yes	Geographic closeness.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_15			no				
3orange_20110628_16			no				
3orange_20110628_19			no				
3orange_20110628_20			no				
3orange_20110628_21			no				
3orange_20110628_22			no				
3orange_20110628_23	Similar communities and interests		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_24	6282011	Michelle Houser	no		Garden Grove	Orange	yes	View separate attached maps.Garden Grove is a COI with Anaheim Flatlands,Santa Ana and Orange west of 57fwy.
3orange_20110628_25	6282011	Imelda Preciado	no		Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Garden Grove does not belong with Santa Ana. Has much more in common with west Orange cities like Huntington Beach and Seal Beach.Please link Garden Grove,Westminster and Fountain Valley with Huntington Beach, Not Santa Ana.
3orange_20110628_26	6282011	Wendy Valencia	no		Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Garden Grove does not belong with Santa Ana. Has much more in common with west Orange cities like Huntington Beach and Seal Beach.Please link Garden Grove,Westminster and Fountain Valley with Huntington Beach, Not Santa Ana.
3orange_20110628_27	6282011	Rafael Preciado	no		Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Garden Grove does not belong with Santa Ana. Has much more in common with west Orange cities like Huntington Beach and Seal Beach.Please link Garden Grove,Westminster and Fountain Valley with Huntington Beach, Not Santa Ana.
3orange_20110628_28	6282011	Richard Ramirez	no		Anaheim	Orange	yes	Keep Santa Ana and Anaheim(west of 57Fwy,South of 91) together in Congressional,senate,assembly districts.If needed,add South Fullteron(South of Chapman Ave)East Garden Grove(East of BrookhurstEuclid Ave) Southwest Orange(West of 55 fwy) for population
3orange_20110628_29	6282011	Lloyd and Glorria Morrison	no		Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley,Westminster must be in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_24	Orange	Orange,Garden Grove,Anaheim,Santa Ana		no	yes	Disneyland industry,Vietnamese and Latino Communities,	
3orange_20110628_25	Orange	Santa Ana,Garden Grove,Westminster,Seal Beach,Fountain Valley		no	no		
3orange_20110628_26	Orange	Santa Ana,Garden Grove,Westminster,Seal Beach,Fountain Valley		no	no		
3orange_20110628_27	Orange	Santa Ana,Garden Grove,Westminster,Seal Beach,Fountain Valley		no	no		
3orange_20110628_28	Orange	Santa Ana,Anaheim	57 freeway,91 freeway,chapman Ave,Brookurst ave,Euclid Ave,55freeway	yes	no	low high school graduation rate,low school achievement,	
3orange_20110628_29	Orange	Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley,Westminster		no	yes	Same school districts,disaster concerns,fire and law enforcement,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_24			no				
3orange_20110628_25			no				
3orange_20110628_26			no				
3orange_20110628_27			no				
3orange_20110628_28	Very similar areas		no				
3orange_20110628_29	Every public safety and education is the same for these areas.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_30	6282011	Joanne Simpson	no		Westminster	Orange	yes	Westminster needs to be with Huntington Beach.Not Santa Ana. Supports Shawn Dewane CD map to keep West OC cities together
3orange_20110628_31	6282011	Amy Harman	no		Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Fountain Valley must be with Huntington Beach,Costa Mesa.Not with Santa Ana.Nothing in common.Little Saigon cities of Westminster,Fountain Valley,Garden grove must be together and with Huntington Beach.
3orange_20110628_32	6282011	Craig S. Green	yes	Treasurer City of Placentia			yes	72nd district should be Anaheim,Placentia,Fullerton.
3orange_20110628_33	6282011	Carmern and Linda Morrow	no		Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Support map by Shawn Dewane.Keep Orange with Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley,Westminster.Not with Irvine.
3orange_20110628_34	6282011	John W. Briscoe	no		Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Fountain Valley is not COI with Santa Ana.Fountain Valley is COI with Huntington Beach.
3orange_20110628_35	6282011	Glenn Hayes	yes	Neighborhood Housing Service of Orange County.			yes	Keep Santa Ana and Anaheim(west of 57Fwy,South of 91Fwy) together for congressional,senate,assembly districts.If needed,add South Fullerton(south of Chapman Ave) East Garden Grove, Southwest Orange(west of 55 Fwy)
3orange_20110628_36	6282011	Holly and Bruce Madewell	no				yes	Please do not split our city in half.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_30	Orange,Los Angeles	Santa Ana,Huntington Beach,Laguna,Irvine,Westminster		no	yes	shopping,recreation,transportation routes,	Close economic ties
3orange_20110628_31	Orange	Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley,Westminster,Santa Ana,Garden Grove		no	yes	Asian American population,school districts,medical services,shopping,community service organizations,entertainment	
3orange_20110628_32	Orange	Fullerton,Placentia,Anaheim		no	yes	traffic mitigation,signal sychronization,local academic issues,college projects,school districts	
3orange_20110628_33	Orange	Huntington Beach,Westminster,Fountain Valley		no	yes	School districts,water district,	
3orange_20110628_34	Orange	Santa Ana,Huntington Beach,Fountain Valley		no	yes	sanitation district,school districts,cultural and community service clubs,shared sports leagues and teams	
3orange_20110628_35	Orange	Santa Ana,Anaheim	57,91,55 freeways,chapman Ave	no	yes	Affordable housing,working families,commercial services,	
3orange_20110628_36	Orange			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_30			no				
3orange_20110628_31			no				
3orange_20110628_32	Intertwined cities, function together.		no				
3orange_20110628_33			no				
3orange_20110628_34			no				
3orange_20110628_35			no				
3orange_20110628_36			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110628_37	6282011	Miguel A. Pulido	yes	City Council of Santa Ana	Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Do not divide Santa Ana,Anaheim into separate districts.
5sbarbara_20110628_1	6282011	Richard Dowhower	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split city of Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110628_2	6282011	Wickie Rodenhi	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	View Maps.City of Lompoc and Lompoc Valley should not be redistricted.
5sbarbara_20110628_5	6282011	Cynthia Jones	yes	Dublin San Ramon Services District	San Ramon	Contra Costa	yes	Dublin San Ramon Services district must not be fragmented.Water treatment and resources in Livermore,Amador,San Ramon must stay together.
5ventura_20110628_1	6282011	Jeri Cowley	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Nest east Ventura county assembly with a seat in Santa Clarita.Put Ventura and Malibu with Santa Monica.Same goes for congressional.
5ventura_20110628_2	6282011	Elizabeth Priedkalns	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Thousand Oaks stay in one assembly dist. Move Oxnard from East Ventura, add split area to East Ventura seat.Keep East Ventura with Santa Clarita in Senate.Malibu and Santa MonicaVenturaSanta Barbara with Central Coast.Keep SimiMoorpark in our congress

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110628_37	Orange	Santa Ana,Anaheim		no	yes	language,demographics,regional transit,densely populated,shared water districts,recycling and disposal habits,public safety concerns,fire fighting,emergency response,	
5sbarbara_20110628_1	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110628_2	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		no	yes	Churches,unemployment rates,small employers,goals,activities,	economic interets,
5sbarbara_20110628_5	Contra Costa	Livermore,San Ramon,Amador		no	yes		
5ventura_20110628_1	Ventura	Camarillo,Santa Clarita,Santa Barbara,Malibu,Santa Monica		no	yes	shopping,business	
5ventura_20110628_2	Ventura,Santa Barbara	Simi,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks,Oxnard,Santa Clarita,Malibu,Santa Monica,Santa Barbara		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110628_37			no				
5sbarbara_20110628_1			no				
5sbarbara_20110628_2			no				
5sbarbara_20110628_5	Infrastructures for water,wastewater, and recycled water in this area need to stay together to continue functioning.		no				
5ventura_20110628_1	Inland communities should stay together.		no				
5ventura_20110628_2	Keep Inland areas together and let coastal areas be separate.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110628_3	6282011	Bradley Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Exclude Oxnard and other Coastal Cities and group Thousand Oaks wholly with Ventura County.Do not include Thousand Oaks with Santa Barbara County in Senate.Include eastern portion of Ventura with Conejo Valley for Senate.
5ventura_20110628_4	6282011	Sarah Sarian	no				yes	Disagree with assembly map for Ventura.Take out Oxnard,put in Thousand Oaks,Include Conejo Grande with Ventura and Los Angeles County for One assembly dist.Senate dist should be Ventura,Conejo Valley,Santa Clarita Valley and NW San Fernando Valley.
5ventura_20110628_5	6282011	Paul Wenger	yes	California Farm Bureau Federation			yes	Swap Ventura County out of Los Angeles dist.,trade for San Fernando Valley in East District.
5ventura_20110628_7	6282011	Brad Golden	no			Ventura	yes	Do not place Ventura with Los Angeles district.Los Angeles should be kept whole,Ventura is a better fit with East district.LancasterPalmdale similarities with Ventura and Kern.View attached map.
5ventura_20110628_8	6282011	Gregory D. Totten	yes	Ventura County District Attorney			yes	Simi Valley,Moorpark must be included in Ventura County,not Los Angeles.Malibu should not be in Ventura.It should be with Santa Monica,Pacific Palisades.
5ventura_20110628_9	6282011	Nancy Lindholm	yes	Oxnard Chamer of Commerce	Oxnard	Ventura	yes	Oxnard is pleased with proposed maps.Grouping with East Ventura is ok.Better to be with Ventura and Santa Monica.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110628_3	Ventura,Santa Barbara	Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Oxnard,Malibu,Santa Clarita,		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110628_4	Ventura,Santa Barbara,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Oxnard,Santa Clarita,		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_5	Los Angeles,Ventura			no	yes	agricultural industry,rural and suburban lifestyles	
5ventura_20110628_7	Los Angeles,Ventura,Kern,	Lancaster,Palmdale,		no	yes		
5ventura_20110628_8	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Malibu		no	yes	Law enforcement funding,black out area concerns for police force if grouped with LA,	
5ventura_20110628_9	Ventura	Oxnard,Santa Monica		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110628_3	Keep inland areas separate from coastal areas.		no				
5ventura_20110628_4			no				
5ventura_20110628_5			no				
5ventura_20110628_7	Rural areas need own district.LA deserves own district like other major cities.		no				
5ventura_20110628_8	Law Enforcement will be inadequate for Ventura if grouped with LA.These cities grouped with Los Angeles would disenfranchise them because of LA high population.		no				
5ventura_20110628_9			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110628_10	6282011	Nancy Eisenhart	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	San Fernando Valley should be 2 or 3 districts.Does not need to be combined with areas of no interest.Should include West Hills,Woodland Hills,Hidden Hills.Boundary for Valley is Santa Monica Mountains,Mulholland Hwy,405 Fwy.Nothing in common with Malibu
5ventura_20110628_10	6282011	Nancy Eisenhart	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	East Valley,or Thousand Oaks,Newbury Park.We have more in common with Simi Valley than Santa Clarita or a beach community.View Attached maps.
5ventura_20110628_11	6282011	Ken Breitag	yes	United Water Conservation District	Santa Paula	Ventura	yes	Dividing East Ventura and San Luis Obispo Santa Barbara seperates Santa Clara River from its Watershed.Do not split Lake Piru in 2.This would leave half the lake in a district that has no concerns for it.Border should run along north Ventura,to Kern C.
5ventura_20110628_12	6282011	Doug and Doris Wieben	no				yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark together with Ventura County. Not with San Fernando Valley and Palmdale.
5ventura_20110628_13	6282011	Trisha K. Monesi	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley with Thousand Oaks in one assembly district with Moorpark.Not with Oxnard.We would fit in senate map Santa Clarita.
5ventura_20110628_14	6282011	Michael Valentino	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley,Moorpark in with Los Angeles County.Vast differences between these two cities and LA.They belong in Ventura.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110628_10	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Newbury Park,Malibu,Santa Clarita,Woodland Hills		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110628_10	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Newbury Park,Malibu,Santa Clarita,Woodland Hills		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110628_11	Kern,Ventura,Santa Barbara,San Luis Obispo,Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110628_12	Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Palmdale		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_13	Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Camarillo, Oxnard,Santa Clarita,Thousand Oaks.		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_14	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110628_10	High enough population to be own districts without mixing with Coastal communities or ones with no common interests.		no				
5ventura_20110628_10	High enough population to be own districts without mixing with Coastal communities or ones with no common interests.		no				
5ventura_20110628_11			no				
5ventura_20110628_12			no				
5ventura_20110628_13			no				
5ventura_20110628_14	Nothing in common with Los Angeles, need to be with LA.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110628_15	6282011	Kathy Whitmire	no				yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County instead of with Malibu.Keep Camarillo,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in senate seat.
5ventura_20110628_16	6282011	Carole Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Chatsworth with Simi Valley and surrounding cities.Santa Clarita,Thousand Oaks,Porter Ranch have more in common with Simi Valley,Moorpark,Chatswoth than Oxnardcoastal cities.Keep these areas in single senate map.
5ventura_20110628_17	6282011	Nick Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Remove Oxnard,Include Thousand Oaks in Ventura assembly.Include Simi,Thousand Oaks.
3orange_20110628_17	6282011	Anna Bryson	yes	Capistrano Unified School District.	Laguna Niguel	Orange	yes	Do not place South Orange with different northern cities.Laguna Niguel should be with South County Lake Forest,Aliso Viejo,Laguna Hills,Laguna Woods,Irvine.
3orange_20110628_18	6282011	Sharon Quirk Silva	yes	Fullerton City Council.	Fullerton	Orange	yes	Do not divide communities in Anaheim and Santa Ana.Combine Santa Ana,Anaheim(west of 57Fwy) with South Fullterton(south of Chapman)Other similar areas include East Garden Grove,Southwest Orange
5sbarbara_20110628_3	6282011	John A. Rodenhi	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split City of Lompoc between two assembly and state senate districts.
5sbarbara_20110628_4	6282011	Paul G. Rosso	no				yes	Keep Lompoc in one assembly district.It should all be in the district SLOSB.More closely related to Santa Maria rather than city of Santa Barbara

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110628_15	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Santa Clarita,Camarillo,Thousand Oaks		no	yes		
5ventura_20110628_16	Ventura	Santa Clarita,Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Porter Ranch,Oxnard,Oak Park,Agoura Hills,Chatsworth,Westlake Village		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110628_17	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Oxnard,Moorpark,		no	yes		
3orange_20110628_17	Orange	Lake Forest,Aliso Viejo,Laguna Hills,Laguna Woods,Irvine,Laguna Niguel		yes	yes	Climate,topography,water and land use,educational issues	
3orange_20110628_18	Orange	Fullerton,Santa Ana,Anaheim,Garden Grove,	57 Freeway.	no	no		
5sbarbara_20110628_3	Santa Barbara	Lompoc		yes	yes	high unemployment,low property values,shopping	
5sbarbara_20110628_4	Santa Barbara	Lompoc,Santa Maria,Santa Barbara		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110628_15	Keep areas better represented,do not divide Inland and coastal populations.		no				
5ventura_20110628_16	Keep Coastal cities together,inland cities together.		no				
5ventura_20110628_17	Keep Coastal cities together,inland cities together.		no				
3orange_20110628_17			no				
3orange_20110628_18			no				
5sbarbara_20110628_3	Split would disenfranchise city.		no				
5sbarbara_20110628_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110628_6	6282011	Paul J. Heron	no			Ventura	yes	Do not place Ventura with Los Angeles district.Los Angeles should be kept whole,Ventura is a better fit with East district.LancasterPalmdale similarities with Ventura and Kern.View attached map.
5ventura_20110628_18	6282011	Adela Oseguera	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not break Thousand Oaks up.Do not group it with Santa Barbara,Carpinteria,Goleta.Add Simi Valley,Moorpark,Conejo Valley to Santa Clarita.
5ventura_20110628_19	6282011	Anonymous	no				yes	Do not place Simi and Moorpark into L.A. County.Oxnard should be with L.A. instead.
5ventura_20110628_20	6282011	Paul H. Johnson	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	For State sen. LASCV,Assembly Thousand OaksSanta Monica make same boundaries for State AssemblyCongressional dist.For all districts,establish Cong. Dist,then cut Cong. Into State sen. Districts,then cut those into State Assembly.Santa Clarita should be
5ventura_20110628_20	6282011	Paul H. Johnson	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	with W. San Fernando,Calabasas,Antelope Valley Santa Clarita for State assembly and Congressional districts.LASCV should not include Santa Clarita region and Westlake Village.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110628_6	Los Angeles,Ventura,Kern,	Lancaster,Palmdale,		no	yes		
5ventura_20110628_18	Santa Babara,Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Santa Clarita,Thousand Oaks,Carpinteria,Goleta		yes	yes	Suburban Desires, safety of each city.	
5ventura_20110628_19	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Oxnard		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_20	Los Angeles,Ventura	Thousand Oaks,Santa Monica,Malibu,		yes	no		
5ventura_20110628_20	Santa Barbara,Los Angeles,Ventura	Thousand Oaks,Santa Monica,Malibu,		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110628_6	Rural areas need own district.LA deserves own district like other major cities.		no				
5ventura_20110628_18			no				
5ventura_20110628_19			no				
5ventura_20110628_20			no				
5ventura_20110628_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110628_21	6282011	Melissa Carlson	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley has nothing in common with Malibu,Santa Barbara,or other coastal cities.Simi Valley is more like Thousand Oaks,Santa Clarita,Chatsworth,Porter Ranch.Do not break up Thousand Oaks.Group Los Angeles part of Conejo V. with Simi V.Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110628_22	6282011	Bryan Ryles	no				yes	Do not remove Simi Valley from Ventura County district.If it must remove any part of Ventura and place with Santa Clarita,split at Route 126 Corridor.Simi Valley,Moorpark are integral to Ventura.
5ventura_20110628_23	6282011	Carrie Golden	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks,Camarillo should be in one assembly district.Placed with Santa Clarita in Senate district instead of Santa Barbara.
5ventura_20110628_24	6282011	Ron Golden	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Ventura Coastal Communities should stay together in Legislative districts.Suburban communities of East Ventura(Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Camarillo) have a great deal in common.Do not mix these areas.Place E. Ventura in one district with Santa
5ventura_20110628_24	6282011	Ron Golden	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Clarita assembly district to creat senate district.Simi Valley,Moorpark should be included with Ventura County Congressional district.
5ventura_20110628_25	6282011	Tracie Breiter	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep East Ventura County united in assembly,senate and congressional maps.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110628_21	Ventura,Los Angeles,Santa Barbara	Thousand Oaks,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu,Santa Barbara		no	yes		
5ventura_20110628_22	Los Angeles,Ventura	Thousand Oaks,Simi Valley,Moorpark,		yes	yes	Shared water district,same council boardsagencies like Ventura Council of Governments,Transportation comission,	
5ventura_20110628_23	Ventura,Los Angeles,Santa Barbara	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Camarillo,Santa Clarita,Santa Barbara		no	yes	Work and play,community ties	
5ventura_20110628_24	Camarillo,Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Santa Clarita	Ventura,Los Angeles,Santa Barbara		yes	yes	Public interests,transit,housing,environmental and land use patterns	
5ventura_20110628_24	Camarillo,Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Santa Clarita	Ventura,Los Angeles,Santa Barbara		yes	yes	Public interests,transit,housing,environmental and land use patterns	
5ventura_20110628_25	Ventura			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110628_21	Very much in common		no				
5ventura_20110628_22			no				
5ventura_20110628_23			no				
5ventura_20110628_24			no				
5ventura_20110628_24			no				
5ventura_20110628_25			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110628_26	6282011	Nancy Wofford	no				yes	Keep Simi Valley,Moorpark with East Ventura County.Assembly seat of areas is with Santa Clarita Valley.Congressional Dist of Simi V. should not be with Lancaster area.Keep East Ventura with Santa Barbara.
5ventura_20110628_27	6282011	Janet R. Snee	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Oppose any changes in the districts.
5ventura_20110628_28	6282011	Kathy Whitmire	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Stay with Ventura County.People moved to Ventura to escape Los Angeles County.
5ventura_20110628_29	6282011	Jeri Cowley	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo in East Ventura.Nest E. Ventura assembly seat with Santa Clarita.Put Ventura with Santa Barbara and Malibu with Santa Monica.For Congress,Put Ventura with Santa Barbara.
5ventura_20110628_30	6282011	Cheryl Harriott	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Oppose any congressional redistricting that would Divide Ventura Couty.
5ventura_20110628_31	6282011	Chris Lanier(Duplicate)	yes	CAUSE			yes	Keep Ventura City whole in EVENT district,not with SLOSB district.
5ventura_20110628_32	6282011	Lynn Bertucci	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not remove Simi ValleyMoorpark or combine Thousand Oaks with L.A. County. Keep Thousand Oaks together with Simi ValleyMoor Park. Dont put Ventura county residents with LA county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110628_26	Ventura,Santa Barbara,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Santa Clarita		no	yes	Shared watershed	Business and economy.
5ventura_20110628_27	Ventura	Camarillo		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_28	Ventura,Santa Barbara,Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Simi Valley,Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110628_29	Ventura,Los Angeles,Santa Barbara	Santa Clarita,Camarillo,Malibu,Santa Monica		no	yes	Shopping	Business concerns
5ventura_20110628_30	Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110628_31	Ventura	Ventura		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110628_32	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks.		no	yes	Transportation,Animal regulation,education and health	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110628_26			no				
5ventura_20110628_27			no				
5ventura_20110628_28			no				
5ventura_20110628_29	Keep Coastal communities together, and Inland ones separate		no				
5ventura_20110628_30			no				
5ventura_20110628_31	Splitting city would make it difficult for Westside neighborhood to have voice heard. This is a poor, hispanic area.		no				
5ventura_20110628_32	L.A. does not represent Ventura cities well. People left L.A. to go to Ventura to escape it.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110628_34	6282011	Dianne Alexander	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Ventura interests are not tied with Antelope Valley.Simi Valley,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks,Newberry Park are COI.Keep Santa Barbara with Ventura County.Oxnard could be added for pop.
5ventura_20110628_28	6282011	Kathy Whitmire	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	East Ventura County must stay united in Assembly,Senate,Congressionl maps.Nest East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Santa Barbara.Congress seat should keep Coastal Ventura and Coastal Santa Barbara and rest of Ventura as whole,Moorpark,Simi Valley
1sdiego_20110628_3	6282011	Josie L. Calderon-Scott	yes	Mexican American Bussines and Professional Association	Bonita	San Diego	yes	Differences,Vastly different racial makeups in both areas,Coastal Versus Inland.Current maps are highly discriminatory,Very different interests and needs between two regions of San Diego.
1sdiego_20110628_4	6282011	Ofelia Rayos	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law) CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)		San Diego	yes	Support keeping Asian Communities in Diego County together based on cultural,ethnic,language access, etc.
1sdiego_20110628_5	6282011	Salvador B. Flor	no				yes	Redraw district lines to better reflect voting strength of Asian Pacific Island COI.
1sdiego_20110628_6	6282011	Christopher Arcito	yes	FUSO(Filipino Ugnayan Student Organization)	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Maintain Asian Pacific Islander voting block within a district.This will keep voters active and empowered in this community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110628_34	Ventura,Los Angeles,Santa Barbara	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks,Newberry Park,Santa Barbara		yes	yes	schools,churches,community involvement.water,trasit,police and fire protection,	economic development.
5ventura_20110628_28	Ventura,Santa Barbara,Los Angeles	Santa Clarita,Simi Valley,Moorpark		no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_3	San Diego	Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,West Chula Vista,National City Barrio Logan,Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma,Coronado		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110628_4	San Diego			no	yes	Socio Economic,Cultural,Ethnic, Religious,Language Access needs and interests.	
1sdiego_20110628_5	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_6	San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110628_34			no				
5ventura_20110628_28			no				
1sdiego_20110628_3	Latino Communities		no				
1sdiego_20110628_4			no				
1sdiego_20110628_5			no				
1sdiego_20110628_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_7	6282011	Erik Castellanos	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Latino Population must be represented.District LMSAND should expand,include East of 805Fwy.Cities of East Paradise Hills,East National City,Chula Vista.Logan Heights must be kept whole,added to SSAND district.SSAND district should not include East Chula
1sdiego_20110628_7	6282011	Erik Castellanos	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Vista because 805Fwy is dividing line.Keep Logan Heights,Sherman Heights together.For state senate,Latino COI Oceanside,San Marcos,Escondido on I 78 must stay together.Remove Orange C. from SANOC,expand it East towards I 15,include Murrieta,Temecula.
1sdiego_20110628_7	6282011	Erik Castellanos	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	CSTSN district expand east to I 15,include Escondido,San Marcos,Vista,Oceanside,Fallbrook,Bonsall.Remove Orange C. from CSTSN and make it wholly San Diego County district.
1sdiego_20110628_8	6282011	Israel Adato	yes	Mexican American Bussines and Professional Association			yes	South San Diego and North San Diego are not A COI.South Cities include Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,North include Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma.Different household incomes between regions.Education differences,Public safety

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_7	San Diego,Imperial,Los Angeles,Orange,	Paradise Hills,East Chula Vista,National City,Logan Heights,Sherman Heights,Oceanside,Vista,San Marcos,Escondido,Murrieta,Temecula,Fallbrook,Bonsall	I 15,1 78,805 FWY,	yes	yes	Latino communties.	
1sdiego_20110628_7	San Diego,Imperial,Los Angeles,Orange,	Paradise Hills,East Chula Vista,National City,Logan Heights,Sherman Heights,Oceanside,Vista,San Marcos,Escondido,Murrieta,Temecula,Fallbrook,Bonsall	I 15,1 78,805 FWY,	yes	yes	Latino communties.	
1sdiego_20110628_7	San Diego,Imperial,Los Angeles,Orange,	Paradise Hills,East Chula Vista,National City,Logan Heights,Sherman Heights,Oceanside,Vista,San Marcos,Escondido,Murrieta,Temecula,Fallbrook,Bonsall	I 15,1 78,805 FWY,	yes	yes	Latino communties.	
1sdiego_20110628_8	San Diego	Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,West Chula Vista,National City Barrio Logan,Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma,Coronado		yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_7		Maps must comply with VRA to protect underrepresented communities from discrimination.	no				
1sdiego_20110628_7		Maps must comply with VRA to protect underrepresented communities from discrimination.	no				
1sdiego_20110628_7		Maps must comply with VRA to protect underrepresented communities from discrimination.	no				
1sdiego_20110628_8	Latino COI	Keep latino community together, or it will violate VRA	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_8	6282011	Israel Adato	yes	Mexican American Bussines and Professional Association			yes	Differences,Vastly different racial makeups in both areas,Coastal Versus Inland.Current maps are highly discriminatory,Very different interests and needs between two regions of San Diego.
1sdiego_20110628_9	6282011	Gigi Fenley	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	Rancho Santa Fe is not COI with Coastal Communities proposed.
1sdiego_20110628_10	6282011	Paul Manuel	yes	Mexican American Bussines and Professional Association			yes	South San Diego and North San Diego are not A COI.South Cities include Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,North include Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma.Different household incomes between regions.Education differences,Public safety
1sdiego_20110628_10	6282011	Paul Manuel	yes	Mexican American Bussines and Professional Association			yes	Differences,Vastly different racial makeups in both areas,Coastal Versus Inland.Current maps are highly discriminatory,Very different interests and needs between two regions of San Diego.
1sdiego_20110628_11	6282011	Arnel Encabo	yes	CAPAFR		San Diego	yes	Support keeping Asian Communities in Diego County together based on cultural,ethnic,language access, etc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_8	San Diego	Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,West Chula Vista,National City Barrio Logan,Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma,Coronado		yes	yes		
1sdiego_20110628_9	San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe		no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_10	San Diego	Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,West Chula Vista,National City Barrio Logan,Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma,Coronado		yes	yes		
1sdiego_20110628_10	San Diego	Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,West Chula Vista,National City Barrio Logan,Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma,Coronado		yes	yes		
1sdiego_20110628_11	San Diego	San Diego		yes	yes	Socio Economic,Cultural,Ethnic, Religious,Language Access needs and interests.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_8	Latino COI	Keep latino community together, or it will violate VRA	no				
1sdiego_20110628_9			no				
1sdiego_20110628_10	Latino COI		no				
1sdiego_20110628_10	Latino COI		no				
1sdiego_20110628_11		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_12	6282011	Reynaldo Riego	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_13	6282011	Sam Besa	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_14	6282011	Charmaine Jamias	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_15	6282011	Maria Lourdes F. Reyes	yes	CAPAFR	La Jolla	San Diego	yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_16	6282011	Matt Hooper	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_17	6282011	Christopher Hooper	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_12	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_13	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_14	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_15	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_16	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_17	San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_12		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_13		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_14		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_15		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no				
1sdiego_20110628_16		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_17		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_18	6282011	Vince Vasquez	yes	CAPAFR		San Diego	yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_19	6282011	Beverly Pestano Magtanong	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_20	6282011	Marcel Ocampo	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_21	6282011	Erlinda D. Parnsoonthorn	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_22	6282011	Thea Quiray Tagle	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_18	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_19	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_20	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_21	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_22	San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_18		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_19		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_20		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_21		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_22		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_23	6282011	Myrna TF Reyes	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_24	6282011	Arnold Alagar	yes	CAPAFR			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_27	6282011	Vina M. Phelps	yes	CAPAFR	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_28	6282011	Marc Schaefer	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Include Logan Heights with related COIs in Imperial South San Diego cong.dist.Add Logan Heights back to district,Connect areas of Oak park to San Diego East Chula Vista district.Unite smaller portion of Tierrasanta into Poway San Diego Coronada district.
1sdiego_20110628_29	6282011	Jon Streeter,T.J. Zane	no			San Diego	yes	attached maps.Unite Poway,Rancho Bernardo,4SRanch,Rancho Penaquitos into MMRB San Diego Cong.Dist.Add near University of San Diego the areas south of La Jolla Village Dr.North Nobel Drive,Rose Canyon,West of Genesee.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_23	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_24	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_27	San Diego			yes	no		
1sdiego_20110628_28	San Diego,Imperial	San Diego,Chula Vista,Coronado	View Attached Maps	yes	yes	Share Chicano Park,Cesar Chavez Parkway,Strong Latino COI.	
1sdiego_20110628_29	San Diego	Poway,Rancho Bernardo,Rancho Penasquitos	La Jolla Village Drive,Nobel Drive,Rose Canyon,Genesee	no	yes	Health care,Shared university,Community college,School districts,San Diego north Economic Development Council,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_23		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_24		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_27		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_28	It needs to be connected to thrive.		no				
1sdiego_20110628_29			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_30	6282011	Jo Marie Diamond	yes	East County Economic Development Council	El Cajon	San Diego	yes	Cities of El Cajon,La Mesa,Lemon Grove,Santee,Alpine,Borrego Springs,Lakeside,Rancho San Diego,Jamul,Spring Valley remain together in single State assembly,State Senate,Congressional district.
1sdiego_20110628_31	6282011	RE and Nick Dieterich	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	CSAND and CNSAN go from Rancho Santa Fe to San Diego,Imperial Beach,Chula Vista.Rancho Santa Fe should be with SANOC(senate) NCOASTSAND(assembly) districts.
1sdiego_20110628_32	6282011	David Villanueva	yes	CAPAFR			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_33	6282011	Purita Buencamino Andrews	yes	CAPAFR	Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_34	6282011	Lana Talampas	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_30	San Diego	El Cajon,La Mesa,Lemon Grove,Santee,Alpine,Borrego Springs,Lakeside,Rancho San Diego,Jamul,Spring Valley		yes	yes	Transportation networks,School districts,water and energy infrastructure,public safety,fire protection,	economic development programs
1sdiego_20110628_31	San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe,Imperial Beach,Chula Vista,Whispering Palms		yes	yes	Fire protection,School districts,irrigation	
1sdiego_20110628_32	San Diego			no	yes	Similar social,geography and demographic interests.	
1sdiego_20110628_33	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_34	San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_30			no				
1sdiego_20110628_31			no				
1sdiego_20110628_32		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_33		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_34		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_35	6282011	Reynaldo I Monzon	yes	CAPAFR	San Diego	San Diego	yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_36	6282011	Rizalyn M. Cruz	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL	San Diego	San Diego	yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_37	6282011	Salvacion De Vera	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_38	6282011	Benny Catapusan	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_39	6282011	Aileen E Catapusan	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_35	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_36	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_37	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_38	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_39	San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_35		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_36		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_37		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_38		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_39		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_40	6282011	Xay Kaignavongsa	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_41	6282011	Joyce Yonemoto	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_42	6282011	Ed Lim	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL		San Diego	yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_43	6282011	Jay M. Montenegro	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_44	6282011	Marlon Garzo Saria	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_40	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_41	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_42	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_43	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_44	San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_40		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_41		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_42		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_43		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_44		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_45	6282011	Allen Chan	yes	CAPAFR			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_46	6282011	Juanito R. Amor Jr.	yes	CAPAFR			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_47	6282011	Jen Vo	no				yes	I support San Diego speakers who testified in June for redistricting.
1sdiego_20110628_50	6282011	Mary Eleanor McGee	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Thank you for putting Escondido in one Assembly and Senate district.It should be with San Marcos and Valley Center.Many shared interests.North San Diego should stay an inland district.
1sdiego_20110628_51	6282011	Helen Madrid	yes	CAPAFR			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_52	6282011	Chris Duggan	no		La Mesa	San Diego	yes	Redraw lines for State senate in San Diego County district ISLAND.Imperial County and East San Diego County should not be together.Sanatee,El Cajon,La Mesa,Alpine,Jamul,Spring Valley have nothing in common with Imperial. ISLAND map should extend west.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_45	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_46	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_47	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_50	San Diego			yes	no		
1sdiego_20110628_51	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_52	San Diego,Imperial	Sanatee,El Cajon,La Mesa,Alpine,Jamul,Spring Valley,San Ysidro,Nestor,Chula Vista		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_45		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_46		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_47			no				
1sdiego_20110628_50			no				
1sdiego_20110628_51		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_52			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_53	6282011	Lorena Gonzalez	yes	San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council			yes	Reconsider assembly map ISAND,Senate maps ISAND,CSAND which links BACOI with parts of San Diego County.Not same COI.Coronado,Pacific Beach,La Jolla,Del Mar,Rancho Santa Fe should not be in CSAND.Border area COI must have Imperial C,South San Diego C,
1sdiego_20110628_53	6282011	Lorena Gonzalez	yes	San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council			yes	and Coachella Valley communities of Riverside County.View attached data and maps.
1sdiego_20110628_54	6282011	Humberto Peraza	yes	United Latinos Vote	Chula Vista	San Diego	yes	Do not split Chula Vista. ISAND.Imperial County should not be with San Diego County.Not COIs.Santee,El Cajon,La Mesa,Alpine,Jamul,Spring Valley nothing in common with Imperial and Border region.ISAND map go west,include San Ysidro,Nestor.
1sdiego_20110628_55	6282011	Robert J. Apodaca	no				yes	View Attached Maps for San Diego County Region.
2riverside_20110628_1	6282011	Carole M. Zaffino	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Strong support for current drafe redistricting plan for Coachella Valley.Entire district should stay with Riverside County.Not with Imperial County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_53	San Diego,Imperial,Riverside	La Jolla,Coronado,Pacific Beach,Del Mar,Rancho Santa Fe,Alpine,El Cajon,Santee,El Centro,Calexico,National City,Chula Vista,San Ysidro,Logan Heights,San Diego,		yes	yes	Border Area Community of Interest must remain together.Large Households,Speak second Languages,lower income per capita,more children,	
1sdiego_20110628_53	San Diego,Imperial,Riverside	La Jolla,Coronado,Pacific Beach,Del Mar,Rancho Santa Fe,Alpine,El Cajon,Santee,El Centro,Calexico,National City,Chula Vista,San Ysidro,Logan Heights,San Diego,		yes	yes	Border Area Community of Interest must remain together.Large Households,Speak second Languages,lower income per capita,more children,	
1sdiego_20110628_54	San Diego,Imperial	San Ysidro,Nestor,Santee,Chula Vista,El Cajon,La Mesa,Alpine,Jamul,Spring Valley.	View Attached map	yes	yes		
1sdiego_20110628_55				no	no		
2riverside_20110628_1	Riverside,Imperial			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_53	Border area COI can not be grouped with other area.		no				
1sdiego_20110628_53	Border area COI can not be grouped with other area.		no				
1sdiego_20110628_54	Similar communities.		no				
1sdiego_20110628_55			no				
2riverside_20110628_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110628_2	6282011	C. E. Krause	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Coachella V. drafts do not represent Latino Pop.Riverside Coachella V. and Imperial Latino communities must be together.
2riverside_20110628_3	6282011	George Raymond	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Coachella V. and Imperial are COI.District should go West into San Bernardino, Moreno Valley.
1sdiego_20110628_25	6282011	Fred Gallardo	yes	CAPAFR,Council of Philippine American Organizations of San Diego County			yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_26	6282011	Glenn L. Barroga	yes	CAPAFR	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Supports CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_48	6282011	Luisa Lee	yes	CAPAFR, SCAPAL			yes	CAPAFRs proposed maps keep San Diego County COIs intact and united.
1sdiego_20110628_49	6282011	Stewart Gage	no		Escondido	San Diego	yes	Thank you for Inland assembly district for North San Diego County,joining Escondido and unifying with Hidden Meadows,San Marcos,Valley Center,Fallbrook,Ramona.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110628_2	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes	Latino Communities in both areas.	
2riverside_20110628_3	Riverside,Imperial	San Bernardino,Moreno Valley,Duroville		no	yes	transit,medical services,Salton sea environmental disaster,latino population.	
1sdiego_20110628_25	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_26	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_48	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_49	San Diego	Hidden Meadows,San Marcos,Fallbrook,Ramona, Valley Center		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110628_2	If they are split and disenfranchised,Latino voice will not be heard.	Current maps will decrease influence of Latino voices. This is not keeping with VRA	no				
2riverside_20110628_3	Strong COI.		no				
1sdiego_20110628_25		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_26		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_48		CAPAFRs maps comply with VRA	no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_49			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110628_4	6282011	Edward J. Doyle	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Cochella V. Maps do not represent Latino pop. Growth.Latinos in Riverside and Imperial Counties should not be split.
2riverside_20110628_5	6282011	Patrick R. Richardson	yes	Director of Planning and Redevelopment, Temecula		Riverside	yes	Keep Temecula with Riverside County in the Congressional district maps,not with San Diego County.
2riverside_20110628_6	6282011	Tizoc DeAztlan	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Include Eastern Coachella Valley(Riverside) with Imperial County in Assembly.
2riverside_20110628_7	6282011	Pamela Levin	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley must remain with Riverside County.
2riverside_20110628_8	6282011	Jerome F. Green	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial Valley with San Diego County, Not with Coachella Valley(Riverside)
2riverside_20110628_9	6282011	Raymond Smith	no				yes	Do not place Temecula with San Diego Congressional district instead of Riverside.Include Temecula in New 15 Corridor Cong. Dist.,keep city whole within Riverside.
2riverside_20110628_10	6282011	Amalia DeAztlan	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley together in single district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110628_4	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes	shared social interests	Economic interests
2riverside_20110628_5	Riverside,San Diego	Temecula		no	yes	Long history with Riverside	
2riverside_20110628_6	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes	Salton Sea,Renewable Energy concerns,Agriculture,High Latino Population,Cultural Similarities,Imperial Irrigation District,Hwy 86, Hwy 111	
2riverside_20110628_7	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_8	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_9	Riverside,San Diego	Temecula		no	no		
2riverside_20110628_10	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes	Community interets,similar workers and communities,agriculture,Salton Sea issues,Renewable energy work, Rural, Low income Latinos.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110628_4	Strong Latino COI, maps should keep areas together to keep their voice strong.	Current maps will decrease influence of Latino voices. This is not keeping with VRA	no				
2riverside_20110628_5			no				
2riverside_20110628_6			no				
2riverside_20110628_7			no				
2riverside_20110628_8			no				
2riverside_20110628_9			no				
2riverside_20110628_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110628_11	6282011	Ian Helmstadter	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Agree with first draft Coachella Valley Maps.Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon should be with Coachella Valley.
2riverside_20110628_12	6282011	Patrick R. Richardson	yes	Director of Planning and Redevelopment, Temecula			yes	Keep Temecula with Riverside County in the Congressional district maps,not with San Diego County.
2riverside_20110628_13	6282011	Ron Roberts	yes	Mayor,City of Temecula		Riverside	yes	Opposition to division of Temecula in congressional maps.City should not be placed with San Diego County.
2riverside_20110628_14	6282011	Sharon French	no		Indian Wells	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego. Not with Coachella Valley.Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside.
2riverside_20110628_15	6282011	Patricia and Eugene Wyskocil	no			Riverside	yes	Imperial,Riverside should be one community.Do not include Imperial with San Diego C. Imperial and Riverside are a COI reaching from Banning Pass to Blythe.
2riverside_20110628_16	6282011	Eric Gosch	yes	Hemet San Jacinto Action Group			yes	San Jacinto Valley(Riverside)has no connection to Coachella V.Idyllwild,Anza should be with San Jacinto.Place Imperial C. with COACH district.NESAN dist. Include Temecula,Murrieta,Wildomar.RVMVN dist. Include Calimesa,portion of March Air Reserve Base.
2riverside_20110628_17	6282011	Ron Roberts	yes	Mayor of Temecula			yes	Opposition to division of Temecula in congressional maps.City should not be placed with San Diego County.
2riverside_20110628_18	6282011	Patricia Cooper	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Object to seperation of Coachella V from Imperial County.Keep them together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110628_11	Riverisde	Beaumont,Banning,Cabazon,Palm Desert		no	yes	Tourism interests	
2riverside_20110628_12	Riverside,San Diego	Temecula		no	yes	Long history with Riverside	
2riverside_20110628_13	Riverside,San Diego	Temecula		no	no		
2riverside_20110628_14	Riverside,San Diego,Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110628_15	Riverside,San Diego,Imperial			no	yes	similar irrigation systems,Common heritage,Language,customs,interests,education,	economic bonds
2riverside_20110628_16	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego	Temecula,Perris,Menifee,Idyllwild,Anza,Murrieta,Wildomar,Calimesa	I 15,View attached maps.	yes	yes	Water districts,school and college districts,hospitals,parks,common railroad line.Geographic features like Salton Sea, Mountains,	
2riverside_20110628_17	Riverside,San Diego	Temecula		no	no		
2riverside_20110628_18	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes	Native american heritage,farm worker migrant population,rural concerns,desert,Salton Sea concerns	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110628_11	Shared interests, need to be together.		no				
2riverside_20110628_12			no				
2riverside_20110628_13			no				
2riverside_20110628_14			no				
2riverside_20110628_15	Very similar communities.		no				
2riverside_20110628_16			no				
2riverside_20110628_17			no				
2riverside_20110628_18			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110628_19	6282011	Eduardo Hernandez	no				yes	Norco and Eastvale should be removed from congressional map,Perris Included in Riv-Moval district.Part of Woodcrest removed,new map include Jurupa Valley,Riverside,Moreno Valley,Perris.
2riverside_20110628_20	6282011	Luisa Uribe	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Eastern Coachella Valley with Imperial County.Indio should not be attached to cities to the west.
1imperial_20110628_1	6282011	Conrad Negron	no		Indian Wells	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego. And Keep Coachella Valley with Riverside County.
1imperial_20110628_2	6282011	Frances and Donald Miller	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Imperial County should be part of Coachella Valley.Much more in common than with San Diego.
1imperial_20110628_3	6282011	Delite Vogley	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Imperial County with San Diego, Not the Coachella Valley.
1imperial_20110628_4	6282011	Briana Burt	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Imperial And Coachella Valley (Indio) share important connection.Reconnect these two areas.
1imperial_20110628_5	6282011	Esteban Robles	no			Indio	yes	Keep Eastern Coachella Valley(Indio) and Imperial Valley together,particularly for 80th Assembly district.Do not put Coachella Valley with Rancho Mirage or put people of Imperial with People in San Diego
1imperial_20110628_6	6282011	Sterling Mayes	no			Imperial	yes	Do not link Imperial with East San Diego County in ISAND.Renewable energy jobs will be slowed by this connection.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110628_19	Riverside,Imperial	Corona,Lake Elsinore,Temecula,Riverside,Jurupa Valley,Perris		yes	yes		
2riverside_20110628_20	Riverside,Imperial	Indio		no	no		
1imperial_20110628_1	Riverside,Indio,Imperial,San Diego,Indio	Indian Wells		no	no		
1imperial_20110628_2	Riverside,Indio,San Diego,Imperial	San Diego		yes	no		
1imperial_20110628_3	Indio,Riverside,Imperial,San Diego			no	no		
1imperial_20110628_4	Imperial,Indio			no	yes	similar cultures	
1imperial_20110628_5	Imperial,Indio	San Diego,Rancho Mirage		no	yes	Imperial Irrigation district,rural latino agricultural communities,high poverty levels,emerging renewable energy sector,Salton sea	
1imperial_20110628_6	Imperial,San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110628_19	Much more in common with each other		no				
2riverside_20110628_20			no				
1imperial_20110628_1			no				
1imperial_20110628_2	Much more in common.		no				
1imperial_20110628_3			no				
1imperial_20110628_4	Tightly connected through transportation and culture		no				
1imperial_20110628_5			no				
1imperial_20110628_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110628_1	6282011	Lynette Williams,Randal Dorian,Joan Pernicano,Donna Woodrum,Camille Dorian	no			San Diego	yes	Protest of maps for San Diego County. They make it difficult to determine boundaries.
1sdiego_20110628_2	6282011	Herminia and Felizardo Moscoso	yes	SCAPAL(Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law) CAPAFR(Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting)		San Diego	yes	Support keeping Asian Communities in Diego County together based on cultural,ethnic,language access, etc.
1sdiego_20110628_3	6282011	Josie L. Calderon-Scott	yes	Mexican American Bussines and Professional Association	Bonita	San Diego	yes	South San Diego and North San Diego are not A COI.South Cities include Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,North include Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma.Different household incomes between regions.Education differences,Public safety
2sbernardino_20110629_3	6292011	Christi Schneider	no		Lake Arrowhead	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Crestline from other mountain communities and San Bernardino
2sbernardino_20110629_4	6292011	Eleanor Hborkowski	no				yes	Keep Redlands with Loma Linda and Highland

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110628_1	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110628_2	San Diego			no	yes	Socio Economic,Cultural,Ethnic, Religious,Language Access needs and interests.	
1sdiego_20110628_3	San Diego	Imperial Beach,San Ysidro,Nestor,Otay Mesa,West Chula Vista,National City Barrio Logan,Solano Beach,Del Mar,La Jolla,Point Loma,Coronado		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110629_3	San Bernardino	Crestline, Lake Arrowhead		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110629_4		Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110628_1			no				
1sdiego_20110628_2			no			Support requests made by following speakers who testified on June 29th.speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91	
1sdiego_20110628_3	Latino COIs		no				
2sbernardino_20110629_3	snow, fire, evacuation, school district, associations, scholarships		no				
2sbernardino_20110629_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110629_5	6292011	Neil Derry, Supervisor	yes	San Bernardino Board of Supevisors		San Bernardino	yes	Do not divide Redlands. Keep with Loma Linda
2sbernardino_20110629_6	6292011	Eugene Riddick	no		Chino Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Chino Hills in half.
4langeles_20110629_1	6292011	Mr and Mrs Bruce Bilson	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Nest Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains and West Side Santa Monica districts, keep Studio City whole
4langeles_20110629_2	6292011	Marsha McLean, Mayor	yes	Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Santa Clarita Valley in one district
5sbarbara_20110629_1	6292011	Ronald C. Faas	no		Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	yes	Preserve Santa Barbara Ventura COI, Put Santa Maria with Santa Barbara.
5ventura_20110629_1	6292011	Bruce Feng, City Manager	yes	City of Camarillo	Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo whole. Keep Ventura County Whole.
5ventura_20110629_1a	6302011	Kim Moore	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not put Thousand Oaks in with LA County, keep with Ventura
6fresno_20110629_1	6272011	Venancio G. Gaona	yes	El Concilio de Fresno	Fresno	Fresno	yes	Do not divide Fresno along highway 41.
7monterey_20110629_1	6292011	Patrick Egann	no			Monterey	yes	27th and 28th districts should be nested in single Tri-County including Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Southern Santa Clara
8alameda_20110629_1	6272011	David W. Smith, Mayor	yes	City of Newark	Newark	Alameda	yes	Keep Newark, Fremont, Union City together in Alameda

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110629_5		Redlands, Loma Linda		no	yes	sister cities,	
2sbernardino_20110629_6		Chino Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110629_1		Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica, Studio City	101	no	yes		
4langeles_20110629_2		Santa Clarita		no	yes		economic, watershed
5sbarbara_20110629_1	Santa Barbara, Ventura	Santa Maria		no	yes	Hispanic population	social service needs, poverty rates, foreclosure and unemployment rates
5ventura_20110629_1	Ventura	Camarillo		no	yes		governmental services, environmental custodians, infrastructure, econ dev, housing
5ventura_20110629_1a	Ventura, LA	Thousand Oaks		no	yes	geriatric community, lifestyle, social issues	
6fresno_20110629_1		Fresno	Highway 41	no	yes	Latino communitiesminority population,	socio-economic concerns
7monterey_20110629_1	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, South Santa Clara			no	yes		agricultural, educational, tourism, regional plannin
8alameda_20110629_1	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes	historic connection	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110629_5	renewable energy, military base, environmental concerns, invasive insects, insurance discrimination, urban sprawl		no				
2sbernardino_20110629_6			no			roadways, population, tax burdens	
4langeles_20110629_1	schools, shopping, education highway, institutions, environmental priorities		no				
4langeles_20110629_2	Geographic, social, climatic, political boundariess		no				
5sbarbara_20110629_1			no				
5ventura_20110629_1	transportation land use, charity, service		no				
5ventura_20110629_1a	topography		no			different lifestye from LA	
6fresno_20110629_1	drop-out rate, political concerns		no				
7monterey_20110629_1	media markets		no				
8alameda_20110629_1	common interests, shared geography		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta20110629_1	6292011	Emily Brockman	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Richmond.
8ccosta20110629_2	6292011	Jeff Nibert	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	no	
8ccosta20110629_3	6292011	Wayne Price	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Tri-Valley together, do not put San Ramon with Fremont, Newark, Union City, Hayward or Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore with San Jose
8ccosta20110629_4	6292011	Linda Caruso	no				yes	Do not comment San Ramon to Fremont, or Livermore to San Jose
8ccosta_20110629_1	6292011	Judith Morgan, President and CEO	yes	Richmond COC	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond whole in Contra Costa CD7
8ccosta_20110629_2	6292011	Dave Hudson	yes	San Ramon City Council	San Ramon	Contra Costa	yes	Keep San Ramon, Danville, Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore together.
8ccosta_20110629_3	6292011	Michael W. Yarbrough, Business Managers	yes	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 302.			yes	Assign Contra Costa an Odd numbbered district
8napa_20110629_1	6292011	Teresita Tindan	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Please leave American Canyon in Napa
8napa_20110629_2	6292011	Richard J. Ramirez, City Manager	yes	American Canyon	American Canyon	Napa	yes	Please leave American Canyon in Napa
8sfrancisco_20110629_1	6302011	Mark Dunlop	no				yes	Do not leave Treasure Island without representation
8sfrancisco_20110629_2	6292011	Kevin Mullin, Mayor	no		South San Francisco	San Mateo	yes	Do not split South San Francisco.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta20110629_1		Richmond		no	yes	city struggling to improve	
8ccosta20110629_2				no	no		
8ccosta20110629_3		San Ramon with Fremont, Newark, Union City, Hayward or Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore with San Jose		no	no		
8ccosta20110629_4		San Ramon, Fremont, Livermore, San Jose		no	no		
8ccosta_20110629_1	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes		industrial and port base
8ccosta_20110629_2		San Ramon, Danville, Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore		no	yes	historic	
8ccosta_20110629_3	Contra Costa			no	no		
8napa_20110629_1	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8napa_20110629_2	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110629_1		Treasure Island		no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110629_2		South San Francisco		no	yes	quality of life	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta20110629_1			no				
8ccosta20110629_2			no				Attached PDF chart
8ccosta20110629_3			no			stop disadvantaging republicans	
8ccosta20110629_4			no				
8ccosta_20110629_1	National labs, health services, school districts		no				
8ccosta_20110629_2	busy freeway, population, low cost housing, infrastructure		no				
8ccosta_20110629_3			no				
8napa_20110629_1			no				
8napa_20110629_2			no				
8sfrancisco_20110629_1			no				
8sfrancisco_20110629_2	school districts, parks and recreation, countywide services, San mateo, criminal justice		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8solano_20110629_1	6292011	Belinda Smith	no				yes	Benicia and Vallejo should be separate from Solano
8sonoma_20110629_1	6292011	Pearl Burkart	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not separate Santa Rosa from Sonoma. Area more similar to Marin than Bay
8sonoma_20110629_1a	6292011	Shelly Starr	no		Sebastopol	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa and Sonoma in North Bay
8sonoma_20110629_2	6292011	Darryl Huismann	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not put Santa Rosa with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba and Yolo counties
8sonoma_20110629_3	6292011	Aaron A. Miller	no		Healdsburg,	Sonoma	yes	Add Santa Rosa to North Coast. Add people to northern end of North coast
8sonoma_20110629_4	6292011	Marv Parker	no		Sebastopol	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa and Sonoma in North Bay
9humboldt_20110629_1	6292011	Karen Brooks	no		Bayside	Humboldt	yes	Do not want Marin or Sonoma in Humboldt districts
9humboldt_20110629_2	6292011	Adrienne LeMieux	no			Humboldt	yes	Do not include Marin with HumboldtMendocino
9humboldt_20110629_3	6292011	Chet Ogan	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Do not include Humboldt with Marin and Sonoma
9humboldt_20110629_4	6292011	Ernie Degraff	no			Humboldt	yes	Do not include Humboldt with Marin and Sonoma. Include Parts of Siskiyou and Trinity
9humboldt_20110629_5	6292011	Loretta Magnuson	no			Humboldt	yes	When is the hearing scheduled for Humboldt
9medocino_20110629_1	6292011	John Dickerson	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8solano_20110629_1	Solano	Benicia, Vallejo		no	no		
8sonoma_20110629_1	Marin, Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes	cost and culture	
8sonoma_20110629_1a	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
8sonoma_20110629_2	Glen, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
8sonoma_20110629_3		Santa Rosa		no	yes	shopping,	jobs, russian river watershed, agriculture, wine grapes, olives, small family farms
8sonoma_20110629_4	Sonoma	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
9humboldt_20110629_1	Humboldt, Marin, Sonoma			no	yes	rural community	water rights, east-west road improvements
9humboldt_20110629_2	Humboldt, Marin, Mendocino			no	no		
9humboldt_20110629_3	Humbodlt, Marin, Sonoma			no	yes		
9humboldt_20110629_4	Humbodlt, Siskiyou, Trinity,Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
9humboldt_20110629_5	Humboldt			no	yes		need to be joined with other counties similar in economy
9medocino_20110629_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8solano_20110629_1			no			urban vs. agriculture	see attached maps
8sonoma_20110629_1			no			vs. agriculture and Bay	
8sonoma_20110629_1a	river, coast, wine production, organic gardening		no			not large commercial agriculture	
8sonoma_20110629_2	contiguous, interests		no			are not rural or crop oriented	
8sonoma_20110629_3	population		no			vs. large-scale agriculture	
8sonoma_20110629_4	river, coast, wine production, organic gardening		no			not large commercial agriculture	
9humboldt_20110629_1			no				
9humboldt_20110629_2			no			little in common with each other	
9humboldt_20110629_3	tree, amphibian, gastropod, mammal diversity		no				
9humboldt_20110629_4	more in common		no				
9humboldt_20110629_5			no				
9medocino_20110629_1			no				Put public videos on the website

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110629_1	6292011	Phil Pluckebaum, VP	yes	River Park Neighborhood Association	River Park	Sacramento	yes	Keep East Sacramento with Sacramento
9sacramento_20110629_2	6292011	Erica Tealey Linnick, Esq. Coordinator	yes	AARC	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Create new South LA districts based on Unity maps submitted
9siskiyou_20110629_1	6292011	Carleen Rogers	no		Red Bluff	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_1a	6292011	Michael Thackeray	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_2	6292011	Selma R. George	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110629_2a	6292011	Jay D. Brauning	no				yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_3	6292011	Jon E. Lopey, Sheriff-Coroner	yes	Siskiyou County Sherrifs department		Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110629_3a	6292011	Phyllis Murphy	no		Redding	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_4	6292011	Ms Ruth T. Hinkle	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110629_4a	6292011	Robert	no				yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_5	6292011	Richard Marshall	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou County.
9siskiyou_20110629_5a	6292011	Robert J. Bigham	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not exclude Siskiyou, Modoc and Lassen County
9siskiyou_20110629_6	6292011	Margo L. Perryman	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110629_1	Sacramento	Sacramento		no	yes	historical ties, similar interests ,	business activity, economic development, education
9sacramento_20110629_2	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	African American Community	
9siskiyou_20110629_1	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_1a	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama		1-5, 101, US395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_2	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_2a	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_3	Siskiyou.			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_3a	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama		101, I5 395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_4	Siskyou			no	yes	rural community	agriculture, ranching
9siskiyou_20110629_4a	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama		101, I5 395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_5	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_5a	Siskyou, Modoc, Lassen			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_6	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter		I-5, Highway 99	no	yes		agriculture centered economy

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110629_1	hospital, connectivity		no				
9sacramento_20110629_2		plans are responsive to VRA	no				Unity maps submitted by AARC, APALC, MALDEF and AARC
9siskiyou_20110629_1			no			sick of lefties	
9siskiyou_20110629_1a			no			do not group coast with valley or mountains	
9siskiyou_20110629_2			no			Yreka, Eureka different	
9siskiyou_20110629_2a			no				
9siskiyou_20110629_3			no			working relationship with senators, too far to attend events, public safety, decline in economy	
9siskiyou_20110629_3a			no			do not put with coastal districts	
9siskiyou_20110629_4	government center, sheriff, library, court house, fair, media		no				
9siskiyou_20110629_4a			no			do not put with coastal districts	
9siskiyou_20110629_5			no			distance to coast, keep county intact	
9siskiyou_20110629_5a			no			nothingg to tie proposal to coast	
9siskiyou_20110629_6	water resources, economic and social interests,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110629_6a	6292011	Sharon O Brien	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou county
9siskiyou_20110629_7	6292011	Cliff Munson	no			Siskiyou	yes	North state seperates better north south than east-west
9siskiyou_20110629_8	6292011	Margo L. Perryman	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskyou with Coast
9siskiyou_20110629_9	6292011	Kim Brown	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_10	6292011	Kevin and Davie Martin	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Align districts NorthSouth not EastWest, use highways.
9siskiyou_20110629_11	6292011	Rose R. Chesnut	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_12	6292011	Thomas D. Pease	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou with Coast
9siskiyou_20110629_13	6292011	Loran G. Berck, City Council Member	yes	Town of Fort Jones	Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_14	6292011	Stanley G. Meager	no		Seiad Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_15	6292011	Maureen Coleman	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_16	6292011	Andree Nippe	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_17	6292011	Dick Fyten	no				yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_18	6292011	Randy and Sharon Ollmann	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not place Siskiyou with Coast

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110629_6a	Siskiyou		I-5	no	yes	unique needs and challenges	
9siskiyou_20110629_7	Siskiyou		US395, I-5, 101	no	yes		agriculture, high desert, timber, fish
9siskiyou_20110629_8	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_9	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_10	siskiyou		I5, US395, 101	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_11	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.		I5, US395, 101	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_12	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_13	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_14	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.		I5, US395, 101	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_15	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_16	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.		I5, US395, 101	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_17	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_18	Siskiyou		I-5 corridor	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110629_6a			no			makes no sense to place with Humboldt and Del Norte	
9siskiyou_20110629_7			no			Native Americans should not be considered when creating districts	
9siskiyou_20110629_8			no			Very far to coast, hard climate	leave us the hell alone
9siskiyou_20110629_9			no			valley and coast have very different way of life	
9siskiyou_20110629_10			no			meetings will be terrible endeavor	
9siskiyou_20110629_11			no			do not group coast with valley or mountain communities	
9siskiyou_20110629_12			no			different lifestyle, economy, agriculture	
9siskiyou_20110629_13			no			do not merge with coast will be unfair	
9siskiyou_20110629_14			no			do not group coast with valley or mountain communities	
9siskiyou_20110629_15			no			draw lines North and south	
9siskiyou_20110629_16			no			do not group coast with valley or mountain communities	
9siskiyou_20110629_17			no			coast counties have little in common	
9siskiyou_20110629_18			no			geographically seperated	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110629_19	6292011	James W and Wendy J Sehrt	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9siskiyou_20110629_20	6292011	Ann Meyer	no				yes	Do not put Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc and Lassen with coastal areas
9siskiyou_20110629_21	6292011	Ross Slaughter	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou with coast
9siskiyou_20110629_22	6292011	Jeff Maddox	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou with coast
9siskiyou_20110629_23	6292011	Laurie Leeper	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc and Lassen with coastal areas
9siskiyou_20110629_24	6292011	Tina Frost	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9sjoaquin_20110629_1	6292011	Anthony Teresi	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not split Lodi, keep with San Joaquin
9tehema_20110629_1	6292011	Georgia Standridge	no		Corning	Tehama	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together.
9tehema_20110629_2	6292011	Lois Rogan	no		Red Bluff	Tehama	yes	Keep Tehama, Shasta, Butte separate from Coast
9tehema_20110629_3	6292011	Robert James	no			Tehama	yes	Keep Shasta, Modoc, Tehama together and separate from Coast
9yolo_20110629_1	6292011	Susan Lovenburg, President	yes	Yolo Count School Boards Association		Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo County together
cscfrsupporters_20110629_1	6292011	Marilyn Brannan Whitmore	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura, not Malibu. Keep East Ventura together
lulac_20110629_1	6292011		yes	Santa Ana LULAC			no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110629_19	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.		I5, US395, 101	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_20	Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_21	Siskiyou		I5	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_22	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_23	Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen		North south	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110629_24	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.		North south	no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110629_1	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes		wine growers, agricultural community
9tehema_20110629_1	Siskiyou, Shasta, tehama.			no	yes	work well together	
9tehema_20110629_2	Tehama, Shasta, Butte			no	no		
9tehema_20110629_3	Tehama, shasta, Modoc			no	no		
9yolo_20110629_1	Yolo			no	yes		
cscfrsupporters_20110629_1	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
lulac_20110629_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110629_19			no			do not group coast with valley or mountain communities	
9siskiyou_20110629_20			no			makes no sense and is not fair	
9siskiyou_20110629_21			no			dangerous 4-5 hour drive, nothing in common	
9siskiyou_20110629_22			no			far drive, mountains, ranching community	
9siskiyou_20110629_23			no			nothing in common with coast	
9siskiyou_20110629_24			no				For crying out loud
9sjoaquin_20110629_1	similar interests and concerns		no				
9tehema_20110629_1			no			totally different resources and problems	
9tehema_20110629_2			no			different needs and different living	
9tehema_20110629_3			no			coastal business is coastal business	
9yolo_20110629_1	School districts, colleges, organizations		no				
cscfrsupporters_20110629_1			no				supports COSCFR
lulac_20110629_1			no				attached maps

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_1	6292011	Robert and Nancie Colberg	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_2	6292011	John Campbell	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_3	6292011	Dale P. Stedman	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_1		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_2		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_3		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_1	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_2	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_3	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_4	6292011	Susan Stedman	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_5	6292011	Tanya Wilson	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_6	6292011	Susan D. Holland	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_4		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_5		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_6		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_4	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_5	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_6	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_7	6292011	Craig Campbell	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_8	6292011	Eileen Campbell	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_9	6292011	John Campbell	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_7		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_8		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_9		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_7	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_8	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_9	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_10	6292011	Jane El Farra	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_11	6292011	Salam and Laila Al-Marayati	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_12	6292011	Jan Slort	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_10		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_11		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_12		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_10	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_11	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_12	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_13	6292011	Dan Colberg	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_14	6292011	Dusty Briscoe	no		LaCanada	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_15	6292011	Susan L. Mansis	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_13		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_14		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_15		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_13	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_14	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_15	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_16	6292011	James H Spencer	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_17	6292011	Daniel Baceda	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_18	6292011	Kent Tieche	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_16		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_17		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_18		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_16	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_17	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_18	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_19	6292011	Francesca Miller	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_20	6292011	Eli Roth	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_21	6292011	Anita and Brent Hunsaker	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
1imperial_20110629_1	6292011	Jesus Chauarria	no			Imperial	yes	Do not put Imperial county with Eastern San Diego

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_19		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_20		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_21		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		
1imperial_20110629_1	Imperial,	San Diego		no	yes	Hispanic vote	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_19	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_20	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110629_21	Income, Education, Housing, Transport, Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim, Forest, mountains, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails 210, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no				attached map
1imperial_20110629_1			no			you will be supressing the hispanic vote	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110629_1	6292011	Debbie Armstrong	no		Pine Valley	Imperial	yes	Put Pine Valley with San Diego County, not Imperial
1sdiego_20110629_2	6292011	Nick and Brett Dietrich (duplicate)	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	Rancho Santa Fe and Whispering Palms should be in SANOC AND NCOASTSAND
1sdiego_20110629_3	6292011	Don Higginson, Mayor	no		Poway	San Diego	yes	Keep Poway, Rancho Bernardo, and Rancho Penasquitos together in one district
1sdiego_20110629_4	6292011	Jo Marie Diamond, President (duplicate)	yes	San Diego East County Economic Development council		San Diego	yes	Keep together El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Santee
1sdiego_20110629_5	6292011	Jack Mcroskey (duplicate)	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	yes	Move UCSD boundary to 805 and below 52 to include Kearney Mesa
2riverside_20110629_1	6292011	Charlie Ara	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Imperial County and Coachella Valley should be in same districts.
2sbernardino_20110629_1	6292011	Penny Lilburn, Mayor Pro Tem	yes	City of Highland	Highland	San Bernardino	yes	Put Highland in Mono, Inyo, San Bernardino District.
2sbernardino_20110629_2	6292011	Bill Ruh	no		Montclair	San Bernardino	yes	LOSGFM and SBRIA are good maps. Fontana, Loma Linda, San Bernardino have historic ties.
9sacramento_20110625_1	6252011	Donald E Wilsonn	yes	Center Joint Unified School District, Trustee		Sacramento	yes	North Sacramento County communities that share government services with Placer County have been gerrymandered into a Congressional district with SolanoContra Costa counties. This impacts Antelope, Citrus Heights, Elverta, Folsom, N. Highlands, Rio Linda.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110629_1	Imperial, San Diego	Pine Valley		no	no		
1sdiego_20110629_2	San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe, Whispering Palms		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110629_3		Poway, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Penasquitos		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110629_4		El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Santee		no	yes	history, needs	transport, water and energy, economic development programs,
1sdiego_20110629_5	San Diego	Kearney Mesa		no	no		
2riverside_20110629_1	Imperial	Coachella		no	yes	ethnic makeup	agriculture,
2sbernardino_20110629_1	Mono, Inyo, San Bernardino	Highland		no	yes		citrus heritage
2sbernardino_20110629_2		Fontana, Loma Linda, San Bernardino		no	yes	historic ties, and identity, ethnicity	
9sacramento_20110625_1	Sacramento	Antelope, Citrus Heights, Elverta, Folsom, North Highlands, Rio Linda		no	yes	Antelope, Elverta, and Rio Linda belong with Placer County because they share school districts, park districts, chambers of commerce, and rotary clubs.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110629_1			no			Imperial is farming below sea level, Pine County is in SD mountains	
1sdiego_20110629_2	social geography and demographic, rural, inland, fire protection, school districts		no			districts are divided	
1sdiego_20110629_3	economic development council, chambber of commerce	CSU service area, health, college district, school district	no				
1sdiego_20110629_4	schools, safety, fire		no				
1sdiego_20110629_5			no				Mr. Haynors suggestion
2riverside_20110629_1	desert		no				
2sbernardino_20110629_1	schools, paramedics, fire, police, washes, thoroughfares, trails, environmental document		no				
2sbernardino_20110629_2		when looking at VRA	no				
9sacramento_20110625_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110625_2	6252011	Margaret Sigler	no			Sacremento	yes	Opposed to separating Elmhurst from Sacramento. It has nothing in common with the outlying areas.
9sacramento_20110625_3	6252011	Catherine Vade Bon Coeur	no		Elmhurst	Sacramento	yes	Opposed to separating the Elmhurst community from the larger city of Sacramento. It has nothing in common with the foothill communities and it identifies strongly with the city nature of Sacramento.
9siskiyou_20110625_1	6252011	Peggy Goshgarian	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not include the wester portions of Siskiyou County (which includes the home of the commenter, located 20 miles from Happy Camp) with coastal districtscommunities.
9siskiyou_20110625_2	6252011	Edward M Prather	no		Seiad Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Please reconsider the decision to move Scott Valley and Happy Camp to coastal areas. Their interests lie not to the west, but the east with Yreka and the 1-5 corridor.
9siskiyou_20110625_3	6252011	Cliff and Maryann Munson	yes	Kohlcreek and Kaaekrest Angus		Siskiyou	yes	Leave all of Siskiyou County in the same district. It has the most in common with eastern cities like Shasta Valley, Butte Valley, Modoc County, Shasta County.
9siskiyou_20110625_4	6242011	Dean Harris	no				yes	Revisit your decision to place Siskiyou county with the coastal communities. This decision is based on incorrect information.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110625_2	Sacramento	Elmhurst, Sacramento		no	no		
9sacramento_20110625_3	Sacramento	Elmhurst, Sacremonto		yes	yes	Elmhurst and Sacremento share city codes, policies, transportation, energy resources, funding, and tax-base issues.	
9siskiyou_20110625_1	Siskiyou	Happy Camp		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110625_2	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Happy Camp, Yreka	5-Jan	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110625_3	Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta	Shasta Valley, Butte Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110625_4	Siskiyou			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110625_2			no				
9sacramento_20110625_3			no				
9siskiyou_20110625_1			no				
9siskiyou_20110625_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110625_3			no				
9siskiyou_20110625_4			no				Concerned that the CRC has not visited Yreka. The commission has used incorrect information regarding natural resources (fish) and population (Native American persons) to guide its thinking.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110625_5	6252011	Harry Lake	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Let the Salmon Watershed Drainage Area that is in Siskiyou County remain in Siskiyou County and not in the proposed coastal district.
9siskiyou_20110625_6	6252011	Marellen Baird	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to redistricting western Siskiyou county as it places a significant burden on the citizens of that county. It also limits the contact they will have with their elected representatives.
9siskiyou_20110625_7	6252011	Tim Grenvik	no			Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to placing parts of western Siskiyou county with the coastal communities.
9sjoaquin_20110625_1	6252011	Inez Parker	no			San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be placed in the same district as Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisin City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, and Woodland. Lodi does not share interests with the Bay Area, and it will not have proper representation.
9sjoaquin_20110625_2	6252011	Joyce Dickerson	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi needs representatives from the central valley, not from communities like Santa Rosa and others in the North Bay. Need representatives that are familiar with agricultural needs and desires.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110625_5	Siskiyou		Salmon River Watershed Drainage Area	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110625_6	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110625_7	Siskiyou	Yreka		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110625_1	San Joaquin	Sacramento, Lodi, Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, Woodland.		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110625_2	San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa		no	yes	Lodi needs to be represented by those who are familiar with its agricultural, viticultural needs.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110625_5			no				
9siskiyou_20110625_6			no				
9siskiyou_20110625_7			no				The logic used by the CRC with respect to the line drawing in Siskiyou County is faulty is faulty, and the radio interview given by Mr. Forbes demonstrates this (with respect to Native American populations and environmental concerns).
9sjoaquin_20110625_1			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110625_3	6252011	Michael W Bennett	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not split Lodi and San Joaquin County into separate entities - this will only produce gerrymandered districts for democratic candidates.
9sjoaquin_20110625_4	6252011	Gregory Walther	no	Press-F1 Computer Service			yes	Opposes redistricting the city of Lodi into the Bay Area.
9sjoaquin_20110625_5	6252011	Susan Bagley	no			San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be placed in the same district as Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisin City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, and Woodland. Lodi does not share interests with the Bay Area, and it will not have proper representation.
9sjoaquin_20110625_6	6252011	duplicate of comment 9	no				no	
9sjoaquin_20110625_7	6252011	Chris Townsend	yes	Emanuel Lutheran Church, Lead Pastor	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi would not be well-served by redistricting it into Napa or other Bay area communities. Does not support the redistricting of Lodi.
9sjoaquin_20110625_8	6252011	Rebel Hildebrand	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should be kept in the valley where it belongs. It should not be placed with any other district.
9sjoaquin_20110625_9	6252011	Richard C Eklund	yes	Ecklund Engineering, President		San Joaquin	yes	All San Joaquin county voters should be included in the State Assembly voting districts.
9sjoaquin_20110625_10	6252011	Ken Levy	no			San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be included in the same district as East Bay communities. Strongly opposed to the first draft mapping.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110625_3	San Joaquin	Lodi	Bay Area	no	yes	Lodi shares no interests with Santa Rosa or the foothill communities. Keep Lodi and its schoolbusiness districts together.	
9sjoaquin_20110625_4	San Joaquin	Lodi	Bay Area	no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110625_5	San Joaquin	Sacramento, Lodi, Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, Woodland.		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110625_6				no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110625_7	San Joaquin	Lodi, Napa	Bay Area	no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110625_8	San Joaquin	Lodi	Central Valley	no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110625_9	San Joaquin			no	yes	The common goals and activities of San Joaquin county residents have been ignored in the first draft of redistricting.	
9sjoaquin_20110625_10	San Joaquin	Lodi	Bay Area	no	yes	Lodi is an agricultural town and is closely aligned with other towns in San Joaquin county.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110625_3			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_4			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_5			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_6			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_7			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_8			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_9			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110625_11	6252011	Marc Robinson	no			San Joaquin	yes	The first draft maps unnecessarily split Lodi into Assembly and Senate districts with Woodland, Vacaville, and Santa Rosa. It would be better to place Lodi with Stockton and San Joaquin county.
9sjoaquin_20110625_12	6252011	Robert Lauchland	no			San Joaquin	yes	The redistricting of Lodi is unsupportable. It appears to have been drawn solely to diminish the presence of Lodi in the CA legislature.
CSCFR_20110625_1	6252011	Toni Baiera-Kelly	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Supports the Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation. Assembly seats are correct (if anything, include entire city of Thousand Oaks and remove Oxnard). State senate seats should have Santa Clarita nested with East Ventura county.
CSCFR_20110625_2	6252011	Craig Kelly	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Supports the Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation. Assembly seats are correct (if anything, include entire city of Thousand Oaks and remove Oxnard). State senate seats should have Santa Clarita nested with East Ventura county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110625_11	San Joaquin	Lodi, Stockton, Woodland, Vacaville, Santa Rosa.		no	yes	Lodi has a close community of interest with the city of Stockton and the county of San Joaquin. Many Lodi residents work in Stockton (and vice versa). They also share school districts, ethnic communities, and family structures.	
9sjoaquin_20110625_12	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
CSCFR_20110625_1	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Oxnard, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		
CSCFR_20110625_2	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Oxnard, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110625_11			no				
9sjoaquin_20110625_12			no				
CSCFR_20110625_1			no				
CSCFR_20110625_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
CSCFR_20110625_3	6252011	Robert Caughey	no		Westlake Village	Ventura	yes	Supports the Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation. Assembly seats are correct (if anything, include entire city of Thousand Oaks and remove Oxnard). State senate seats should have Santa Clarita nested with East Ventura county.
CSCFR_20110625_4	6252011	Linda Foster	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Supports the Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation. Assembly seats are correct (if anything, include entire city of Thousand Oaks and remove Oxnard). State senate seats should have Santa Clarita nested with East Ventura county.
CSCFR_20110625_5	6252011	Denise Lynn Nielsen	no		Rosa Valley	Ventura	no	Supports the Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation. Assembly seats are correct (if anything, include entire city of Thousand Oaks and remove Oxnard). State senate seats should have Santa Clarita nested with East Ventura county.
general_20110625_1	6252011	Karen Kinsley	no				no	
general_20110625_2	6252011	Craig Hemphill	no				yes	Supports the CCAG redistricting maps.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
CSCFR_20110625_3	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Oxnard, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		
CSCFR_20110625_4	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Oxnard, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		
CSCFR_20110625_5	Ventura	Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Oxnard, Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		
general_20110625_1				no	no		
general_20110625_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
CSCFR_20110625_3			no				
CSCFR_20110625_4			no				
CSCFR_20110625_5			no				
general_20110625_1			no				Questions what it means when people are told they live in a historical district, but do not receive tax breaks as a result.
general_20110625_2			no				Does not believe that redistricting to isolate certain ethnic groups accords with American values.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110625_3	6252011	Leon Rogson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	no	
general_20110625_4	6252011	Bobbi Feinstein	yes	Feinstein Financial Insurance Services			no	
general_20110625_5	6252011	Dennis Randall	no				yes	It will be good to have the foothill counties in the same district.
general_20110625_6	6252011	Judy Moss	no				no	
general_20110625_7	6252011	Chuck Shetron	no		Oakdale	Stanislaus	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110625_3				no	no		
general_20110625_4				no	no		
general_20110625_5				no	no		
general_20110625_6				no	no		
general_20110625_7				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110625_3			no				Opposes redistricting for anything other than population. Supports color, race, gender blind redistricting.
general_20110625_4			no				Does not want a change of boundaries or a change of zip code.
general_20110625_5			no				Thanks the CRC for a job well done.
general_20110625_6			no				Believes that the law states that there should be two assembly districts per senate district, and this is not reflected in current maps.
general_20110625_7			no				12.5 percent of the assembly districts and 6.9 percent of the senate districts have population deviations over the historically accepted limit of 2 percent. This is excessive and the CRC should redraw the districts to be within the standard deviation.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
smonicamtns_20110625_1	6252011	Myra Turek	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_2	6252011	Lucy Martin	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_3	6252011	Michael Harrison	yes	City of Calabasas, Former Mayor	Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_4	6252011	Sally	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	no	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
smonicamtns_20110625_1	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_2	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_3	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_4	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
smonicamtns_20110625_1			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_2			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_3			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
smonicamtns_20110625_5	6252011	Molly Martin	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_6	6252011	Hal Helsley	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_7	6252011	Gail A Newman	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_8	6252011	Jake Martin	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
smonicamtns_20110625_5	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_6	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_7	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_8	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
smonicamtns_20110625_5			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_6			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_7			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_8			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
smonicamtns_20110625_9	6252011	Billy Martin	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_10	6252011	Shelly Palmer	no		Calabasas (Topanga)	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_11	6252011	Marcia Weiss	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_12	6252011	Jeff Messenger	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation maps from June 22. Disapproves of SD and CD for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deeply connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_13	6252011	Harold V Helsley	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not fragment the Santa Monica Mountains and the National Recreation Area into multiple legislative districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
smonicamtns_20110625_9	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_10	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_11	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_12	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_13	Los Angeles		Santa Monica Mountains, National Recreation Area	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
smonicamtns_20110625_9			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_10			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_11			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_12			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_13			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
smonicamtns_20110625_14	6252011	David Jobe	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation. Disapproves of the Senate and Congressional legislative districts for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deepy connected.
smonicamtns_20110625_15	6252011	J Sperling Reich	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the Las Virgenes Homeowner Federation. Disapproves of the Senate and Congressional legislative districts for the Santa Monica Mountain region. West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, etc, are deepy connected.
1sdiego_20110602	6022011	Elizabeth Taylor	no		Encinitas	San Diego	yes	Solana Beach, Del Mar, Encinitas, Carlsbad, Oceanside should stay together and be considered a North County coastal COI
1sdiego_20110603	6032011	Anne Estes	no			San Diego	yes	Keep Carlsbad with all coastal cities - Del Mar, Lake San Marcos, Solana Beach, Oceanside. Do not break up Carlesbad or put it with inland cities
1sdiego_20110605	6052011	Paul G Marx	no			San Diego	no	
2sbernardino_20110602	6022011	Sam Garcia	no			San Bernardino	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
smonicamtns_20110625_14	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
smonicamtns_20110625_15	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	These communities share fire services, council governments, water and sewer services.	
1sdiego_20110602	North Diego County	Encinitas, Carlsbad, Oceanside, Del Mar, Solana Beach		no	yes	Share concerns about water, beach, urban runoff, marine debris, and health of coastal Zone. Want a marine protected area in swamis.	Beach economy revolves around relationship to coast
1sdiego_20110603		Carlsbad, Del Mar, Lake San Marcos, Solana Beach, Oceanside		no	no		
1sdiego_20110605				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110602				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
smonicamtns_20110625_14			no				
smonicamtns_20110625_15			no				
1sdiego_20110602			no				
1sdiego_20110603			no				
1sdiego_20110605			no				Best idea to control government corruption in years.
2sbernardino_20110602			no			what do the boxed numbers on the maps mean.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110527_2	5272011	R A Ergas	no		San Clemente	Orange	yes	Keep the beach cities of southern OC as COI, do not put San Clemente and other beach cities with Riverside or San Diego Districts
3orange_20110527_2	5272011	Bettye Hayes	no		San Clemente	Orange	yes	Keep San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point, Laguna Beach as part of South Orange County.
3orange_20110527_2	5272011	Dwayne Phillips	no				no	
3orange_20110527_2	5272011	Hal Forsen	no		San Clemente	Orange	yes	His community is San Clemente, Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano, NOT Riverside.
3orange_20110602	6022011	Richard Boyer	no			Orange	yes	keep together San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point, they share a strong Orange County identity, which should be recognized
3orange_20110603	6032011	Carolyn Cavecche	yes	Mayor, City of Orange	Orange	Orange	yes	CD-good job keeping Orange whole and with N Central Orange. ADSD-Keep Orange whole in SD. N and E go to border with San Bernadino, have little in common, Orange shares intrest with N Central OC. Consider putting Orange in DBRHC for SD.
3orange_20110604	6042011	Ken Roth	no			South Orange	yes	southern part of Orange County is not part of San Diego County nor Riverside County. Keep Southern OC cities with other OC cities.
3orange_20110604	6042011	Zeke Hernandez	no				no	
4langeles_20110527_2	5272011	Brian Cameron	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110527_2	Riverside, San Diego, Orange	San Clemente	Camp Pendleton and ocean are natural boundaries of San Clemente and beach cities area	no	no		
3orange_20110527_2	South Orange	San Juan Capistrano,Dana Point, Laguna Beach, San Clemente		no	yes	share interests and needs	
3orange_20110527_2				no	no		
3orange_20110527_2	Riverside	San Clemente, Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano		no	no		
3orange_20110602	Orange	San Clemente, San Juan Capiastrano, Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110603	Orange County	Orange		no	yes	Transportation and Housing needs are alike in Placentia, Anaheim, Fullerton. Public Safety officials work together	
3orange_20110604	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110604				no	no		
4langeles_20110527_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110527_2			no				
3orange_20110527_2	share interests and needs		no				
3orange_20110527_2			no			Wants to see fair districts drawn	
3orange_20110527_2			no				Does not like current congressman
3orange_20110602			no				
3orange_20110603			no				
3orange_20110604			no				
3orange_20110604			no				Bad info about Fullerton meeting place.
4langeles_20110527_2			no			Maldef maps are bad.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110527_2	5272011	John Mika	no			Los Angeles	yes	Dont split the San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110527_2	5272011	Alex Burrola	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach intact in all three districts. It has population on its own to be an AD. San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City are COI. Palos Verdes Penninsula, South Bay cities are COI. Long Beach and neighboring cities are COI. But all three groups are not
4langeles_20110527_2	5272011	Rob Maffit	no				no	
4langeles_20110601_2	5312011	Christine McKinney	no		Baldwin Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Baldwin Hills, South Central, Exposition Park, Vermont Slauson, Westmont, Watts, Florence-Graham, Figueroa Corridor, Vermont Knolls together as COI in all districts.
4langeles_20110601_2	6012011	Armen Ross	no		Lafayette Square	Los Angeles	yes	COI is Baldwin Hills, Ladera heights, West Adams, Crenshaw, Jefferson Park, Hyde Park, Leimer Park , View Park, Windsor Hills, Culver City, Playa Vista, Mid-City. All known as Crenshaw community, African American.
4langeles_20110603	6032011	Christine Rowe	no		San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110603	6032011	Jon Fuhrman	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110603	6042011	Jones	no				no	
4langeles_20110603	6042011	Robert Vaughn	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Pomona is left out of Los Angeles county and given over to Santa Barbara. LA maps are a bit better than before.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110527_2				yes	no		
4langeles_20110527_2	Los Angeles	Long beach, San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City,Palos Verdes		no	yes		
4langeles_20110527_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110601_2	Los Angeles	Baldwin Hills, South Central, Exposition Park, Vermont Slauson, Westmont, Watts, Florence-Graham, Figueroa Corridor, Vermont Knolls		yes	yes	share similar demographics and many common interests	
4langeles_20110601_2		Baldwin Hills, Ladera Heights, West Adams, Crenshaw,Culver City, Playa vista,	Venice Blvd, Washington Blvd, Crenshaw Blvd,	yes	yes	Neighborhood with high percentage of African Americans who share culture, demographics	
4langeles_20110603				no	no		
4langeles_20110603				no	no		
4langeles_20110603				no	no		
4langeles_20110603	Los Angeles County	Pomona		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110527_2			no			Boundaries of a district should be compact,along geological and existing city or town boundary lines	
4langeles_20110527_2			no			Nest the ADs to make SDs. Nest SDs to make BOE	
4langeles_20110527_2			no			Maldef maps are bad.	
4langeles_20110601_2			no				
4langeles_20110601_2			no				
4langeles_20110603			no				Previous comment still not posted.
4langeles_20110603			no			Why did nesting of ADs get abandoned for SDs.	
4langeles_20110603			no				blank
4langeles_20110603			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110603	6032011	Diana Dixon-Davis	yes	Chatsworth Neighborhood Council, Elected member	Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Chatsworth in any district. Include Chatsworth with Twin Lakes and Lake View Terrace. Chatsworth is part of San Fernando Valley not Simi or Santa Clarita.
4langeles_20110603	6032011	Alex Zucco	no		Monrovia	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Monrovia together
4langeles_20110603	6032011	Ron Howard	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Los Angeles should be kept in straight lines to elimanate the zig-zag to create a safe district for any particular politician
4langeles_20110605	6062011	Vickere Murphy	no		La Crescenta	Los Angeles	yes	Keep La Crescenta whole in all three districts. La Crescenta share a high school, middle school, zip code, town name, library and post office.
4langeles_20110605	6052011	Christopher Wiemberg	no		Palms	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Palms Neighborhood and keep it intact in overlapping AD, SD and CD. Currently it is in coastal SD, inland AD and split in two CDs. Shares common interest with Santa Monica. West LA and Mar Vista not Baldwin Hills.
5ventura_20110528	5282011	Kyle Draper	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Calabasas and other cities on 101 corridor (Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village) should not be linked with other side on Santa Monica Mountain Range. Makes more sense to link Calabasas, etc. with WSFV like Woodland Hills and Tarzana.
5ventura_20110531	5312011	Gary Cushing	no			Ventura	no	
5ventura_20110602	6022011	DC Crosse	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	SD - Keep Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark connected to the Santa Clarita for SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110603	Los Angeles County	Chatsworth, Twin Lakes, Lake View Terrace	Chatsworth boundaries 118 freeway,ridge lines Oak Mountain, Twin lakes, Lake View Terrace	no	yes		
4langeles_20110603		Monrovia		no	no		
4langeles_20110603	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	no		
4langeles_20110605	Los Angeles County	La Cresenta	Stretches along Foothill Blvd. between city of the La Canada-Flintridge and the Tujunga portion of the city of Los Angeles	no	no		
4langeles_20110605	Los Angeles			yes	no		
5ventura_20110528		Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills and Westlake Village,Fernando Valley, Woodland Hills,Tarzana		no	yes	have common transportation by Hwy 101, people in Calabasas regularly eat , shop, and work in WSFV.	
5ventura_20110531				no	no		
5ventura_20110602		Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110603		No minority VRA group dominates but they are all represented here.	no				
4langeles_20110603			no				
4langeles_20110603			no				
4langeles_20110605			no				
4langeles_20110605			no			Ensure consistent districting across all levels.	
5ventura_20110528			no				
5ventura_20110531			no				Has the Oxnard hearing been cancelled?
5ventura_20110602			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Scott Figgins	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo with eastern Ventura county; inclued Camarillo, Santa Clarita, Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Thousand Oaks in this AD
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Trisha Monesi	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley, Moorpark , Camarillo, and Thousand Oaks together in Eastern Ventura county
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Kerry Rafferty	no		Ventura	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley, Moorpark and Thousand Oaks in the same district
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Debby Heron	no		Ventura	Ventura	yes	Put Ventura and Santa Barbara in the same
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Dan Nahmias	no			Ventura	yes	Do not split up Oxnard, even if it must be with district to the north; Keep Santa Clara Valley together with East Ventura County
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Thelma Barry	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Do not split up Thousand Oaks; Keep Thousand Oaks in SD wCamarillo, Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Santa Clarita; do not put Thousand Oaks with LA county
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Paul Heron	no		Ventura	Ventura	yes	Put Ventura And Santa Barbara in the same District.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110602	Ventura	Camarillo, Santa Clarita, Simi Vally, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks		no	yes	Ventura County and Camarillo share the same business owners, Residents, Santa clarita shares common intrest with the community.	
5ventura_20110602	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo and Thousand Oaks		no	yes		
5ventura_20110602		Simi Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110602		Ventura, Santa Barbara		no	no	Common intrest within the community	
5ventura_20110602	Ventura	Oxnard		no	yes		
5ventura_20110602	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110602	Ventura	Vetura, Santa Barbara		no	no	Both Ventura and Santa Barbara are beach communities, residents share outlook on life and well being	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Barbara Evans	no		Ventura	Ventura	yes	Do not put Ojai in CD wMonterey, San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara counties; Put Ojai wVentura, Santa Paula, and Fillmore; do not split cities
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Maeve Rios	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Santa Clarita in the same SD.
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Lisa Figgins	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Keep Camarillo with Eastern Ventura County District Including Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Thousand Oaks
5ventura_20110602	6022011	Anne Telling	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley and Moorpark together; do not put these cities wSan Fernando Valley
5ventura_20110603	6032011	Judith Young	no			Ventura	yes	Put Ventura, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, and Santa Clarita in the same SD.
5ventura_20110603	6042011	Ercell M. Stout	no			Ventura	yes	Keep Ventura County intact in one CD; do not put Ventura wLos Angeles or San Fernando Valley
5ventura_20110603	6032011	Susan D. Tanner	no			Ventura	yes	Do not split Thousand Oaks; Put Thousand Oaks wSimi Valley, Moorpark, and Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110603	6032011	Stanley Young	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Put Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, and Santa Clarita together within the same SD; do not put Thousand Oaks wWest Ventura County or West San Fernando Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110602	Ventura, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara	Ojai, Ventura, Santa Paula, Fillmore		no	yes	Ojai linked to Ventura, Santa Paula, Fillmore politically, economically, for resource mgmt, transportation infrastructure, and cultural events.	
5ventura_20110602	Ventura	Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110602	Ventura	Camarillo, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110602		Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110603	Ventura	Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Residents of these cities have much in common	
5ventura_20110603	Ventura, Los Angeles			no	no		
5ventura_20110603	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110603	Ventura	Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita together		no	yes	These four cities are a COI	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110602			no				Cities plan for the whole city, not just a portion; splitting cities among districts makes regoinal planning very difficult, politicians would have to duplicate effort and staff members to represent the whole city
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110602			no				
5ventura_20110603			no				
5ventura_20110603			no				
5ventura_20110603			no				
5ventura_20110603			no			Separating any one of these four cities from the others would seem politically-motivated	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110603	6032011	Daryl Reynolds	yes	Thousand Oaks Planning Commissioner	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not split Thousand Oaks; Keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo and Santa Clarita together
5ventura_20110604	6042011	David Stewart	no			Ventura	yes	Do not split Thousand Oaks; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Santa Clarita in same SD
5ventura_20110605	6052011	Gary Smart	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not put Thousand Oaks with Los Angeles
5ventura_20110605	6052011	Marcia Smart	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Put Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Simi Valley, and Moorpark under the same SD; do not include any of these cities with Los Angeles County.
6kern_20110601	6012011	Linda Miller	no				yes	Keep Ridgecrest and China Lake in the Kern County district
6stanislaus_20110601	6012011	Charles Shetron	no				no	
6stanislaus_20110602	6022011	John Lazar	yes	City of Turlock, Mayor	Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Keep Turlock in SD 12 with cities along the Hwy 99 corridor (Ceres, Livingston); do not put Turlock with Foothhill Communities in Mariposa or Tuolumne counties, or weastern cities such as Oakdale and Waterford
6stanislaus_20110603	6032011	Jerry Powell	no		Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Keep Turlock in SD 12 with cities along the Hwy 99 corridor (Ceres, Livingston); do not put Turlock with outlying areas (Hughson, Oakdale, or foothill areas)
7sclara_20110601	6012011	Barbara Lea	no		Los Gatos	Santa Clara	yes	Do not use the proposal for District 15; Santa Clara and Santa Barbara counties are very far apart and should not be in the same district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110603	Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo		no	yes	Residents of these cities share views, work together on transportation and watershed issues	
5ventura_20110604		Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	These cities share commanalities	
5ventura_20110605	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	no		
5ventura_20110605	Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita, Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
6kern_20110601	Kern	Ridgecrest		no	no	China Lake in Kern County	
6stanislaus_20110601				no	no		
6stanislaus_20110602	Mariposa, Tuolumne	Turlock, Ceres, Livingston, Oakdale, Waterford	Hwy 99	no	no		
6stanislaus_20110603		Turlock, Ceres, Livingston, Hughson, Oakdale	Hwy 99	no	yes	Cities along HWY 99 corridor share transportation, jobs, and retail areas	Shared shopping and jobs along HWY 99 corridor
7sclara_20110601	Santa Clara, Santa Barbara			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110603			no				
5ventura_20110604			no				
5ventura_20110605			no				
5ventura_20110605			no				
6kern_20110601			no				
6stanislaus_20110601			no				Attempting to attend June fisrt meeting in Sacramento, cannot get connected.
6stanislaus_20110602			no				
6stanislaus_20110603			no				
7sclara_20110601			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110531_2		Sergio U. Santos	yes	UAW, LETC, Community Labor Liason at NRC Fremont; Former UAW president		Alameda	yes	Keep Southern Alameda County CD 13 intact, follow 1990 map; Include San Leandro, Newark, Hayward, Union City, Fremont, and Milpitas; do not include Pleasanton, Livermore; consider Columbia Congressional Study for CA
8alameda_20110601_1	6012011	Traci Reilly	no			Alameda	yes	Put Lafayette, Orinda, Moraga with Walnut Creek, not with Berkeley, Oakland
8alameda_20110601_1	6012011	Pat Ferguson	no				yes	Put Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Byron, E Contra Costa wAntioch, Oakley, Bethel Island, not wSolano, Sacrameto or Yolo ; put MartinezPachecoVine HillMtn Viewsome of Concord wSolano Cnty; LafayetteMoragaOrinda map looks good, but include Walnut Cr.
8alameda_20110601_1	6012011	Ruth Friedrichs	yes			Contra Costa	yes	Use Bay Area Maps submitted 52411 by CA Conservative Action Group and CA Citizens Redistricting Task Force; put Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, San Ramon Valley, Dublin, Pleasonton, Livermore in same CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110531_2	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City, Hayward, San Leandro, Milpitas, Pleasanton, Livermore		no	yes	Southern Alameda county cities share demographics, have been together for decades	Shared Labor and economic interests; common industrial-labor base
8alameda_20110601_1	Alameda	Lafayette,Orinda, Moraga, Walnut Creek, Berkeley, Oakland	Caldecott Tunnel and hills	no	yes	Caldecott Tunnelhills are natural barrier; cities to the west (Berkeley, Oakland) are more urban, have different issues re water, transportation, housing	
8alameda_20110601_1	Contra Costa, Solano, Sacramento, Yolo	Brentwood, Antioch, Oakley, Martinez, Mountain View, Concord, Lafayette, Moraga, Orinda, Walnut Creek	Mt. Diablo foothills, Sacramento River, San Joaquin River	no	yes	MartinezPachecoMt ViewConcord etc are connected to Solano co. by the Benecia Bridge and I-680, but BrentwoodByronDiscovery bay are not	
8alameda_20110601_1	Contra Costa	Walnut Creek, Oakley, Antioch, Clayton, Brentwood, Dublin, Pleasonton, Livermore		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110531_2			no				
8alameda_20110601_1			no				
8alameda_20110601_1			no				
8alameda_20110601_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110601_2	6012011	Saleacia Taylor	no		Hayward	Alameda	yes	Keep Hayward in CD 13, Keep Hayward, Fremont, Union City and Newark together; do not put Hayward wPleasanton, Livermore, Dublin
8alameda_20110601_2	6012011	William Fazakerly	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Use Alameda County Citizens Redistricting Task Force maps
8alameda_20110602	6022011	Bob Howe	no				yes	Do not use maps submitted by MALDEF (Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund), they are an example of gerrymandering that should be rejected by the commission.
8alameda_20110602	6022011	Bob Howe	no		Pleasanton	Alameda	yes	Do not divide Pleasanton (Alameda County) into 3 different districts
8alameda_20110602	6022011	Tim Holmes	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro under in district, regardless of which one
8alameda_20110602	6032011	Jacob Smit	no			Alameda	yes	Draw line at San Leandro city boundary (do not split San Leandro); put San Leandro with Hayward

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110601_2		Hayward, Fremont, Union City, Newark, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore		no	yes	Hayward, Fremont, Newark, Union City share socioeconomic demographics, school needs, economic development issues, social services, crimegang management; DublinPleasantonLivermore has more affluent population	Hayward has low median income, 11 living under poverty line, has made redevelopment a priority, improving economic growth
8alameda_20110601_2				no	no		
8alameda_20110602				no	no		
8alameda_20110602	Alameda	Pleasanton		no	no		
8alameda_20110602		San Leandro		no	yes	San Leandro is a cohesive community, shares city government, primary shared school district, common goals	
8alameda_20110602		San Leandro, Hayward		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110601_2			no				
8alameda_20110601_2			no				Do not allow special interest groups use voter affiliation; instead draw compact, nested, contiguous districts
8alameda_20110602			no				
8alameda_20110602			no				
8alameda_20110602			no				
8alameda_20110602			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110603	6032011	Jonathan C. Breault	no				no	
8alameda_20110603	6042011	Stephen Cassidy	yes	City of San Leandro, Mayor	San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Do not divide San Leandro among districts
8alameda_20110604	6042011	Rich Mayrend	no				yes	Put some of Livermore with Contra Costa; consider a San FranciscoNorth Alameda County district; comment does not make enough sense to summarize request
8alameda_20110604	6042011	Graham Crowe	no				yes	Split W Contra Costa AD (RichmondBerkeley) from the Oakland AD near 98024 FWY; keep West Berkeley, Emeryville, West Oakland in same AD; Oakland CD looks OK, do not add RichmondSan Pablo, or put El Cerrito in Contra Costa County CD; remove Castro Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110603				no	no		
8alameda_20110603		San Leandro		no	yes	San Leandro is cohesive community; shares shopping, dining, recreation, family acitivites, shoreline, parksnature areas; high level of civic engagement; shared school investments; has never been divided in the past	
8alameda_20110604	Alameda, San Francisco, Contra Costa	Livermore, San Francisco		no	no		
8alameda_20110604	Contra Costa	Richmond, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, Richmond, San Pablo, El Cerrito, Castro Valley	I-980, HWY 24	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110603			no				Implement the Independent Peer Review Process (inline review process) to make districts as fair as possible; appalled by Commissioner Maria Blancos behavior, which does not comport wcivilized or intelligent discourse
8alameda_20110603			no				
8alameda_20110604			no				
8alameda_20110604			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110604	6042011	Jim and Diana Graham	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	Keep San Leandro under same ADSDCD
8ccosta_20110527_2	5272011	Vitaly Luban	no				yes	Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group; Sierra Club map violates VRA; San Joaquin Co Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting carves up TriValley; Latino Policy Forum map violates VRA; CIJEE jumps over hills; MALDEF plan violates VRA
8ccosta_20110527_2	5272011	Alan Wolfer	no		Santa Clara	Santa Clara	yes	Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group
8ccosta_20110527_2	5272011	Stepan Merjanian	no				yes	Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group; reject Sierra Club, SJCCCR, Latino Policy Forum, CIJEE, Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR plan, and MALDEF plan; put San Leandro wMilpitas, not wtri valley
8ccosta_20110527_2	5272011	Walter Trebick	no				yes	Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group; reject Sierra Club, SJCCCR, Latino Policy Forum, CIJEE, Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR plan, and MALDEF plan; put San Leandro wMilpitas, not wtri valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110604		San Leandro		no	yes	San leandro has a diverse population of 29 Asian, 27 Hispanic, 27 Caucasian, 12 African-American, and 5 other	
8ccosta_20110527_2				no	yes	Lamorinda and Pleasanton should not be put with Berkeley because the demographics are very different	
8ccosta_20110527_2	Contra Costa			no	no		
8ccosta_20110527_2		San Leandro, Milpitas		no	no		
8ccosta_20110527_2		San Leandro, Milpitas		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110604		See COI field	no				
8ccosta_20110527_2		See summary field for allegations that some of the maps submitted by other organizations violate VRA	no				
8ccosta_20110527_2			no				
8ccosta_20110527_2		Maps opposed in summary field violate VRA	no				
8ccosta_20110527_2		Maps opposed in summary field violate VRA	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110527_2	5272011	Victor Goodrum	no				yes	Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group; reject Sierra Club, SJCCCR, Latino Policy Forum, CIJEE, Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR plan, and MALDEF plan; put San Leandro wMilpitas, not wtri valley
8ccosta_20110527_2	5272011	Christine Merjanian	no				yes	Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group; reject Sierra Club, SJCCCR, Latino Policy Forum, CIJEE, Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR plan, and MALDEF plan; put San Leandro wMilpitas, not wtri valley
8ccosta_20110527_2	5272011	Neil Mammen	no				yes	Supports testimony of Neil Mammen at San Jose meeting; do not use MALDEF, NALEO, or CAUSE maps; Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group
8ccosta_20110602	6022011	Patty ODay	no		Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	yes	Do not split Walnut Creek; put it wLamorinda, Alamo, Danville, other cities along 680 Corridor; use CCAG maps
8ccosta_20110602	6022011	Lois Mordock	no				yes	Keep Martinez with Contra Costa, and cities along the 680 corridor
8ccosta_20110602	6012011	Lois Morduck	no				yes	Do not put Martinez with Solano County; keep it with 680 corridor cities (Concord, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, 680 cities south)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110527_2		San Leandro, Milpitas		no	no		
8ccosta_20110527_2		San Leandro, Milpitas		no	no		
8ccosta_20110527_2				no	no		
8ccosta_20110602		Walnut Creek, Danville	680 corridor	no	no		
8ccosta_20110602	Maritnez	Martinez	680 Corridor	no	yes	Martinez should be with Contra Costa county as it is the county seat	
8ccosta_20110602		Martinez, Concord, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek	680 Corridor	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110527_2		Maps opposed in summary field violate VRA	no				
8ccosta_20110527_2		Maps opposed in summary field violate VRA	no				
8ccosta_20110527_2		Drawing lines based on minority groups violates VRA, replicates ethnic divisions causing strife in the countries where immigrants came from	no				Comment repeats exact testimony from San Jose meeting
8ccosta_20110602			no				
8ccosta_20110602			no				When will maps reflecting unification of Contra Costa county be able to be displayed?
8ccosta_20110602			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110602	6012011	Allen Payton	yes	Contra Costa Citizens Redistricting Task Force, Chairman; CA Conservative Action Group			yes	SEE LISTS Do not split Walnut Cr; Hayward AD shcould not cross cnty line; keep AntiochBrentwoodOakleyDiscovery Bay wE Contra Costa, OakleyPittsburghPay Pt, not wSolanoSacYolo; put MartinezPachecoVine HillMtn Viewsome of Concord wSolano
8ccosta_20110602	6022011	Harold Bray	no		Brentwood	Contra Costa	yes	Put Lamorinda (Lafayette, Moraga, and Orinda), Walnut Creek, Clayton, Alamo, Danville, San Ramon, Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore (Tri-Valley), Discovery Bay, Brentwood, Bethel Island, Knightsen, Byron, Antioch and Oakley together
8ccosta_20110603	6032011	Carol M. Hehmeyer	no				no	
8marin_20110604	6042011	Roger Lion	no				yes	6th CD going from Marin to Del Norte is too long, keep boundaries of 6th CD as they are now; do not put Solano with Marin

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110602	Contra Costa, Solano, Sacramento, Yolo	Walnut Creek, Hayward, Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, Pittsburgh, Bay Point, Maritnez, Mountain View, Concord	Mt. Diablo Foothills, Sacramento River, San Joaquin River	no	no		
8ccosta_20110602		Lafayette, Moraga, Orinda, Walnut Creek, Clayton, Danville, San Ramon, Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore, Brentwood, Antioch, Oakley		no	yes	Shared natural resources, gov svcs, infrastructure, retail, recreation, transportation, habitat conservancy, health services, law enforcement services, water resources and discharge, air quality and quality of life issues.	
8ccosta_20110603				no	no		
8marin_20110604	Marin, Del Norte, Solano			no	yes	Although coastal communities share environmental interests, they diverge on many other interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110602			no				
8ccosta_20110602			no				
8ccosta_20110603			no				Rose Institute should be hired to do inline review (independent peer review) as per Commissioner Wards request; Q2 has no mapping experience; Maria Blanco should not be on the commission because of her multiple conflicts
8marin_20110604	Too much distance for a representative to travel; northern counties would be under represented		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110604	6042011	Roberta Sharnak	no				yes	Proposed District is too large; do not put Marin and Sonoma wnorthern coastal counties, keep them with local metro areas
8marin_20110604	6042011	John Lim	no				yes	Do not change current lines of district 6 to as far east as Suisun City
8napa_20110605	6052011	Kent Cohea	no		Napa	Napa	yes	Draw Zip code lines on compact areas, such as Wine growong, Farming Industrial areas in Napa County
8solano_20110601	6022011	Lois Murdock, duplicate	no				no	
8solano_20110601	6012011	Lois Murdock, duplicate	no			Solano	no	
8sonoma_20110601	6012011	Elizabeth Gatley	no				yes	Do not put Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, and Sonoma with Southern Marin; Do not split Sonoma County; Put Novato with Sonoma County; do not make Sonoma a second priority to keeping other counties whole
8sonoma_20110602	6022011	Bonnie Krupp	no			Sonoma	yes	Use Bay Area Maps by California Conservative Action Group; reject Sierra Club, SJCCCR, Latino Policy Forum, CIJEE, Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR plan, and MALDEF plan; put San Leandro wMilpitas, not wtri valley
8sonoma_20110604	6042011	Barbara Ritter	no				yes	Keep Sonoma and Marin County together; if necessary, add 38k residents to the 6th dist by including more of Northern or Eastern Sonoma

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110604	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes	Marin, Sonoma share interests wlocal metro areas	
8marin_20110604		Suison City		no	no		
8napa_20110605	Napa			no	yes		Wine growing, industrial, farming regions should be kept together with like areas
8solano_20110601				no	no		
8solano_20110601				no	no		
8sonoma_20110601	Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Marin	Novato		no	no		
8sonoma_20110602	Sonoma			no	no		
8sonoma_20110604	Sonoma, Marin			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110604			no				
8marin_20110604			no				
8napa_20110605			no				
8solano_20110601			no				
8solano_20110601			no				
8sonoma_20110601			no				
8sonoma_20110602		Maps opposed in summary field violate VRA	no				
8sonoma_20110604			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110605	6052011	Martha McClure	no				yes	Likes proposal for North Coast representation at the state level; do not put all of northern CA coast in one CD; put Lake, Napa counties back into the 1st dist.
9humboldt_20110601_2	6012011	Judy Hageman	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Put Humboldt county with counties along the HWY 101 corridor, not inland counties; Leave Humbold district as it is
9humboldt_20110601_2	6022011	Tim Howard	no			Humboldt	yes	Keep Humboldt County with Medocino, Sonoma County, not with Modoc, Plumas, Siskiyou, Tehama; Keep Humboldt district the way it is
9humboldt_20110603	6032011	Katheleen Pelley	no				no	
9humbolt_20110601	6012011	Kit and Rebbeca Mann	no		Blue Lake	Humboldt	yes	Keep coastal counties together, do not put winland couties; put Humbold wDel Norte and Mendocino, not with Trinity, Siskiyou, or Shasta (Redding)
9mendicino_20110601	6012011	Eric Wilcox	no		Fort Bragg	Mendocino	yes	Do not change the current district lines of Humboldt, Mendocino, and Del Norte counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110605	Lake, Napa			no	no		
9humboldt_20110601_2	Humboldt		101 corridor	no	yes	Humbold is in COI w101 corridor, not inland counties, Homboldt is rural.	
9humboldt_20110601_2	Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Modoc, Plumas, Siskiyou, Tehama			no	yes	Humboldt has more in common culturally, ideologically, with Sonoma and Mendocino; not typical rural area, more populous, high-tech, and urbane	
9humboldt_20110603				no	no		
9humbolt_20110601	Humboldt, Del Norte, Mendocino, Trinity, Siskiyou, Shasta	Redding		no	no		
9mendicino_20110601	Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110605			no				
9humboldt_20110601_2			no				
9humboldt_20110601_2			no				
9humboldt_20110603			no				Why are there no meeting locations near Eureka CA?
9humbolt_20110601			no				There were not any forums offered north of Santa Rosa; the Commission has a poor grasp of characteristics of the northwest part of the state
9mendicino_20110601			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110603	6032011	Kathleen Swain	no			Mendocino	yes	Keep mendocino county under two congressional voters.
9mendocino_20110603	6032011	Richard Schaefers	no				yes	Put Mendocino with Napa, Sonoma, and Lake counties
9mendocino_20110605	6052011	Bob Coppock	no				no	
9placer_20110601	6052011	Ronald Brant	no			Placer	no	Follow existing county lines as much as possible to simplify local representation and district relationships.
9siskiyou_20110603	6032011	Alisa Taylor	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou with coastal counties; keep it wcounties along I-5 corridor, like Shasta, Tehama
9yolo_20110603	6042011	Gary Sandy	yes	City of Woodland, Former Mayor	Woodland	Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo; keep Woodland, Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, Esparto, Madison, Dunnigan, Knights Landing, Capay, Guinda, Brooks, and Clarksburg together
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) Central OC SD- Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Westminster, Stanton, much of Anaheim, Buena Park, La Palma, Cypress and Los Alamitos.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110603	Mendocino			no	no		
9mendocino_20110603	Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Lake			no	yes		Mendocino is a wine country area, should be kept with other wine-industry counties
9mendocino_20110605				no	no		
9placer_20110601				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110603	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama		I-5	no	no	Siskiyou county has unique water issues, which conflict with Delta water interests	
9yolo_20110603	Yolo	Woodland, Davis, West Sacramento, Winters		no	yes	Yolo communities share UC Davis, markets, and issues re watershed, air quality, farming, transportation; common interests in public safety, similar demographics	
3orange_20110601	Orange	Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Westminster, Stanton, much of Anaheim, Buena Park, La Palma, Cypress and Los Alamitos.		no	yes	Transportation issues, demographics, crime, public safety, entertainment	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110603			no				Do not de-prioritize northern CA, consider that region an essential part of the states economic future, and not a rural area to be ignored
9mendocino_20110603			no				
9mendocino_20110605			no				Unable to open latest map
9placer_20110601			no				Follow existing county lines as much as possible to simplify local representation and district relationships.
9siskiyou_20110603			no				
9yolo_20110603			no				
3orange_20110601			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats)SW OC SD-Aliso Viejo,Laguna Woods,L.Hills,L.Niguel,San Juan Capistrano,San Clemente,Rancho Santa Margarita,Irvine,Tustin,Lake Forest,Villa Park,E OrangeAnaheim,unincorp.Foothill Ranch,Ladera Ranch,Dove Canyon,Coto de Casa.
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) Coastal OC SD-Seal Beach, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley,small bit of Garden Grove, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach,Laguna Beach. LA AD-Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates,Long Beach S of PCH,Catalina Island.
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) N OC SD-Fullerton, Yorba Linda, Placentia, central and N Anaheim,W half of Orange,La Habra,La Habra Heights,Brea,Whittier,Diamond Bar,Walnut,Rowland Heights,Hacienda Heights
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) S OC AD-Aliso Viejo, Laguna Woods, Rancho Santa Margarita,Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110601	Orange	Aliso Viejo,Laguna Woods,L.Hills,L.Niguel,San Juan Capistrano,San Clemente,Rancho Santa Margarita,Irvine,Tustin,Lake Forest,Villa Park,E OrangeAnaheim,unincorp. Foothill Ranch,Ladera Ranch,Dove Canyon,Coto de Casa	N SR 91 freeway, W SR 55, Eedge of county to San Clemente, S county line	no	yes	Demographics, traffic, urban interface, watershed, canyon dwelling	
3orange_20110601	Orange, Los Angeles	Seal Beach, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley,Costa Mesa, Newport Beach and Laguna Beach, and a Los Angeles		no	yes	Environmental, crime, tourism, retail	coastal communities is to some degree dependent on the sales tax,retail sales and the tourism industry for providing key municipal services. Harbor district.
3orange_20110601	Orange	Fullerton, Yorba Linda, Placentia, central and N Anaheim,W half of Orange,La Habra,La Habra Heights,Brea,Whittier,Diamond Bar,Walnut,Rowland Heights,Hacienda Heights		no	yes	Canyon corridors, transport and rail, housing, higher education	
3orange_20110601	Orange	Aliso Viejo, Laguna Woods, Rancho Santa Margarita,Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente.		no	yes	Coastal communities, equestrian communities, family oriented, retirement communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110601			no				
3orange_20110601			no				
3orange_20110601			no				
3orange_20110601			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) N Central OC AD- Fullerton, Yorba Linda, Placentia, central and N Anaheim, W half of Orange
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) E OC AD- Irvine, Tustin, Lake Forest, Villa Park, the E portions of OrangeAnaheim, and the unincorporated area of Foothill Ranch
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) Central OC AD - Santa Ana and Garden Grove, Coastal OC AD- Seal Beach, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, a small bit of Garden Grove, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach and Laguna Beach
3orange_20110601	6012011	Lacy Kelly	yes	Association of California Cities, CEO	Orange	Orange	yes	(see map and stats) W Central OC AD- Westminster, Stanton, much of Anaheim , Buena Park, La Palma, Cypress, Los Alamitos. N OC AD-La Habra, La Habra Heights, Brea, Whittier, Diamond Bar, Walnut, Rowland Heights and Hacienda Heights
4langeles_20110527_2	5272011	Mary Wiesbrock	yes	Save Open SpacesSanta Monica Mountains, Chair	Agoura	Los Angeles	yes	supports 1991 lines. Las Virgenes, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village and the mountain communities of Topanga to Malibu should be kept together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110601	Orange	Fullerton, Yorba Linda, Placentia, central and N Anaheim, W half of Orange		no	yes	Transportation and rail, housing, Santa Ana river, CSU Fullerton	Industrial corridor
3orange_20110601	Orange	Irvine, Tustin, Lake Forest, Villa Park, the E portions of OrangeAnaheim, and the unincorporated area of Foothill Ranch		no	yes	Aiport corridor, watershed, canyon dwelling, urban interface	
3orange_20110601	Orange	Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Seal Beach, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, a small bit of Garden Grove, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach and Laguna Beach		no	yes	Transportation, demographics, crime and public safetyEnvironmental, housing, retail, tourism	
3orange_20110601	Orange	La Habra, La Habra Heights, Brea, Whittier, Diamond Bar, Walnut, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, Westminster, Stanton, much of Anaheim , Buena Park, La Palma, Cypress, Los Alamitos		no	yes	Entertainment, shared infostructure, militaryCanyon connectivity, transit corridor	
4langeles_20110527_2	Los Angeles	Las Virgenes, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu		no	yes	Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area and ocean are environmental COI	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110601			no				
3orange_20110601			no				
3orange_20110601			no				
3orange_20110601			no				
4langeles_20110527_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110604	6042011	Michael Rives	yes			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Antelope Valley with LA county for CDADSD, not with Kern
4langeles_20110706_8b	7062011	Rebecca Alvarado	yes		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_9b	7062011	Alysia Dakie	yes		Tarzana	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_10b	7062011	Dewey G Russell	yes		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_11b	7062011	Kimberly Zuber	yes		Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110604	Los Angeles, Kern			no	yes	Antelope Valley cities are located in LA county, has LA county supervisor, services provided by LA county	
4langeles_20110706_8b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_9b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_10b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_11b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110604			no				
4langeles_20110706_8b			no				
4langeles_20110706_9b			no				
4langeles_20110706_10b			no				
4langeles_20110706_11b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_12b	7062011	Cindy Zuber	yes		Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_13b	7062011	Farial Dadvand	yes		Winnetka	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_14b	7062011	Parviz Dadvand	yes		Winnetka	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_15b	7062011	Juan Ormeno	yes		North Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_12b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_13b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_14b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_15b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_12b			no				
4langeles_20110706_13b			no				
4langeles_20110706_14b			no				
4langeles_20110706_15b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_16b	7062011	Koroush Farahani	yes		Canago Park	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_17b	7062011	Leonard Semmer	yes		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_18b	7062011	Rene S. Lozeno	yes		Panorama City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_19b	7062011	Reymont Guterrez	yes		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_16b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_17b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_18b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_19b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_16b			no				
4langeles_20110706_17b			no				
4langeles_20110706_18b			no				
4langeles_20110706_19b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_20b	7062011	Luis Hidalgo	yes		Panorama City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_21b	7062011	Margaret C. Werner	yes		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_22b	7062011	Joseph Weiman	yes		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_23b	7062011	SMJ	yes		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_20b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_21b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_22b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_23b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_20b			no				
4langeles_20110706_21b			no				
4langeles_20110706_22b			no				
4langeles_20110706_23b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_24b	7062011	Parivash Moradi	yes		Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_25b	7062011	Hassan Rela	yes		Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_26b	7062011	Mahuash Dadvand	yes		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_27b	7062011	Fredy Perira	yes		Panorama City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
7sclara_20110706_1	7062011	Bea Robinson Mendez, Chair	yes	Silicon Valley Latino Forum	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Emailed maps on June 24 on behalf of SVLDF, and provided two more on june 25, do not see them on list

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_24b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_25b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_26b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_27b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
7sclara_20110706_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_24b			no				
4langeles_20110706_25b			no				
4langeles_20110706_26b			no				
4langeles_20110706_27b			no				
7sclara_20110706_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110707_1b	7072011	Ellen Swenson	no				yes	Do not combine Imperial County with Coachella valley. It is a political move with weak arguments and no COI reasons
2sbernardino_20110707_1b	7072011	Paul Leon, Mayor	yes	City of Ontario	Ontario	San Bernardino	yes	revise ONTPM to be consistent with Commission Visualization 2, include entire cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Chino, Montclair, Claremont, Pomona in single CD. Contains traditionally West Valley communities, respects established community
2sbernardino_20110707_2b	7072011	Margaret Bierschbach	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Splitting Redlands in half and taking territory away from Jerry Lewis is unfair and dishonest. Give him the area back he has always represented, Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland. Should be represented by the two parties
3orange_20110707_1b	7072011	J. Scott Schoeffel, Mayor	yes	City of Dana Point	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Do not divide Dana point geographically or place the city outside any state Senate or Assembly districts that do not include neighboring Orange county cities. Have common issues, working relationships, ocean water quality, transportation, land use plannin
3orange_20110707_2b	7072011	Robert Ming, President	yes	Association of California Cities-Orange County		Orange	yes	Keep Dana Point, La Palma, Los Alamitos, La Habra, Laguna Niguel whole and together in legislative and congressional districts. Common issues, strong working relationships, shared issues
3orange_20110707_3b	7072011	Douglas C. Chotkevys, City Manager	yes	City of Dana Point	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana point in its entirety with the other South County cities in all redistricting maps. Has historical relationships, water quality, transportation, housing, land-use issues

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110707_1b	Imperial, Riverside			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110707_1b		Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Chino, Montclair, Claremont, Pomona	Kellogg Hill, I15	no	yes	Traditionally West Valley communities,	established business ties
2sbernardino_20110707_2b		Redlands, Loma Linda, Highlands		no	yes		
3orange_20110707_1b	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes		
3orange_20110707_2b	Orange	Dana Point, La Palma, Los Alamitos, La Habra, Laguna Niguel		no	yes		
3orange_20110707_3b	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	historical relationship	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110707_1b			no			No COI reasons, just politics	
2sbernardino_20110707_1b	Educational institutions, colleges, zero deviation		no				
2sbernardino_20110707_2b	Congressman Jerry Lewis, republican voices		no			gives region to democrats	
3orange_20110707_1b	working relationships, ocean water quality, transportation, land use plannin		no				
3orange_20110707_2b	similar transportaiton, water concerns, city boundaries, fire, police, medical centers		no				
3orange_20110707_3b	similar transportaiton, water concerns, city boundaries, fire, police, medical centers		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110707_4b	7072011	Laura Ouimet, Executive Directo	yes	Dana Point Chamber of Commerce	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana point in its entirety with the other South County cities in all redistricting maps. Reconsider State Senate and Assembly district boundaries.
4langeles20110707_1b	7072011	Cyndi Hench, President	yes	NCWP		Los Angeles	yes	Map communities of Westchester, Playa del Rey and Playa Vista COI by zip code. Map Westchester in SD east of 405 fwy to La Cienega. AD same, include Playa Vista, Marina del Rey, Mar Vista and Venice together. In CD map by zip Westchester E of 405 fwy
4langeles20110707_2b	7072011	Joanne L. Scribner	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City between SDs LASCV and LADNT. Make whole in one district LASCV, connect with other SFV cities along Ventura blvd and 101. No COI with north LASCV or LADNT. Share with Southern SFV, transportationn, environmental priorities.
4langeles20110707_3b	7072011	Mary Stack	no		Topanga Canyon	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Topanga whole, do not divide from schools, lower Topanga canyon park and beach. Interests are unique and should be preserved. No common interests with Santa Clarita
4langeles20110707_4b	7072011	James R. Bozajian, Mayor	yes	City of Calabasas	Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Include all LVM COG within AD, including Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Hidden Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, Topanga. Do not include with Santa Clarita Valley in SD, instead use East-West alignment. Include Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu in CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110707_4b	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	common issues	working relationships
4langeles20110707_1b	Los Angeles	Westchester, Playa del Rey, Playa Vista, Mar Vista, Venice	405 Freeway, La Cienega Blvd	no	yes		
4langeles20110707_2b	Los Angeles	Studio City	Ventura Blvd, 101 fwy	no	yes		
4langeles20110707_3b		Topanga, Santa Clarita		no	yes	unique interests	
4langeles20110707_4b		Santa Clarita, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Hidden Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, Topanga		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110707_4b	cooperative arrangements		no				
4langeles20110707_1b	keep communities together, Neighborhood Council		no				
4langeles20110707_2b	transportation corridors, LA River and Santa Monica Mountains		no			no COI with N half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles20110707_3b	schools, clubs, state parks, beach		no			nothing in common with Santa Clarita	
4langeles20110707_4b			no			no COI with Santa Clarita	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles20110707_5b	7072011	Sam Yebri, President	yes	30 Years After		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Iranian population neighborhoods of Beverly Hills, Westwood and Pico-Robertson between two Ads, two SDs, two CDs. Unique character of communities needs single representation. Largest population of Iranians and Iranian Jews outside Iran.
4langeles20110707_6b	7072011	Mary G. Bankston	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City between SDs LASCV and LADNT. Make whole in one district LASCV, connect with other SFV cities along Ventura blvd and 101. No COI with north LASCV or LADNT. Share with Southern SFV, transportationn, environmental priorities.
4langeles20110707_7b	7072011	Rosemary Frankle	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City between SDs LASCV and LADNT. Make whole in one district LASCV, connect with other SFV cities along Ventura blvd and 101. No COI with north LASCV or LADNT. Share with Southern SFV, transportationn, environmental priorities.
9sacramento_20110707_1b	7072011	Mary Garza	yes	CAPAFR-Sacramento	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Elk Grove should be with South Sacramento in AD and SD, not with Galt and Lodi because of suburban setting, Asian and Pacific Islander populations, commonalities. Recomment lines in Unity assembly plan or CAPAFR senate plan.
9siskiyou_20110707_1b	7072011	Kathy Herrera	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split up Siskiyou in redistricting. Would result in no representation for W Siskiyou. Need to be represented by one representative with other non-coastal agricultural counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles20110707_5b		Beverly Hills, Westwood, Pico-Robertson	405 Freeway, Rexford, La Cienega, Cadillac	yes	yes	Iranian and Iranian Jew Population	
4langeles20110707_6b	Los Angeles	Studio City	Ventura Blvd, 101 fwy	no	yes		
4langeles20110707_7b	Los Angeles	Studio City	Ventura Blvd, 101 fwy	no	yes		
9sacramento_20110707_1b	Sacramento	Elk Grove, Sacramento, Galt, Lodi		no	yes	Asian American and Pacific Islander population	
9siskiyou_20110707_1b	Siskiyou			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles20110707_5b	synogogues, businesses, restaurants, markets, schools		no				
4langeles20110707_6b	transportation corridors, LA River and Santa Monica Mountains		no			no COI with N half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles20110707_7b	transportation corridors, LA River and Santa Monica Mountains		no			no COI with N half of LASCV or LADNT	
9sacramento_20110707_1b	foreign born, low rates English proficiency		no			Elk grove is suburban, Galt and Lodi are rural	
9siskiyou_20110707_1b	representation with agricultural counties		no			Coastal representative would probably never even visit	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110707_1b	7072011	Rick Long	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, put with neighbors in San Joaquin to preserve city boundaries and give Lodi political voice. Tracy has more in common with Bay Area than Lodi does with Davis or Santa Rosa
9sjoaquin_20110707_2b	7072011	Carolyn Long	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD with Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, put with neighbors in San Joaquin to preserve city boundaries and give Lodi political voice. Tracy has more in common with Bay Area than Lodi does with Davis or Santa Rosa
general_20110707_1	7072011	Tony Quinn	no				yes	Redistricting Commission hired staff of line drawers who know nothing about the complex demographics of California.
general_20110707_2	7072011	Tony Quinn	no				yes	Never quoted anything from AARC. Correspondence between Tony Quinn and AARC.
2sbernardino_20110708_1b	7072011	Richard H. Hart, MD, President	yes	Loma Linda University	Loma Linda	San Bernardino	yes	Supports Inland Action and IEEP maps for San Bernardino. Large part of work force resides in Redlands and Yucaipa, proposed maps give employees better opportunity to interact with representatives
4langeles_20110708_1b	7072011	Nina Royal, Redistricting Advocate	yes	Sunland Tujunga Neighborhood Council	Sunland-Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Consider the request for the Foothill district proposal. Has ideal population count. Attached letters, maps, proposals, petitions with 230 signatures.
4langeles_20110708_2b	7082011	Tzeitel Paras-Caracci, Mayor	yes	Duarte	Duarte	Los Angeles	yes	Keep foothill cities intact and connected in one voting district. Many common issues from geographic connections, foothill preservation, emergency management. Do not split Duarte in half, place in one district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110707_1b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi, Davis, Santa Rosa, Tracy		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110707_2b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi, Davis, Santa Rosa, Tracy		no	yes		
general_20110707_1				no	no		
general_20110707_2				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110708_1b	San Bernardino	Redlands, Yucaipa		no	yes		Loma Linda University
4langeles_20110708_1b	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110708_2b		Duarte		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110707_1b	effective political voice		no			no one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110707_2b	effective political voice		no			no one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
general_20110707_1			no				From Fox and Hounds, 77
general_20110707_2			no				correspondence
2sbernardino_20110708_1b	Health care, representation		no				
4langeles_20110708_1b			no				Attached maps and letters, petitions
4langeles_20110708_2b	geography, foothill preservation, emergency management, public safety		no			differences from inland communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110708_3b	7082011	Thomas Lynch and Margaret Hicks	no		Sunland-Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not lump Sunland-Tujunga with E SFV. Shares common geography, history, open spaces with Shadow Hills, Lakeview Terrace, La Tuna Canyon, Kagel Canyon. No commonality with East Valley
7scruz_20110708_1b	7082011	Neal Coonerty, Supervisor	yes	Third District	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Preserve entire city of Santa Cruz in Monterey Bay Congressional District. Do not divide into two. Share COI based on media and local economy, toursim, higher education, high tech. Small City.
general_20110624_1	7122011	Tom Del Beccaro, Chairman,	yes	California Republican Party			yes	Do not hire Professor McDonald as peer reviewer, find another racially polarized voting consultant without a conflict of interest. Q2 Data and Research has principals with liberal ideological leanings.
1sdiego_20110705_1b	7052011	Edgarud Badillo, Nenita Bautista, Regina Mendoza, Domingo Bautista	yes			San Diego	yes	Keep Asian Pacific Islander COIs in San Diego together based on similar socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, language needs.
4langeles_20110706_1b	7062011	Shilen Ghal	yes		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110708_3b		Shadow Hills, Lakeview Terrace, La Tuna Canyon, Kagel Canyon		no	yes		
7scruz_20110708_1b	Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		media, local economy, tourism, higher education, high tech
general_20110624_1				no	no		
1sdiego_20110705_1b	San Diego	San Diego		no	yes	similar socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, language needs.	
4langeles_20110706_1b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110708_3b	geography, history, open spaces		no			no common interests with East Valley	
7scruz_20110708_1b	small city		no				
general_20110624_1			no				bias in consultants
1sdiego_20110705_1b			no				suppots speakers from june 20 hearing who said the same
4langeles_20110706_1b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_2b	7062011	Afarin Mostoufi	yes		Tarzana	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_3b	7062011	Joe Sergf	yes		Northridge	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_4b	7062011	Daisy Echwema	yes		Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_5b	7062011	Hector Bakereles	yes		Lake Balboa	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_2b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_3b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_4b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_5b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_2b			no				
4langeles_20110706_3b			no				
4langeles_20110706_4b			no				
4langeles_20110706_5b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_6b	7062011	Daisy Chavez	yes		Reseda	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
4langeles_20110706_7b	7062011	Raquel Serrato	yes		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Calabasas part of W San Fernando Valley CD, with Grananda Hills. Same High Tech employees as Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills. Split Valley Village differently to unify Granada Hills with WSFV.
8solano_20110708_1b	7082011	John M. Vasquez	yes	Board of Supervisors, Solano County 4th District		Solano	yes	Do not divde Solano county among CDs, keep whole like first Congressional map. Solano and Yolo I-80 CD share transport, economy, education, agricultre, environmental interests
9yolo_20110708_1b	7082011	Kerry Wicker	no		Esparto	Yolo	yes	Move Esparto out of conservative district into one of two neighboring ADs and CD. Is clearly not conservative. Belong with ES Yolo county. Place in WSAC or ECC district.
general_20110708_1	7082011	Paul Mitchell	yes	Redistricting Partners			yes	Commission should give out equivalency files with full PDFs. Recreating maps ourselves takes forever.
general_20110708_2	7082011	Tom Del Beccaro, Chairman	yes	California Republican Party			yes	Current and proposed deviation standards discriminate against and disenfranchise voters. Commission should hew to Supreme Courts Standards and guidance

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_6b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
4langeles_20110706_7b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, W San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Woodland Hills		no	yes		high tech employees
8solano_20110708_1b	Solano, Yolo			no	yes		transport, economy, education, agricultre, environmental interests
9yolo_20110708_1b	Yolo	Esparto		no	yes		
general_20110708_1				no	no		
general_20110708_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_6b			no				
4langeles_20110706_7b			no				
8solano_20110708_1b			no				
9yolo_20110708_1b	progressive, dense, employees of landowners, businesses, government		no			move out of conservative district	attached maps
general_20110708_1			no				should give out equivalency files
general_20110708_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110708_3	7082011	David Salaverry	yes	CCAG			yes	Timely video posting and transcripts from hearings have been consistent problem. Timely posting is critical to not disenfranchise citizens from the process
general_20110708_4	7082011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Cannot find 14 day post-decision review reference in prop 11 or 20. Commision should review and relax schedule to permit ample time for producing best maps possible
8alameda_20110709_1	7092011	Ana Apocada, Councilmember	yes	City of Newark	Newark	Alameda	yes	Supports CD map for Tri-Cities, Includes Hayward, Union City, Newark, Fremont. Pleased Newark is in Alameda County, respecting history and institutions, COIs. Hope will be final map.
8solano_20110709_1b	7092011	John Riley, Executive Director	yes	Napa-Solano CLC		Solano	yes	Do not divde Solano county among CDs, keep whole like first Congressional map. Solano and Yolo I-80 CD share transport, economy, education, agricultre, environmental interests
general_20110709_1	7092011	Eugene Lee, Voting Rights Project Direcot	yes	Asian Pacific American Legal Cetner			yes	Release of more detailed maps should be done in the form of official second draft map in jpeg, not PDF. Provide visualizations on a rolling basis.
general_20110709_2	7092011	John Mitchell	no				yes	IF Q2 provides equivalency files in lieu of second draft, would be happy to receive them and have PDFs by 9am. Maps would be commission property, would exclude partisan information.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110708_3				no	no		
general_20110708_4				no	no		
8alameda_20110709_1	Alameda	Hayward, Union City, Newark, Fremont		no	yes		
8solano_20110709_1b	Solano, Yolo			no	yes		transport, economy, education, agricultre, environmental interests
general_20110709_1				no	no		
general_20110709_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110708_3			no				
general_20110708_4			no				
8alameda_20110709_1	history and institutions		no				
8solano_20110709_1b			no				
general_20110709_1			no				
general_20110709_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110711_1b	7112011	Bill Campbell, Chairman	yes	range County Board of Supervisors	Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Orange county is its own COI. Should be minimum of four Orange County CDs, three Orange County SDs, six or seven Orange County assembly seats. County border crossing should be avoided. Cleveland national forest and Chino Hill Park are barriers.
3orange_20110711_2	7112011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Chino will not be best served in Orange CD. Wish La Habra could be part of Crea YL Placentia AD.
3orange_20110711_3	7112011	Carol Nigsarian	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Put La Habra in same district as Whittier and Pico Rivera, where city is more aligned than Brea, Fullerton, other Orange cities. Large population of Hispanics, working class.
4langeles_20110711_1	7112011	Mary Anne Himlin	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	First draft for Antelope Valley was good draft. Keep Lancaster and Palmdale together with East Kern and Victor Valley in same district. Unify desert communities
4langeles_20110711_1b	7112011	Melanie and Jack Leland	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Include West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village and Malibu in shared legislative districts. Those who live nearest Santa Monica Mountains are motivated to preserve them. Redistricting would dilute their voice
4langeles_20110711_2	7112011	Dorothy J. Martin	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay (LAX to Palos Verdes) together as COI. Many common interests which need representation.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110711_1b	Orange	La Habra, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor	Cleveland National Forest, Chino Hills Park	no	yes		
3orange_20110711_2	Orange	La Habra, Chino, Crea, Placentia		no	no		
3orange_20110711_3	Orange	La Habra, Whittier, Pico Rivera, Brea, Fullerton		no	yes	Hispanics, Working-class people	
4langeles_20110711_1	Kern	Antelope Valley, Lancaster, Palmdale, East Kern, Victor Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_1b		West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village and Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_2		South Bay, Palos Verdes		no	yes	common interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110711_1b	political integrity of county, political representation		no				
3orange_20110711_2			no				
3orange_20110711_3			no				Tim Shaw works for Senator Bob Huff
4langeles_20110711_1	desert communities		no				
4langeles_20110711_1b	stewardship, collaboration, services, COG, sherrifs station, fire station, water district, school district, shared voice		no				
4langeles_20110711_2	need representation on state and federal levels		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110711_2b	7112011	Kathleen Mayerski	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Does not support CRC 1 Downey-Whittier. Supports Cathy Warners alignment within 605, 60, 57, I-5 encompassing Whittier, La Habra, La Habra Heights, La mirada, Brea, Santa Fe Springs, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar. Shopping, restaurants
4langeles_20110711_3	7112011	Ingrid Jodele	no		Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay together, Palos Verdes, Marina Del Rey and Torrance
4langeles_20110711_3b	7112011	Caroline Schweich	yes	Oaks Homeowners Asssociation	The Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	AD and CD districts should include Oaks, Los Feliz and Silverlake with Hollywood. All three districts should include Beachwood, Hollywoodland and Lake Hollywood in same districts as Oaks, Los Feliz, Silverlake. Western Boundary should be 101.
4langeles_20110711_4	7112011	Doris Blaker	no		Inglewood	Los Angeles	yes	Opposed to CD 33, 35, 36, as they disenfranchise African American Communities. CD 35 should not be disconnected from Westchester- has no COI with Beach Cities. Taking LAX out depletes it of big business. Include Westchester and Inglewood together with LAX
4langeles_20110711_4b	7112011	David B. Kilner, President	yes	Palisades Bowl Resident Association	Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Place Palific Palisades in same SD as Malibu and Topanga who have mutual relations in socio-economic, environmental, transportation, cultural, educational interests. Not with South Bay.
4langeles_20110711_5	7112011	Doris Jeanne Blaker	no		Inglewood	Los Angeles	yes	Put Westchester, Inglewood together with LAX in CD35. Do not place Airport, oil refineries and all ports in one CD36

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110711_2b		Whittier, La Habra, La Habra Heights, La mirada, Brea, Santa Fe Springs, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar	605, 60, 57, I-5	no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_3		Palos Verdes, Marina Del Rey, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_3b		Oaks, Los Feliz, Silverlake, Hollywood	101	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110711_4		Inglewood, Westchester	LAX	no	yes	african americans	LAX and surrounding businesses
4langeles_20110711_4b		Pacific Palisades, Malibu, Topanga		no	yes		socio-economic
4langeles_20110711_5		Westchester, Inglewood		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110711_2b	shopping, restaurants, entertainment, medical needs		no			no COI with downey, bell gardens, etc.	
4langeles_20110711_3			no				
4langeles_20110711_3b	commune socially, economically, culturally with Hollywood, population, topography, living standards, goals		no			nothing in common with East Los Angeles	
4langeles_20110711_4			no			no COI with beach cities, disenfranchises african american communities	
4langeles_20110711_4b	environmental, transport, cultural, educational interests		no			no COI with South Bay area	
4langeles_20110711_5	shared interests		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110711_5b	7112011	E. Irving	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Place West side communities of Pacific Palisades, Topanga, and Malibu togethe, as they have similar environment, transport, schools, economics. Do not put with South Bay.
4langeles_20110711_6	7112011	Sandy Mittan	no		Lakewood	Los Angeles	yes	Montebello is part of San Gabriel Valley, not Gateway Cities, belongs in district North of LAPRW. Lynwood, South Gate and Huntington are COI, not Montebello. Supports Chinese American Citizens proposed 27th SD map.
4langeles_20110711_6b	7112011	Jim Cohen, Mayor	yes	City of Hidden Hills	Hidden Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Put Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu and Westlake Village together in all three districts, to maintain long existing COG, common interests of public safety, water quality, emergency preparedness, education, tranportation, traffic.
4langeles_20110711_7	7112011	Molly Casey	no		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	District in a straight line from Palos Verdes through Marina Del Rey. No COI with Santa Monica or West Hollywood. Concerns are LAX, transportation, economy, aerospace, coastal protection
4langeles_20110711_7b	7112011	George and Carol DeMott	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Newhall from rest of Santa Clarita Valley, do no place with San Fernando valley. Enjoyed voting for local people, but now feel seperated
4langeles_20110711_8	7112011	Sharon Nixon Escochea	no				yes	Keep district from Palos Verdes to Santa Monica including Torrance as one district. Anything else would be gerrymandering

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110711_5b		Pacific Palisades, Topanga, Malibu		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_6		Montebello, Gateway Cities, Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington Park		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_6b		Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu and Westlake Village		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_7		Palos Verdes, Santa Monica, West Hollywood Marina Del Rey		no	yes		aersopace, business economy
4langeles_20110711_7b		Newhall, Santa Clarita, SFV	Lyons Ave	no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_8		Palos Verdes, Santa Monica, Torrance		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110711_5b	environment, transport, schools, economics.		no			no COI with South Bay area	
4langeles_20110711_6	similarity of communities, geography,		no			rarely go to Montebello for entertainment, shopping, dining	
4langeles_20110711_6b	public safety, water quality, emergency preparedness, education, tranportation, traffic.		no				
4langeles_20110711_7	LAX, transportation, economy, aerospace, coastal protection		no			tired of contacting reps who care nothing for issues that concern us	
4langeles_20110711_7b	voting for local people		no				
4langeles_20110711_8			no			anything else is gerry mandering	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110711_8b	7112011	Elba Guerrero, Council Member	yes	City of Huntington Park	Huntington Park	Los Angeles	yes	New maps disenfranchise Latinos. Huntington Park shares more characteristics wth East LA, Boyle Heights, El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Lynwood, South Gate, not Los Feliz, Atwater, Silver Lake, South Pasadena. Make sure Latinos are not packed into district.
4langeles_20110711_9	7112011	Harry Engel,	yes	Frye Chiropractic, In	Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Lancaster and Palmdale. Palmdale has needs different from SFV. Putting Palmdale with San Fernando will eliminate representation due to smaller size. High desert needs own representaton as a whole. Unique challenges
4langeles_20110711_9b	7112011	Terry Dipple, Executive Director	yes	Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Government		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu and Westlake Village together in AD SD CD. Geographically situated, shared environmental, transportation, public safety concerns. Wildfires and Flooding.
4langeles_20110711_10	7112011	Larry Grooms	yes		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep first draft plan that keeps High Desert cities together and does not divide representation by putting Lancaster and Palmdale in separate SDs. Keep in northern LA County with East Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino in same SD
4langeles_20110711_11	7112011	Brandon Farkas	no		Silverlake	Los Angeles	yes	Silver Lake fits more logically into LAGBP district, share shopping, media, outlook, culture, geographic continuity

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110711_8b		Huntington Park, East LA, Boyle Heights, El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Lynwood, South Gate, not Los Feliz, Atwater, Silver Lake, South Pasadena		no	yes	Latino community	90 percent of the states growth
4langeles_20110711_9		Lancaster, Palmdale, San Fernando		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_9b		Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu, Westlake Village		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_10	San Bernardino, Kern,, LA	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victorville		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_11		Silver Lake		yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110711_8b			no			make sure Latinos are not packed into districts in a manner that would dilute their votes	
4langeles_20110711_9	unique challenges and opportunities, specific needs		no			eliminate representation	
4langeles_20110711_9b	environmental, transportation, and public safety concerns, history of wildfires and flooding		no				
4langeles_20110711_10	High Desert issues		no			worst kind of gerrymandering	
4langeles_20110711_11	shopping, media, outlook, culture, geographic continuity		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110711_12	7112011	Sharon L. Cook, Ph.D	no			Los Angeles	yes	Go back to old draft lines and keep Palos Verdes with Torrance, Lomita, Beach Cities, and El Segundo- the rest of South Bay. Leave apart frm Venice, Santa Monica and Long Beach, where we have no business.
4langeles_20110711_13	7112011	Chris Fall	no		Santa Clara Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Latest not greatest. Does not reflect COI testimony. Residents of Santa Clarita valley are affluent.
4langeles_20110711_14	7112011	Alison Wilk	no		Santa Clara Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Honor COI testimony and connect Santa Clarita Valley with E Ventura county in SD, which has similar industries, challenges, history.
4langeles_20110711_15	7112011	Glenda Johnson	no		Santa Clara Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley with Ventura County. Do not link with San Fernando Valley, mountain range seperates.
4langeles_20110711_16	7112011	Mary Moffatt	no				yes	Keep PalmdaleLancaster in same district as Kern and Victor Valley. Do not put with Pacoima. Outrageous.
4langeles_20110711_17	7112011	Dorothy J. Martin	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay (LAX to Palos Verdes) together as COI. Area has many common interests.
4langeles_20110711_18	7112011	Joyce and Joseph Pincetich	no			Los Angeles	yes	Return to plan that kept Lancaster and Palmdale together, with cities of East Kern and Victor Valley in San Bernardino. High desert is geographic community. Water conservation, electrical usage, sewage handling, health and safety.
4langeles_20110711_19	7112011	Dan Guinn	no				yes	Keep high desert cities of Palmdale and Lancaster together. Antelope Valley has little relation to San Fernando, Pacoima, etc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110711_12		Palos Verdes with Torrance, Lomita, Beach Cities, and El Segundo, Venice, Santa Monica, Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_13		Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_14	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_15	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley	mountain range	no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_16		Palmdale, Lancaster, Pacoima		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_17		South Bay, Palos Verdes		no	yes		LAX
4langeles_20110711_18	East Kern	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_19		Palmdale, Lancaster, Antelope Valley, San Fernando, Pacoima		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110711_12	South Bay		no			No business with Venice, Santa Monica, Long Beach	
4langeles_20110711_13			no			does not reflect COI testimony	
4langeles_20110711_14	similar industries, challenges, history		no				
4langeles_20110711_15	ventura is closer, freeway		no				
4langeles_20110711_16			no			outrageous. Not acceptable.	
4langeles_20110711_17	common interests		no				
4langeles_20110711_18	extreme environment, water conservation, electrical usage, sewage handling, health and safety		no			to cut high desert into smaller pieces is blatant gerrymandering	
4langeles_20110711_19			no			little relation to San Fernando	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110711_20	7112011	Beverly A. McCalla	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura. Communities are similar and have been together in SD for 20 years.
4langeles_20110711_21	7112011	Pamela A and Jeno Horvath	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Leave Santa Clarita whole, do not want to become part of Los Angeles
4langeles_20110711_22	7112011	Charles O Connell	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Continue to keep Santa Clarita Valley together as well as similar communities in East Ventura County area, been a part for 30 years.
4langeles_20110711_23	7112011	Matt Dietrich	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Adopt a Senate SD which includes Santa Clarita Valley and Eastern Ventura County. They have a longstanding COI
4langeles_20110711_24	7112011	Betty Limpus	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together in nortern LA county with East Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino in SD. More in common with each other than SFV.
4langeles_20110711_25	7112011	Donna Takaki	no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110711_26	7112011	Marcus E. Pierce	no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula, including Torrance, with straight lines. You cannot ignore the law.
4langeles_20110711_27	7112011	Joe Cannizzaro	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Palos Verdes does not share anything in common with Santa Monica and Venice when it comes to political views. Are more a part of Hawthorne, Lennox, Lawndale, South Bay

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110711_20	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes	similar, together in SD for 20 years	
4langeles_20110711_21	Los Angles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_22	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_23	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_24	Kern, Los Angeles, Los Angeles	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_25		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_26		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes, Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_27		Palos Verdes, Santa Monica, Venice, Hawthorne, Lennox, Lawndale		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110711_20			no				
4langeles_20110711_21			no				
4langeles_20110711_22	similar communities, 30 year history		no				
4langeles_20110711_23	strong and long standing COI		no				
4langeles_20110711_24	High Desert is COI		no				
4langeles_20110711_25			no				
4langeles_20110711_26	South Bay		no				The law is clear.
4langeles_20110711_27			no			nothing in common when it comes to political views	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110711_28	7112011	Bernie Haller	no		Diamond Bar	Los Angeles	yes	Redistricting for Diamond Bar nullifies republican votes in favor of Democrats. Cities east of Diamond Bar are different in terms of housing densities, industries, transportation, income, social service needs.
4langeles_20110711_29	7112011	Lexi Collins	no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes, including Torrance, with straight lines.
4langeles_20110711_30	7112011	Stewart Kahn	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not gerrymander Southbay of California, including Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Marina Del Rey. Keep district lines straight.
4langeles_20110711_31	7112011	Isabel Freeman	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Topanga in one district with neighbors in Santa Monica Mountains. Do not combine with Santa Clarita. Vorters in Topanga are heavily democratic. Has small town feel, community spirit, conservation.
4langeles_20110711_32	7112011	Ronald C. Faas (duplicate)	no		Santa Maria	Los Angeles	yes	Supports current draft maps of SBWVE SD, SLOSB CD, SLOSB AD. Set of maps is much improved over initial draft maps.
4langeles_20110711_34	7112011	Carol K. Chen	no		Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	City of Cerritos should remain in districts with other cites in Los Angeles County, active leadership role in regional issues in greater Los Angeles area. City of Cerritos has no ties with neighboring Orange County cities. Water production.
4langeles_20110711_35	7112011	Vincent Tangkilisan	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Wondering how we will be redistricted. Ideally the South Bay should be together, with Palos Verdes.
5ventura_20110711_1	7112011	Patricia Hoad	no				yes	Draw Santa Clarita area with E Ventura County on draft, keep inland valleys together, like they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110711_28		Diamond Bar		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_29		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_30		Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Marina Del Rey		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_31		Topanga, Santa Monica, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110711_32	Santa Barbara, Ventura			no	no		
4langeles_20110711_34	Los Angeles	Cerritos		no	yes		
4langeles_20110711_35	Los Angeles	Torrance, Palos Verdes		no	no		
5ventura_20110711_1	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110711_28			no			Difference in housing, industries, tranportation, income, social service needs.	political machine has destroyed jobs, businesses
4langeles_20110711_29			no				
4langeles_20110711_30			no				no more gerrymandering
4langeles_20110711_31	small town feel, community spirit, access to mountains, conservation		no			Santa Clarita is a distance away and has different needs and views on issues	
4langeles_20110711_32			no				
4langeles_20110711_34	water production, planning, transportation, legislation, contract services		no				
4langeles_20110711_35			no				how can I get more info
5ventura_20110711_1	together for 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110711_2	7112011	Riley Neel	no				yes	Connect E Ventura County with Malibu, Pacific Palisades and along 101 corridor in the Valley, will help preserve diversity
5ventura_20110711_3	7112011	Jill Myers	no			Ventura	yes	Do not connect Eastern Ventura County (Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark) with Encino, Malibu, and Pacific Palisades. Should be kept in group that represents inland valleys. Worked for years and should not be changed
5ventura_20110711_4	7112011	Doris Wieben	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Leave Simi Valley alone, with rest of Ventura. Do not need to be moved or changed.
5ventura_20110711_5	7112011	Sonja Todd	no				yes	What is going on here, what minority is being left out, do we still have to deal with gerrymandering
5ventura_20110711_6	7112011	Steve Cummings	no			Ventura	yes	Supports EVENT AD, which keeps oxnard whole, SBWVE SD, includes all of Santa Barbara and West Ventura, Event CD, which is Ventura County CD, except for Simi Valley
6fresno_20110711_1b	7112011	Venancio G. Gaona	yes	Concilio de Fresno	Fresno	Fresno	yes	Do not divide Fresno north-south along Highway 41, it is a physical barrier to uniting citizen voters with many community interests. Would disenfranchise Latino Communities, and school districts.
6kern_20110711_1	7112011	Richard Cayia Rowe, VP	yes	Kern River Valley Revitalization	Wofford Heights	Kern	yes	Kern Valley River Revitalization would like to be on distribution list for proposed districts.
7sclara_20110711_1	7112011	Bill Hughes, Chair	yes	BCAC Redistricting Committee	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Want to keep Berryessa Union School District intact along with Milpitas, at least as far south as Maybury. People were claiming AD 23 was broken up, but do not change maps back again

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110711_2	Ventura,	Malibu, Pacific Palisades	101 corridor	no	no		
5ventura_20110711_3	Ventura	Simi Valley, Encino, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark		no	yes		
5ventura_20110711_4	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110711_5				no	no		
5ventura_20110711_6	Ventura, Santa Barbara	Oxnard, Simi Valley		no	no		
6fresno_20110711_1b	Fresno	Fresno	Highway 41	no	yes	Latino community,	
6kern_20110711_1	Kern			no	no		
7sclara_20110711_1		Berryessa, Milpitas, Mabury		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110711_2	will help preserve dignity that strengthens democracy		no				
5ventura_20110711_3	Inland Valleys, worked well for years, public testimony		no				
5ventura_20110711_4			no			do not need to be moved or changed from status quo	
5ventura_20110711_5			no				
5ventura_20110711_6			no				
6fresno_20110711_1b	school districts, poverty, demographics, health care,		no				
6kern_20110711_1			no				
7sclara_20110711_1	School district		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110711_1	7112011	Janus Blume	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Please do not split Santa Cruz, citizens share many common interests, any redistricting is detrimental to representation of views and needs of citizens
7scruz_20110711_2	7112011	Aurelio Gonzoles	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz into two congressional areas, would be horrible for area. Keep in one CD so residents can be met in a more cost saving manner, so citizens do not have to pay staff cost. It would also save time.
7scruz_20110711_3	7112011	Lee Stanford	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not cut Santa Cruz in too, would be too divisive. Little community is too small to be cut up politically
7scruz_20110711_4	7112011	Ron Dudley	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not chop up Santa Cruz. Too small to be chopped in two.
8alameda_20110711_1	7112011	Scott Haggerty	yes	District One		Alameda	yes	Supports district that includes Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Newark, Milpitas. Pleased Fremont is rooted in Alameda County anchored district. Hope this will be final map.
8alameda_20110711_2	7112011	Bruce Schine	no				yes	Proposed districts look better than the gerrymandered set produced by legislature in 2001. Do not be bullied by special interests
8ccosta_20110711_1b	7112011	Hennry R. Alisssa	no			Contra Costa	yes	Keep Contra Costa county the same in Congressman George Miller 7th district. No jobs in area but hope that with Congressman Miller there will be some employment.
8mateo_20110711_1	7112011	Bill Collins	no		Pacifica	San Mateo	yes	Districts for San Mateo and San Francisco areas are straight forward and make sense.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110711_1	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110711_2	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110711_3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110711_4	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
8alameda_20110711_1	Alameda	Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Newark, Milpitas		no	yes	history and institutions	
8alameda_20110711_2				no	no		
8ccosta_20110711_1b	Contra Costa			no	yes		hope to see upturn in employment, new business brought forth
8mateo_20110711_1	San Mateo	San Francisco		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110711_1	share many common interests		no				
7scruz_20110711_2			no			would cost more money to taxpayers if split	
7scruz_20110711_3			no			would be much too divisive	
7scruz_20110711_4			no			too small	
8alameda_20110711_1	voice of tri-cities together		no				
8alameda_20110711_2			no				keep up the good work
8ccosta_20110711_1b			no				
8mateo_20110711_1			no				fine work

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8solano_20110711_1b	7112011	John Riley, Executive Director	yes	Napa-Solano central Labor Council			yes	Support first draft congressional map that keeps Solano County whole and maintains unified voice, with Yolo County. I-80 CD shares transportation, economic development, education, agriculture, environmental interests, clean energy, life science
9calaveras_20110711_1	7112011	Sally and Richard Tuttle	no				yes	Want Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador County in same districts
9calaveras_20110711_2	7112011	Richard E. Tuttle	no				yes	Ensure counties of the Mother Lode, which share common interests, are included in same CD
9edorado_20110711_1	7112011	Harry Norris	no			El Dorado	yes	Do not place Placer with El Dorado County in 10th AD. Placer population would overwhelm El Dorado, depriving area of representation. Use boundaries that follow highway 50.
9edorado_20110711_1b	7112011	Harry Norris, President of Board of Directors	yes	El Dorado Irrigation District		El Dorado	yes	Add Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills into Foothill SD, so COI is not divided. Use Highway 41 as divider, remove Western Madera and Fresno counties. Use Folsom for territory. Do not divide EID service area, do not place in Esac district
9edorado_20110711_2	7112011	Paul Raveling	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Do not place El Dorado Hills in AD with Placer. No ties with Placer, far distance, isolated by geography, distance. EDH and Sacramento, esp Folsom share traffic and commerce.
9edorado_20110711_2b	7112011	Laurel Brent-Bumb A.C.E	yes	El Dorado Chamber of Commerce	Placerville	El Dorado	yes	Lake Tahoe should remain within same SD and AD as El Dorado and Placer. Do not carve out Lake Tahoe, share history and kinship. Rural region of foothills. Respect proposition 11, re-evaluate proposal

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8solano_20110711_1b	Solano, Yolo		I 80	no	yes		transportation, economic development, education, agriculture, environmental interests, clean energy, life science
9calaveras_20110711_1	Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador			no	no		
9calaveras_20110711_2	Mother Lode			no	yes		
9edorado_20110711_1	El Dorado, Placer	El Dorado Hills		no	no		
9edorado_20110711_1b		El Dorado, Cameron Park	Highway 41	no	yes		
9edorado_20110711_2	Placer, El Dorado, Sacramento	El Dorado Hills, Placer, Folsom		no	no		
9edorado_20110711_2b	El Dorado, Placer	Lake Tahoe		no	yes	history and kinship	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8solano_20110711_1b			no				
9calaveras_20110711_1			no				
9calaveras_20110711_2	common interests		no				
9edorado_20110711_1			no			would overwhelm El Dorado	
9edorado_20110711_1b	EID service area, voting district		no			few common interests with foothill counties, will give electoral dominance to central valley	
9edorado_20110711_2			no			distance, geography	
9edorado_20110711_2b	protection of rural region of Sierra Nevada Foothills, modern communities, demographics,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9edorado_20110711_3	7112011	John E. Thomson, PhD	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Do not include Placer in AD 10 with El Dorado county. Physically divided by American River and Lake Folsom. No affiliation. Also population would overwhelm small El Dorado. More in common with communities along Highway 50.
9edorado_20110711_4	7112011	Frances C. Thomson	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Do not include Placer in AD 10 with El Dorado county. Physically divided by American River and Lake Folsom. No affiliation. Also population would overwhelm small El Dorado. More in common with communities along Highway 50.
9edorado_20110711_5	7112011	Debbie Manning	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	AD should remain the same as it is today. El Dorado county should have two Assembly seats, especially with growth in El Dorado hills community
9edorado_20110711_6	7112011	Hal Erpenbeck	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Likes map that includes El Dorado Hill up 80 to Placer County, makes sense. It does not go way up the hill. Hope map will define AD.
9edorado_20110711_7	7112011	David Williams	no				yes	Critical that El Dorado County have two assembly persons. With wide range of geography, commerce, residents, a single representative could not possibly provide good service to all
9edorado_20110711_8	7112011	Barbara Smiley	no		Cameron Park	El Dorado	yes	Rancho Cordova, El Dorado Hills, Elk Grove should be in same AD and SD due to shopping, highway. Citrus Heights and Roseville should be together along 80.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9edorado_20110711_3	El Dorado, Placer	El Dorado	American River, Highway 50	no	no		
9edorado_20110711_4	El Dorado, Placer	El Dorado	American River, Highway 50	no	no		
9edorado_20110711_5	El Dorado	El Dorado Hills		no	no		
9edorado_20110711_6	Placer	El Dorado Hills		no	no		
9edorado_20110711_7	El Dorado			no	yes		
9edorado_20110711_8	El Dorado	El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, Citrus Heights, Roseville	Highway 50, 80	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9edorado_20110711_3			no			physically you cannot get from Placer to El Dorado	
9edorado_20110711_4			no			physically you cannot get from Placer to El Dorado	
9edorado_20110711_5			no				
9edorado_20110711_6			no				
9edorado_20110711_7	geography, commerce, residents		no				
9edorado_20110711_8	shopping, highway,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9mendocino_20110711_1b	7112011	Kendall Smith, Chair	yes	Mendocino County Board of Supervisors		Mendocino	yes	Maintain existing configurations of two North Coast CDs, CD1 and CD6. Share coastal influences, rural communities, farms, ranches, vineyards, travel, tourism, natural resources. Mendocino has commerce network with Lake, Napa Sonoma.
9sacramento_20110711_1	7112011	Randall Williams	no				yes	Commission has rendered invaluable service to California. Concern to how criticism or recommendation impact the finalized mapping
9shasta_20110711_1	7112011	Dorotha Putnam	no			Shasta	yes	Do not move Shasta Count into a district with Coastal Area, have little in common with those who live on the coast, is out of spirit with why commission was set up.
9shasta_20110711_2	7112011	Erin Ryan	no				yes	Do not put Siskiyou and Shasta into coastal districts. Northern CA has a lot of resource issues. Siskiyou should not be cut in half, Shasta should not be with Humboldt. East to West does not work with Road systems, mountains, weather
9shasta_20110711_3	7112011	Patricia Venti	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta should stay in I-5 area instead of being shoved to coast. Hard to get to meetings in winter, economy is different inland from coast
9shasta_20110711_4	7112011	James Cooksley	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta belongs in Sacramento Valley Corridor. Little in common with coastal communities and region, economically, culturally, history. Important part of Sacramento Valley, sharing history, climate, economy.
9shasta_20110711_5	7112011	Dorotha J. Putnam	no			Shasta	yes	Do not move Shasta in a district with coast. Little in common with those who live on the coast.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9mendocino_20110711_1b	Mendocino, Lake, Napa, Sonoma			no	yes		coastal influences, rural communities, farms, ranches, vineyards, travel, tourism, natural resources
9sacramento_20110711_1				no	no		
9shasta_20110711_1	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110711_2	Siskiyou, Shasta		I-5, 101, 395	no	no		
9shasta_20110711_3	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110711_4	Shasta			no	yes		
9shasta_20110711_5	Shasta			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9mendocino_20110711_1b			no			regional economy is different from Bay Area.	
9sacramento_20110711_1			no				may the final product reflect impartiality
9shasta_20110711_1			no			little in common with coast	gerrymanderingg
9shasta_20110711_2			no			geography, representation	
9shasta_20110711_3			no			difficult in winter, different economy	
9shasta_20110711_4	history, climate, economy with Sac valley		no			little in common with coast	
9shasta_20110711_5			no			little in common with those on the coast	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110711_1	7112011	Rex Cozzalio	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not incorporate Siskiyou County with the coast, will create immense difficulties. Is intrinsically tied with other counties with same socio-economic backgrounds and proximity proving fair representation
9siskiyou_20110711_1b	7112011	Clara A. Anderson	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not group Scott Valley and the rest of Western Siskiyou County with Del Norte-Mendocino and North Coast Districts, would lead to unjust loss of representation for Siskiyou, who do not share interests with North Coast.
9sjoaquin_20110711_1b	7112011	Joseph P Harrington	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD that includes Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties, which are distrant and have nothing in common. Keep Lodi with San Joaquin. SJ should have a SD and entire AD. Would preserve city and county boundaries. Take Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110711_2b	7112011	W. Russell Fields	no		Acampo	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD that includes Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties, which are distrant and have nothing in common. Keep Lodi with San Joaquin. SJ should have a SD and entire AD. Would preserve city and county boundaries. Take Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110711_3b	7112011	M. Sinclair	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD that includes Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties, which are distrant and have nothing in common. Keep Lodi with San Joaquin. SJ should have a SD and entire AD. Would preserve city and county boundaries. Take Tracy.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110711_1	Siskiyou			no	yes		tied with other counties with same socio-economic backgrounds
9siskiyou_20110711_1b	Siskiyou, Del Norte, Mendocino	Scott Valley		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110711_1b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110711_2b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110711_3b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110711_1	proximity		no			placing in coastal district will promote animosity, discord, unequal representation	region suffers enough
9siskiyou_20110711_1b	geographic integrity says Siskiyou should be in AD2, SD4, CD2		no			Siskiyou does not share interests, economic, cultural, social with North Coast	
9sjoaquin_20110711_1b			no			no one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110711_2b			no			no one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110711_3b			no			no one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110711_4b	7112011	Carol Elliot	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD that includes Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties, which are distrant and have nothing in common. Keep Lodi with San Joaquin. SJ should have a SD and entire AD. Would preserve city and county boundaries. Take Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110711_5b	7112011	Gabriel Hyde	no			San Joaquin	yes	Do not put San Joaquin in CD that goes to Merced or Fresno. San Joaquin should be CD of its own to preserve city and county boundaries and residents political voice.
9sjoaquin_20110711_6b	7112011	Pat and Dave Croft	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD that includes Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties, which are distrant and have nothing in common. Keep Lodi with San Joaquin. SJ should have a SD and entire AD. Would preserve city and county boundaries. Take Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110711_7b	7112011	Tina Arnezquita	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put San Joaquin in CD that goes to Merced or Fresno. San Joaquin should be CD of its own to preserve city and county boundaries and residents political voice.
9sjoaquin_20110711_8b	7112011	Clinton D. Harless	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put San Joaquin in CD that goes to Merced or Fresno. San Joaquin should be CD of its own to preserve city and county boundaries and residents political voice.
9sjoaquin_20110711_9b	7112011	Terry Joven	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put San Joaquin in CD that goes to Merced or Fresno. San Joaquin should be CD of its own to preserve city and county boundaries and residents political voice.
9sjoaquin_20110711_10b	7112011	Keri Laywety	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put San Joaquin in CD that goes to Merced or Fresno. San Joaquin should be CD of its own to preserve city and county boundaries and residents political voice.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110711_4b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110711_5b	San Joaquin, Merced, Fresno	San Joaquin		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110711_6b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110711_7b	San Joaquin, Merced, Fresno	San Joaquin		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110711_8b	San Joaquin, Merced, Fresno	San Joaquin		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110711_9b	San Joaquin, Merced, Fresno	San Joaquin		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110711_10b	San Joaquin, Merced, Fresno	San Joaquin		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110711_4b			no			no one in Lodi commutes to Santa Rosa for work	
9sjoaquin_20110711_5b	neighbors, similar interests and concerns, boundaries		no				
9sjoaquin_20110711_6b			no				
9sjoaquin_20110711_7b	neighbors, similar interests and concerns, boundaries		no				
9sjoaquin_20110711_8b	neighbors, similar interests and concerns, boundaries		no				
9sjoaquin_20110711_9b	neighbors, similar interests and concerns, boundaries		no				
9sjoaquin_20110711_10b	neighbors, similar interests and concerns, boundaries		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110711_11b	7112011	Russ Munson, Owner, General Manager	yes	Wine and Roses	Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD that includes Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties, which are distrant and have nothing in common. Keep Lodi with San Joaquin. SJ should have a SD and entire AD. Would preserve city and county boundaries. Take Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110711_12b	7112011	Charles Harless	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put San Joaquin in CD that goes to Merced or Fresno. San Joaquin should be CD of its own to preserve city and county boundaries and residents political voice.
9sjoaquin_20110711_13b	7112011	John and Marcia Fitzgerald	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in SD or AD that includes Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano counties, which are distrant and have nothing in common. Keep Lodi with San Joaquin. SJ should have a SD and entire AD. Would preserve city and county boundaries. Take Tracy.
9sutter_20110711_1	7112011	Betty Knorr	no			Sutter	yes	Supports new congressional lines. Sutter county needs a more balanced political area
ccagsupport_20110711_1	7112011	Kevin C. Morrow	no				yes	Supports all of the Bay Area maps submitted by the California Conservative Action Group. Opposes Sierra Club plan. Do not cross Bay and Golden Gate. Rejects SJCCCR plan. Rejects Latino Policy Forum maps. Opposes CIJEE plan.
general_20110711_1	7112011	Mark Taylor	no				yes	Will equivilancy files be available to individuals? Hopes you will post on website so they are available to individuals to review and comment

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110711_11b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sjoaquin_20110711_12b	San Joaquin, Merced, Fresno	San Joaquin		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110711_13b	Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano, San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	similar interests and concerns	
9sutter_20110711_1	Sutter			no	no		
ccagsupport_20110711_1				no	no		
general_20110711_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110711_11b			no				
9sjoaquin_20110711_12b	neighbors, similar interests and concerns, boundaries		no				
9sjoaquin_20110711_13b			no				
9sutter_20110711_1			no				
ccagsupport_20110711_1			no				supports CCAG maps
general_20110711_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110711_2	7112011	Monica Griffin	no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula, including Torrance, with straight lines
general_20110711_3	7112011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Cannot find 14 day post decision review requirement in prop 11 or 20. Since no revisions will happen, review serves no purpose. Do not rush the decision
general_20110711_4	7112011	Bobby Dutcher	no				yes	Do not mix up rural North Coast with Marin and Sonoma counties. Liberal v. conservative. Farming, ranching, and tourism are important to North counties, while Marin and Sonoma are educated and urban.
general_20110711_5	7112011	David Salaverry	yes	CCAG			yes	Commission must examine CCAG maps, not just MALDEF unity maps, and take them into consideration. That they did not realize they had the material was problematic.
general_20110711_6	7112011	Robert J. Apodaca	yes	United Latinos Vote			yes	It is nearly impossible for the public to analyze your visualizations. Difficult to see bigger picture from PDFs. Please post equivalency or GIS files. Please provide database of plans.
general_20110711_7	7112011	Craig Wilson	no				yes	Pattern the maps after the very fair effort of 1991 supreme court masters.
general_20110711_8	7112011	Ron Davis	no				yes	Resist
general_20110711_9	7112011	Tony Quinn	no				yes	Commission should look at Supreme Court Masters Plan enacted in 1991, dividing in natural regions. Referendum must be qualified against these plans if final districts look like they do now.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110711_2		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes Peninsula		no	no		
general_20110711_3				no	no		
general_20110711_4	Marin, Sonoma, Lake			no	no		
general_20110711_5				no	no		
general_20110711_6				no	no		
general_20110711_7				no	no		
general_20110711_8				no	no		
general_20110711_9				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110711_2			no			do not want gerrymandering lines drawn	
general_20110711_3			no				Best maps possible
general_20110711_4			no			rural v. urban, education v. farming, ranching	
general_20110711_5			no				
general_20110711_6			no				
general_20110711_7			no				
general_20110711_8			no				
general_20110711_9			no				article in fox and hound

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_1	7112011	Judith A. Riley	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_2	7112011	Linda Lambourne	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_3	7112011	Nigel Stout	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_4	7112011	Pamela Koch	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_5	7112011	Eileen M. Blanchard	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_1	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_2	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_3	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_4	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_5	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_1			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_2			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_3			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_4			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_6	7112011	Robert J. Wintzinger	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_7	7112011	Tami Stephens	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_8	7112011	Kathryn Kellar	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_9	7112011	Deborah Moorehead	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_10	7112011	Constance Rice	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_6	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_7	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_8	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_9	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_10	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_6			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_7			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_8			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_9			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_11	7112011	Peter Riley	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_12	7112011	Jeannie Atkins	no		Santa Clarita	Ventura	yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_13	7112011	Paige and John Weaver	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_14	7112011	Jeff Habberstad	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_15	7112011	Jeff Willis	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_11	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_12	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_13	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_14	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_15	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_11			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_12			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_13			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_14			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_15			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_16	7112011	Julie Melssen	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_17	7112011	Michael Berke	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_18	7112011	Joseph Ryan	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_19	7112011	Julie Sturgeon	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_20	7112011	Joan Curd	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_16	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_17	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_18	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_19	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_20	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_16			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_17			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_18			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_19			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_21	7112011	Ruthann Levison	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_22	7112011		yes	San Canyon Community Association			yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_23	7112011	Mike Levison	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_24	7112011	Gina Peterson	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_25	7112011	Bobbe Higby	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_21	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_22	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_23	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_24	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_25	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_21			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_22			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_23			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_24			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_25			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_26	7112011	Bonnie D. Hood	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_27	7112011	Vivian Mayberry	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_28	7112011	Lanny Mayberry	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_29	7112011	Roger Horning	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_30	7112011	Michele Horning	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_26	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_27	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_28	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_29	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_30	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_26			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_27			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_28			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_29			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_30			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_31	7112011	Robert Schmidt	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_32	7112011	Fred L. Seeley	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_33	7112011	Karen Chong	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_34	7112011	Philip Lane	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_35	7112011	Paula Soltero	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_31	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_32	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_33	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_34	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_35	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_31			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_32			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_33			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_34			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_35			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_36	7112011	Gayle Myers	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_37	7112011	Carol E. Upton	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_38	7112011	Karilyn Crolius	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_39	7112011	B.J. Atkins	no				yes	Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNE San Fernando Valley SD visualization does not reflect COI testimony or direction Comission gave to line drawers. Connect SCV with E Ventura County, similar and together in SD sincd 1982
1imperial_20110711_1	7112011	Robert E. Ham	no				yes	Imperial county should not be divided into two districts. Do not split Calexico from rest of Imperial, do not add mountainous regions of Riverside county that have nothing in common. Must remain intact.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_36	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_37	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_38	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_39	Ventura	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando		no	yes	similar communities, together in SD since 1982	
1imperial_20110711_1	Imperial, Riverside	Coachella, Calexico		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_36			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_37			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_38			no				
supporters_sclarita_eventura_20110711_39			no				
1imperial_20110711_1	would disenfranchise Coachella to be split		no			nothing in common with mountainous regions of Riverside county	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110711_1b	7112011	Gene Wunderlich	yes	Southwest California Legislative Council			yes	Do not divide City of Temecula into two separate congressional election boundaries. Keep with Riverside county. Temecula has been well served by congressman Darrell Issa, division violates Proposition 11. Include all Temecula within PRS115 corridor CD
2sbernardino_20110711_1	7112011	Cherise Kuzminski, Administrative Secretary to Assistant City Manager	yes	City of Rancho Cucamonga	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Rancho Cucamonga whole and entirely within San Bernardino County and Revise Proposed Assembly District Map SBCUCA and Senate District Map SBBAN to include entire city of Rancho Cucamonga. Would be disenfranchised.
2sbernardino_20110711_1b	7112011	Rhodes L. Rigsby, M.D., MBA, Mayor	yes	City of Loma Linda	Loma Linda	San Bernardino	yes	Place Loma Linda with Redlands in the Rialto-San Bernardino CD. Share historical, cultural, educational, social, economic interests. Bedroom community, shopping, freeways, etc.
2sbernardino_20110711_2	7112011	Matthew Brown	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Do not split Chino Hills, it is one city not two, want own voice. New boundaries reduce republican seats by four.
2sbernardino_20110711_2b	7112011	Paul Leon, Mayor	yes	City of Ontario	Ontario	San Bernardino	yes	Revise ONTPM to include Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Chino, Montclair, Claremont and Pomona so that they can be represented by one member of congress. Thank you for not splitting Ontario. Do not divide Chino Hills and Fontana.
2sbernardino_20110711_3	7112011	Joanne E. Morse	no			San Bernardino	yes	Proposed split of San Bernardino is unfair to Jerry Lewis who has represented Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110711_1b	Riverside	Temecula		no	yes	historically part of Riverside County	
2sbernardino_20110711_1	San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110711_1b	San Bernardino	Redlands, Loma Linda	I-215, I10	no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110711_2	San Bernardino	Chino Hills		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110711_2b	San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Chino, Montclair, Claremont, Pomona	Kellogg Hill, I-5	no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110711_3		Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110711_1b	Congressman Darell Isa,		no			defies will of voters	
2sbernardino_20110711_1	voices of residents in NW area will be drowned out. Municipal services, library, community services, development, animal control, law enforcement, fire, transport		no			no commonalities between rancho cucamonga and LA county	
2sbernardino_20110711_1b	school district, medical center, shopping, college, freeways, public park, train		no				
2sbernardino_20110711_2			no			if split in two have no voice	
2sbernardino_20110711_2b	compact, traditionally west valley communities, community and business ties, zero deviation		no				
2sbernardino_20110711_3	Lewis knows cities		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110711_4	7112011	Barbara A. Morse	no			San Bernardino	yes	Proposed split of San Bernardino is unfair to Jerry Lewis who has represented Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland.
3orange_20110711_1	7112011	Daren Nigsarian	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Supports draft which would create districts La Habra would share with LA County cities. Ideal way of addressing numerical concerns, as well as creating homogenous districts more effectively served by representative
9sjoaquin_20110624_28_after 5pm	6242011	Pam Aberle	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi has different interests than cities in the East Bay and shouldnt be redistricted.
saigon_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Hien Dang	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley, together
saigon_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Nga T Pham	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley, together
saigon_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	Kim Phung Ha	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley, together
saigon_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Toan	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley, together
saigon_20110624_5_after5pm	6242011	Nam Nquyen	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley, together
saigon_20110624_6_after5pm	6242011	Thieu Van Vo	no			Orange	yes	Keep Little Saigon Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley, together
5slo_20110624_after5pm	6242011	Thomas Geaslen	no		Nipomo	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep San Luis Obispo one voting unit. (Dont split SLO)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110711_4		Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland		no	yes		
3orange_20110711_1	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110624_28_after 5pm		Lodi	East Bay	no	yes		
saigon_20110624_1_after5pm		Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	yes		
saigon_20110624_2_after5pm		Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	yes		
saigon_20110624_3_after5pm		Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	yes		
saigon_20110624_4_after5pm		Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	yes		
saigon_20110624_5_after5pm		Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	yes		
saigon_20110624_6_after5pm		Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		no	yes	Keep the Vietnamese-American community together	
5slo_20110624_after5pm	San Luis Obispo			no	yes	representation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110711_4	Lewis knows cities		no				
3orange_20110711_1	numerical concerns, homogenous districts		no				mixed county argument is disingenuous
9sjoaquin_20110624_28_after 5pm			no				
saigon_20110624_1_after5pm			no				
saigon_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
saigon_20110624_3_after5pm			no				
saigon_20110624_4_after5pm			no				
saigon_20110624_5_after5pm			no				
saigon_20110624_6_after5pm	shared culture		no				
5slo_20110624_after5pm	San Luis Obispo county needs to be one voting unit to avoid voter confusion and improper representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110624_1_12_after5pm	6242011	Ariana Milman	no		Camarillo	Ventura	yes	Support the 1st draft EASTVENT and SBVENT. Recommend changes to keep Oxnard, Port Hueneme, El Rio, Nyland Acres, and Thousand Oaks whole. Support keeping Santa Clara Valley whole in a VenturaSanta Barbara based district.
7sclara_20110624_6_6_after5pm	6242011	Matthew Mo	no			Santa Clara	yes	Keep Evergreen with San Jose and not split into MilpitasBerryessa, San Jose, and Monterey districts.
8alameda_20110624_13_after5pm	6252011	Michael Parker	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Oppose division of Richmond into two congressional districts.
8alameda_20110624_14_after5pm	6242011	Susan Hirsch	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	The Neighborhood of Brentwood 90049 should be kept together and not split at San Vicente Ave
8alameda_20110624_15_after5pm	6242011	Nancy Webb	yes	City College of San Francisco	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Richmond should be in one district included with West Contra Costa County with Hercules, San Pablo, and other West County cities.
8napa_20110624_6_after5pm	6252011	Marjorie Burns	no			Napa	yes	Napa and Sonoma should be in same district and Napa should not be in Yolo Counties district
8napa_20110624_6_after5pm	6242011	Jatinder Singh	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	American Canyon should stay in Napa County.
8smateo_20110624_2_after5pm	6252011	John Feldis	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Group Menlo Park with Atherton and Palo Alto

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110624_1_12_after5pm	Ventura, Santa Barbara	Camarillo, Ventura, Santa Paula, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Thousand Oaks, Vecinos Unidos		no	yes		
7sclara_20110624_6_6_after5pm	Monterey	San Jose, Berryessa, Milpitas		yes	yes	school districts, representation	
8alameda_20110624_13_after5pm		Richmond		no	yes	United representation	
8alameda_20110624_14_after5pm			Brentwood 90049, San Vicente Ave	no	yes	same zip code and neighborhood should be kept in one congressional district	
8alameda_20110624_15_after5pm	Contra Costa	Richmond, Hercules, San Pablo		no	yes	representation, interests, identity	
8napa_20110624_6_after5pm	Yola, Napa, Sonoma	Sacramento, Solano		no	yes		Shared wine industry
8napa_20110624_6_after5pm	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8smateo_20110624_2_after5pm		Menlo Park, Atherton, Palo Alto		no	yes	location	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110624_1_12_after5pm	Santa Clara Valley is a COI and should be kept together.		no				
7sclara_20110624_6_6_after5pm	The Evergreen Neighborhood is a COI with San Jose and shares urban concerns and should have untied representation.		no				
8alameda_20110624_13_after5pm	Richmond needs united representation to deal with urban problems.		no				
8alameda_20110624_14_after5pm	Brentwood 90049 should not be split into two congressional districts because it functions as a unit.		no				
8alameda_20110624_15_after5pm	Richmond needs united representation and has COI with Hercules, San Pablo, and other West County cities.		no				
8napa_20110624_6_after5pm			no				
8napa_20110624_6_after5pm			no				
8smateo_20110624_2_after5pm	Menlo Park is in same area and Atherton and Palo Alto		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Patricia Mancebo	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Lodi should not be redistricted outside of San Joaquin Central Valley
9sjoaquin_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Anonymous	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Leave Lodi in San Joaquin County
9sjoaquin_20110624_3_after5pm	6242011	David Nugent	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi in San Joaquin Valley district and not included in the North Bay
9sjoaquin_20110624_4_after5pm	6242011	Philip J. Marcus	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Concerned about the proposal to remove Lodi from San Joaquin into North Bay district that includes Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, and Woodland
9sjoaquin_20110624_5_after5pm	6242011	Tom and Kim Driscoll	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Oppose proposal to include Lodi into the same district as Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, and Woodland
9sjoaquin_20110624_6_after5pm	6242011	Jackie Bush	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not change the maps that would put Lodi in the Bay Area and out of the Valley
9sjoaquin_20110624_7_after5pm	6242011	Kim Parigoris	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi the Bay Area district.
9sjoaquin_20110624_8_after5pm	6242011	Gayle Oxford	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Extricating Lodi from the Valley will not work
9sjoaquin_20110624_9_after5pm	6242011	Kim Paigoris (duplicate)	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	
9sjoaquin_20110624_21_after5pm	6242011	Jackie Bush (duplicate)	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_1_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	entertainment, representation	work
9sjoaquin_20110624_2_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_3_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_4_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, Woodland		no	yes	geographic, representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_5_after5pm		Lodi, Santa Rosa, Benicia, Vallejo, Suisun City, Fairfield, Napa, Winters, Woodland		no	yes	civic populations	agricultural populations
9sjoaquin_20110624_6_after5pm		Lodi, Sacramento		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_7_after5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	yes	shared conservative politics, shopping	work
9sjoaquin_20110624_8_after5pm		Lodi		no	yes	shared political voice, representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_9_after5pm		duplicate		no	yes	duplicate	
9sjoaquin_20110624_21_after5pm				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_1_after5pm	Lodi shares a COI with Central San Joaquin Valley		no				God bless you, the United State and America and surrounding areas of Lodi in the San Joaquin Valley
9sjoaquin_20110624_2_after5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_3_after5pm	Lodi has always been apart of the San Joaquin Valley.		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_4_after5pm	Lodi is apart of the San Joaquin Valley and not the North Bay		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_5_after5pm	Lodi shares a COI with other Central Valley towns.		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_6_after5pm	It would change the ability to vote in Sacramento		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_7_after5pm	Lodi shares interests with San Joaquin County.		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_8_after5pm	Lodi shares a state political voice and local representation with the valley		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_9_after5pm	duplicate		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_21_after5pm			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110624_22_after 5pm	6242011	Dennis J. Green and Judy R. Green	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not redistrict Lodi out of San Joaquin County and include it in the same district as Santa Rosa, Suisun City, and Napa
9sjoaquin_20110624_23_after 5pm	6242011	Anonymous	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Leave Lodi in San Joaquin County
9sjoaquin_20110624_24_after 5pm	6242011	Linda Jimenez	no		Tracy	San Joaquin	yes	Appreciate making Valley communities and Sierra communities separate. Tracy should be aligned with Stockton not the Bay Area and Lathrop should be included with Tracy and should replace Lockeford.
9sjoaquin_20110624_26_after 5pm	6242011	Robert Bush	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not take Lodi out of San Joaquin
9sjoaquin_20110624_25_after 5pm	6242011	Mark Vincent	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Against moving Lodi into North Bay district
20110618	6182011	Jay Barkman	no			Orange	yes	Keep Santa Ana with West Anaheim 57 fwy W. East Garden grove can also be used as a connector
20110618	6182011	Marcia McDougal	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Community depends of Last Chance Road and Swanton to be in same district
20110618	6182011	Geri Kenyon	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Proposed Senate 25 district leading from Kern County to Malibu and Topanga on the Pacific coast would not be helpful for representing education needs of at risk children

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110624_22_after 5pm	Napa, San Joaquin	Lodi, Santa Rosa, Suisun City		no	yes	voting representation	
9sjoaquin_20110624_23_after 5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_24_after 5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi, Tracy, Stockton, Lothrop, Lockeford	15, I-5, Hwy 99, Hwy 49	no	yes	Geographic	
9sjoaquin_20110624_26_after 5pm	San Joaquin	Lodi		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110624_25_after 5pm		Lodi		no	yes	politics, vote	
20110618		Santa Ana, Tustin, Anaheim, Garden Grove, Irvine, Los Al, Cypress, Westminster, Buena Park, Orange, Villa Park, Yorba Linda, Brea,	57, 5, Santa Ana River	no	yes	Santa Ana, Tustin, Anaheim, and Garden Grove are connected by Hwy 5. They share shopping and entertainment, health, transportation, and education services.	share hotel industry, medical industry,
20110618			Last Chance Road, Swanton	no	yes	School and Fire dept. will lose out.	
20110618	Los Angeles, Kern	Malibu, Topanga, Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Venice	Santa Clarita Valley	no	yes	Education needs are the same	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110624_22_after 5pm	Lodi has a COI with San Joaquin Valley and not East Bay area		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_23_after 5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_24_after 5pm	Tracy should be included in the Valley districts and not with the East Bay		no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_26_after 5pm			no				
9sjoaquin_20110624_25_after 5pm			no				
20110618	Communities share a COI and are geographically connected		no				
20110618	Community depends on Last chance Road and Swanton to be in the same district.		no				
20110618	Communities need representation of the educational needs of at risk children		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
20110618	6182011	Glenn Gelineau	no		San Carlos	San Mateo	no	
20110618	6182011	Carole Robinson	no		Belmont	San Mateo	yes	
1sdiego_20110624_1_after5pm	6242011	Maridel Andrada	no			San Diego	no	
2riverside_20110624_1_after5pm	6252011	Nga Thi Pham	no			Riverside	yes	Please keep the Little Saigon area together including cities of Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley
2riverside_20110624_2_after5pm	6242011	Greg Lucas Rodriguez	no		Palm Springs	Riverside	yes	Riverside and Imperial can be its own district and does not need to be used to fill out districts centered in San Diego, Orange, or Los Angeles Counties
3orange_20110624_1_13_after5pm	6242011	Ann Coil	no		Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Doesnt make sense to combine Orange County cities with San Diego.
4langeles_20110630_7	6302011	Linda Dubin (duplicate)	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Topanga 90290, it is a small community with just one post office and one school.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
20110618				no	no		
20110618				no	no		
1sdiego_20110624_1_after5pm				no	yes	Socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language access needs	
2riverside_20110624_1_after5pm		Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley		yes	yes		
2riverside_20110624_2_after5pm	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego, Orange, Los Angeles	Blythe, Palo Verde, Ripley, Palm Springs		no	yes	Share welfare resources, newspapers	
3orange_20110624_1_13_after5pm	Orange, San Diego, Los Angeles	La Habra,Los Alamitos, La Palma, Artesia, Cerritos,Yorba Linda, Diamond Bar, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente,		no	yes	Orange county has a separate COI from Los Angeles and San Diego counties and should be in separate congressionalsenate districts.	
4langeles_20110630_7		Topanga		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
20110618			no			Use zip codes and county lines to establish district to create fists not fingers.	
20110618			no			Districts look gerrymandered.	
1sdiego_20110624_1_after5pm			no			Supports the requests made by speakers 5,6,7,8,9,14,20,32,46,47,49,56,88,91 who testified on 6202011	
2riverside_20110624_1_after5pm	Keep Little Saigon area together		no				
2riverside_20110624_2_after5pm	Riverside and Imperial Counties are big enough to be in their own districts and do not need to be split up to add to urban areas in other districts.		no				
3orange_20110624_1_13_after5pm	Orange county has a separate COI from Los Angeles and San Diego counties and should be in separate congressionalsenate districts.		no				
4langeles_20110630_7	one post office, one school		no				must be a mistake or needs explanation

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110630_8	6302011	Charles F. Anna	no		Downey	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Downey, keep in one CD. Doney is one entity, working on mighty projects Minuteman Missile, Apollo, Space Shuttle.
4langeles_20110630_10	6302011	Sereivuth Prak	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep intact 37th CD, Long Beach, Signal Hill, Carson, Compton. Have seen progress in terms of racial harmony and different ethnic groups and should not be broken up.
4langeles_20110630_11	6302011	George and Carol DeMott	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Newhall in San Fernando Valley CD, takes away from voting with neighbors in Santa Clarita Valley. Keep valley intact.
4langeles_20110630_12	6302011	Marsha McLean, Mayor	yes	City of Santa Clarita	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Place entire City of Santa Clarita within Antelope ValleySanta Clarita CD. Do not put part with W San Fernando ValleyCalabasas CD. Remove Moorpark from CD, include Simi Valley. Draw SD to include Santa Clarita with parts of Ventura
4langeles_20110630_13	6302011	Eugene Lee, Voting Rights Project Director	yes	Asian Pacific American Legal Center	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Announce joint mapping proposal by CAPAFR, MALDEF, AARC for fair Congressional and Senate Districts to keep together neighborhoods and COIs.
4langeles_20110630_14	6302011	Betty Pumpian	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put North Valley with Mid Valley flatland. Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110630_8		Downey		no	yes		projects, Minuteman Missile, Apollo, Space Shuttle
4langeles_20110630_10		Long Beach, Signal Hill, Carson and Compton		no	yes	Different ethnic backgrounds in harmony	economic prosperity
4langeles_20110630_11		Newhall, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110630_12	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Calabasas, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Antelope Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110630_13				no	yes	Asian American and Latino majority districts	
4langeles_20110630_14		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		income, housing, 210 freeway, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110630_8	one group, working together		no				
4langeles_20110630_10	parades, nutrition programs, Mark Twain Public Library		no				
4langeles_20110630_11	keep community intact, voting		no				
4langeles_20110630_12	municipal boundaries, coastal and inland districts should be paired together		no				map attached
4langeles_20110630_13		plan illustrates how commission can draw districts that comply with VRA	no				link attached
4langeles_20110630_14	education, transportation, historic preservation, environment, protection of open space, rim of valley, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails, colleges, entertainment		no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110630_15	6302011	Matt Rosenberg and family	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Preserve West Valley COI. Do not split Reseda. Supports VICA. Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village, right to LA county line, to West San Fernando Valley CD
5sbarbara_20110630_1	6302011	Thomas and Jerry Gilbert	no		Lompoc	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not split Lompoc. Lompoc, Mesa Oaks, Mission Hills and Vandenberg Village should be considered one entity for unified representation.
5ventura_20110630_1	6302011	Charles B. Benedict	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Leave Simi Valley in Ventura district, do not put with Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley. Would not be in best interest of Simi Valley
5ventura_20110630_2	6302011	Shawn Benedict	no				yes	Do not move Simi Valley out of Ventura county district
6kern_20110630_1	6302011	MaryLou Adams	no			Kern	yes	Valley Mountain counties not part of Coast
8alameda_20110630_1	6302011	Aref Aziz, Co-Chair	yes	Keep Tri Cities in Alameda County		Alameda	yes	Pleased with Fremont Congressional Seat. Support Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Newark, Milpitas CD, strong Asian voice. Understand inclusion of San Jose.
8alameda_20110630_2	6302011	Anu Natarajan, Councilmember	yes	Fremont City	Fremont	Alameda	yes	Supports district of Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Newark, Milpitas. Pleased Fremont is in Alameda. Strong asian voice.
8ccosta_20110630_1	6302011	Gerardo	no				yes	Do not put San Ramon in CD with Fremont, Newark, Union City, Hayward. Do not put Dublin Pleasanton, Livermore into CD with San Jose. Would separate San Ramon Valley from Tri-Valley and isolated San Ramon.
8ccosta_20110630_2	6302011	E.Y. Maness	no			Contra Costa	yes	Assign odd number to EALAM district. If even, there will be not election for Senator until 2014. Will disenfranchise county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110630_15		West Valley, Reseda, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110630_1		Lompoc, Mesa Oaks, Mission Hills, Vandenberg Village		no	yes		
5ventura_20110630_1	Ventura	Simi Valley, Santa Clarita, Antelope Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110630_2	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
6kern_20110630_1				no	no		
8alameda_20110630_1	Alameda	Fremont, Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Newark, Milpitas		no	yes	strong Asiansouth Asian voice	
8alameda_20110630_2	Alameda	Fremont, Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Newark, Milpitas		no	no	strong Asiansouth Asian voice	
8ccosta_20110630_1		San Ramon, Fremont, Newark, Union City, Hayward, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, San Jose		no	yes	republican population	
8ccosta_20110630_2	Contra Costa			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110630_15	school district, Santa Monica Mountains Conservation District.		no				Use VICA plan
5sbarbara_20110630_1	small community, needs unified representation		no				
5ventura_20110630_1			no				Join Bob Huber and Janice Parvin
5ventura_20110630_2			no				
6kern_20110630_1			no				
8alameda_20110630_1			no				urge you to vote for its adoption as a final map
8alameda_20110630_2			no				
8ccosta_20110630_1			no			avoid ripple effect	do what you were elected to do
8ccosta_20110630_2			no				need odd number do residents are not disenfranchised

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110630_1	6302011	Gene Anderson	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not remove Santa Rosa from Sonoma county. Combine intact Sonoma with Marin. Removing county seat from county is gerrymandering
8sonoma_20110630_2	6302011	Tony Crabb	no			Sonoma	yes	Do not remove Santa Rosa from Sonoma, as is integral part of community. Main COIs wine growing Sonoma, Napa, Lake Marin, and Mendacino.
9edorado_20110630	6302011	Harry Norris, President	yes	Board of Directors, El Dorado Irrigation District		El Dorado	yes	Add Cameron Park and El Dorado hills into Foothill SD. Use Highway 41 as divider, remove western Madera and Fresno counties. Add Folsom for population as there are few distinctions. Otherwise dilutes voting power.
9humboldt_20110630_1	6302011	Alison Talbott	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Do not group Marin with North counties. Marin part of SF Bay. Lake, Humboldt, Mendocino, Napa should be together due to agriculture, wine.
9sacramento_20110630_1	6302011	Otho J Mintz	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not split Citrus Heights, is not financially under water.
9sacramento_20110630_2	6302011	Jay Hubert	no		Galt	Sacramento	yes	Do not put Galt with East Contra Costa and parts of Bay counties. Do not share interests with Contra Costa
9siskiyou_20110630_1	6302011	Grace Bennett, Supervisort	yes	Siskiyou County		Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou county together and put in same district as Shasta, Trinity, Modoc and Tehama
9siskiyou_20110630_2	6302011	Patricia Ward	no		Redding	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together, do not group with coast, lines should run North-South
9siskiyou_20110630_3	6302011	Phyllis	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together, do not group with coast, lines should run North-South. Modoc, Lassen

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110630_1	Sonoma, Marin	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
8sonoma_20110630_2	Sonoma, Marin, Napa, Lake, Mendocino.	Santa Rosa		no	yes		integral part of business, ag and community, wine growing and tourism,
9edorado_20110630	Madera, Fresno, El Dorado	El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Folsom	Highway 41	no	yes		
9humboldt_20110630_1	Marin, Humboldt, Mendocino, Lake, Napa.			no	yes		rural, agriculture, timber, wine
9sacramento_20110630_1		Citrus Heights		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110630_2	Contra Costa	Galt		no	yes		semi rural
9siskiyou_20110630_1	Siskiyou, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_2	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_3	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, Modoc, Lassen		I-5, 101, US 395	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110630_1	home county, county seat		no			otherwise is gerrymandering	
8sonoma_20110630_2	traffic corridor 101 and SMART rail, coastal		no				
9edorado_20110630	voting power, geographic integrity, wastewater utility		no			central valley locales have few Common interest with foothills	
9humboldt_20110630_1			no			Marin is not like rural counties	hold meetings in more areas
9sacramento_20110630_1	financially not in the red		no				
9sacramento_20110630_2			no			no shared interests	
9siskiyou_20110630_1			no			nothing in common with Coastal area	
9siskiyou_20110630_2			no			nothing in common with Coastal area	
9siskiyou_20110630_3			no			nothing in common with Coastal area	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110630_4	6302011	Alice Mecham	no		Reddinng	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama with coastal counties. Different issues, employment, lifestyles. Group district maps in north-south manner
9siskiyou_20110630_5	6302011	Robert Sunter	no				yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together, not part of coastal district
9siskiyou_20110630_6	6302011	Jennifer Hurlimann	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not lump Siskiyou with coastal counties. Siskiyou is rural, agricultural, active communities, passionate about property rights. Politically are nothing like Coastal counties.
9siskiyou_20110630_7	6302011	Jennifer Hurliman	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not district Siskiyou with Coastal counties. School lunch in Siskiyou vs. head lice in Marin.
9siskiyou_20110630_8	6302011	Meredith Perry	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou. Do not lump with coast. Do not lump with Shasta, Lassen, Tehema, Modoc and Trinity
9siskiyou_20110630_9	6302011	Sam Bigham	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together, do not group with coast, lines should run North-South.
9siskiyou_20110630_10	6302011	Daniel F. Simon, P.E.	no				yes	Reconsider maps of Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc and Lassen agriculture based, no coastal issues. Tahama is agricultural based. Redistrict north south, not east west.
9siskiyou_20110630_11	6302011	Maxine Lopey	no		Mt Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou or place in coastal region. Will hurt chances to recover from economic slump.
9siskiyou_20110630_12	6302011	Michael Sima	yes	Gold Nugget Printing	Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Redistricting Scott valley to coast would be wrong and unfair. Nothing in common with area

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110630_4	Siskyou, Shasta, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_5	Siskyou, Shasta, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_6	Siskiyou			no	yes		agriculture, blue collar, small population, active communities, water rights
9siskiyou_20110630_7	Siskiyou, Marin			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_8	Siskiyou, Shasta, Lassen, Tehema, Modoc, Trinity			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_9	Siskiyou, Shasta Tehama		I-5, 101, US395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_10	Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc, Lassen, Tehama			no	yes		agriculture based
9siskiyou_20110630_11	Siskiyou			no	yes		economic slump, destitute area
9siskiyou_20110630_12		Scott Valley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110630_4			no			different employment, industries, retail, agriculture, lifestyles	
9siskiyou_20110630_5			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_6			no			smaller population would be swallowed by more populated and liberal coastal voice	
9siskiyou_20110630_7			no			different lives, different values, different health issues	
9siskiyou_20110630_8			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_9			no			Valley has nothing in common with coast	
9siskiyou_20110630_10			no			coastal issues have little to do with agriculture	
9siskiyou_20110630_11	outdoor areas		no			would be attack on rights of siskiyou residents, do not share priorities related to environment, resources, recreation, law enforcement	
9siskiyou_20110630_12			no			nothing in common with coast	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110630_13	6302011	Carol Gross	no			Siskyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together, do not group with coast, lines should run North-South.
9siskiyou_20110630_14	6302011		no				yes	Keep Agricultural based areas together, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen Shasta and Tahama
9siskiyou_20110630_15	6302011	Ron and Gail Whipple	no		Scott Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Scott Valley has nothing in common with Coast. Makes no sense and there is no need
9siskiyou_20110630_16	6302011	Grace Bennett, Supervisort	yes	Siskiyou County		Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou with Tehama, Shasta, Modoc, do not put with coast where there is nothing in common
9siskiyou_20110630_17	6302011	Pauline Reed	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Tehama and Shasta together, do not put with Coast
9siskiyou_20110630_18	6302011	Richard Berry	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Western Siskiyou County with coastal district. Interests should be kept as unit. Join with Shasta and Trinity counties
9siskiyou_20110630_19	6302011	Meridith Perry	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Against maps for Siskiyou, do not lump with coast for which there is nothing in common
9siskiyou_20110630_20	6302011	Mrs. Kim Pearson	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Keep siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together. Lines should be north-sourth, not east-west.
9siskiyou_20110630_21	6302011	Frank Tollerico, Jr	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Redrawn maps make it impossible for citizens in North Central and Northeastern CA to participate in affairs of state. Raodways should run north-south with I5, and 101. Economies are different, coast to Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc and Tehama
9siskiyou_20110630_22	6302011	Dwight Hoertsch	no				yes	Do not lump with coastal district, there are little common interests

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110630_13	siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama		I-5, 101, US395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_14	Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Shasta, Tahama			no	yes		agriculture based areas and interests
9siskiyou_20110630_15		Scott Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_16	Siskiyou, Tehama, Shasta, Modoc			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110630_17	Siskiyou, Tehama, Shasta			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_18	Shasta, Trinity, Siskiyou			no	yes		
9siskiyou_20110630_19	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_20	Siskiyou, Shasta Tehama		I5, 101, US395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_21	Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc, Teham		I5, 101, US395	no	yes		dry, inland areas,
9siskiyou_20110630_22				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110630_13			no			nothing in common with coast	
9siskiyou_20110630_14			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_15			no			makes no sense, it aint natural	
9siskiyou_20110630_16	mountain communities, share same values		no			coast has nothing in commonn	
9siskiyou_20110630_17			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_18	interests, major populations		no			should not be changed to coast	
9siskiyou_20110630_19			no			nothing in common with coast, pray you have ears to hear and eyes to see	
9siskiyou_20110630_20			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_21	climate, customs, culture		no			difficult drive east-west, economies are different, as are climates, customs, culture	
9siskiyou_20110630_22			no			little common interests with coast	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110630_23	6302011	Garland and Catherine Dirks	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Siskiyou, Shasta and Tehama Counties should remain together. Mountain and valley counties should not be combined with coasts, maps lines should be drawn north south not east-west
9siskiyou_20110630_24	6302011	Peggy McCutcheon	no			Siskiyou	yes	Not acceptable to redistrict Siskiyou, lines should not run East-West
9siskiyou_20110630_25	6302011	Floyd McCurdy	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not group Siskiyou with any coastal county
9siskiyou_20110630_26	6302011	H. Richard Long	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama counties together. Many common interests not shared by coastal communities
9siskiyou_20110630_27	6302011	Don and Judy Mackintosh	no		Weed	Siskiyou	yes	Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc and Lassen counties should not be joined with the coast. Nothing in common, do not share same interests and concerns.
9siskiyou_20110630_28	6302011	Walt Pryor	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Put Siskiyou with Tehama, not Coast, where there is a mountain range between and takes hours to drive to
9siskiyou_20110630_29	6302011	Allison	no			Siskiyou	yes	Northern Mountain areas of Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Trinity and Shasta have no connection to coasts Humboldt, Del Norte
9siskiyou_20110630_30	6302011	Jan Smith	no				yes	We are not coastal
general_20110630_1	6302011	James William	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not group Shasta, Siskiyou, Lassen with coast line. Grouping with coast helps skew demographics to Liberal Democrats

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110630_23	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama		I5, 101, US395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_24	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_25	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_26	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_27	Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_28	Siskiyou, Tehama			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_29	Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Trinity, Shasta, Humboldt, Del Norte			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110630_30				no	no		
general_20110630_1	Shasta, Siskiyou, Lassen			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110630_23			no			why combine valley and mountain counties with coastal	
9siskiyou_20110630_24			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_25			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_26			no				
9siskiyou_20110630_27			no			nothin in common with coast, do not share same interests	
9siskiyou_20110630_28			no			mountain range, long drive,	needs to be fixed
9siskiyou_20110630_29			no			no connection	
9siskiyou_20110630_30			no			not a good idea	
general_20110630_1			no			conservative vs. liberal, would lose republican voice, taxes	Socialist country

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_1	6302011	Gevork Arakelian and Yekaterina Boyajian	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put North Valley with Mid Valley flatland. Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_2	6302011	Rich Crowther (duplicate)	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put North Valley with Mid Valley flatland. Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_3	6302011	Alane Livinsohn	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put North Valley with Mid Valley flatland. Keep together Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
1sdiego_20110701_1	6302011	Gary S. Rotto	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Nest SSAND and ISANT, creating VRA district to max Latino strength. Nest NCSAN and CNSAN, coastal district. Nest RCHMM and LMSAND, inland urbband and Jewish. Nest NESAN and MURTM, similar interests.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_1		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		income, housing, 210 freeway, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_2		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		income, housing, 210 freeway, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_3		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		income, housing, 210 freeway, colleges, medical, shopping, jobs
1sdiego_20110701_1	San Diego, Imperial,			no	yes	Latino voters, Jesish communities, similar interests	economic stratum, border communities,

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_1	education, transportation, historic preservation, environment, protection of open space, rim of valley, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails, colleges, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_2	education, transportation, historic preservation, environment, protection of open space, rim of valley, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails, colleges, entertainment		no				attached map
supporterslangelescommunities_20110630_3	education, transportation, historic preservation, environment, protection of open space, rim of valley, hills, wildlife, watershed, trails, colleges, entertainment		no				attached map
1sdiego_20110701_1	rural, urban	SSAND and ISAND creates VRA district	no				diverse interests

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110701_2	7012011	C. Neil Ash	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Do not redistrict SD and AD so that Rancho Santa Fe and other North County areas extend south to San Diego and further. Would impact school, fire, water districts.
1sdiego_20110701_3	7022011	Rick and Dan Merrill	no			San Diego	yes	Do not cut CD through Hillcrest, cuts gay community in half. Do not stick half of Hillcrest and Mission Hills in Poway. Put all Hillcrest and Mission Hills with North Park, South Park, Kensington and City Heights
2riverside_20110701_1	7012011	Nicholas Adcock, Governmental Affairs Manager	yes	Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce		Riverside	yes	Return Temecula from San Diego to Riverside, join Hemet-San Jacinto with Western Riverside Mountains between means little in common. Keep City of Redlands in one district. Do not include portions of area in LA or Orange districts.
2riverside_20110701_2	7012011	Ron Roberts, Mayor	yes	City of Temecula	Temecula	Riverside	yes	Do not divide Temecula into two CD boundaries. Keep all of Temecula in Riverside counties congressional delegation. Area has a history of being in Riverside
2sbernardino_20110701_1	7012011	Richard H. Hart, MD, President	yes	Loma Linda University	Loma Linda	San Bernardino	yes	Supports maps for San Bernardino by Inland Action. Do not split Redlands. Loma Linda, Redlands, Yucaipa share healthcare interests, should share congressional district.
4langeles_20110701_1	7012011	Christine Allon	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City in half between two SDs. Make whole, connect with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. No COI with north half of LASCV or LADNT. COI is with 101 freeway corridor and Santa Monica Mountains.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110701_2	San Diego	Rancho Santa Fe		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110701_3	San Diego	Hillcrest, Mission Hills, Poway, North Park, South Park,Kensington, City Heights		yes	yes	Gay community	
2riverside_20110701_1	Riverside, San Diego, Los Angeles, Orange	Temecula,Hemet-San Jacinto, Redlands		no	yes		
2riverside_20110701_2	Riverside, San Diego	Temecula		no	yes	history of being with Riverside	
2sbernardino_20110701_1	San Bernardino	Redlands, Loma Linda, Yucaipa		no	yes		work force
4langeles_20110701_1		Studio City, Santa Monica, Los Angeles		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110701_2	schools, fire and water districts,		no				
1sdiego_20110701_3			no			Poway is geographically and politically opposite	
2riverside_20110701_1	transportation, water, airmountain ranges		no			mountains separate, little in common with coastal counties	
2riverside_20110701_2			no				
2sbernardino_20110701_1	health care interests, institutions, historic community		no				
4langeles_20110701_1	schools, shopping, education, parks, institutions, 405, transportation corridors, LA River		no			No COI with North half of LASCV or LADNT	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110701_2	7012011	Laura Friedman, Mayor	yes	City of Glendale	Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Glendale, Burbank and part of Pasadena linked to other Foothill cities in SD and CDs. Cities have numerous cooperative aggrements. Supports Pasadena Mayor Bill Bogaards recommendations.
4langeles_20110701_3	7012011	Sharon M. Crigler	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City in half between two SDs. Make whole, connect with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. No COI with north half of LASCV or LADNT. COI is with 101 freeway corridor and Santa Monica Mountains.
4langeles_20110701_4	7012011	Ronald and Patsy Husmann Family	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City in half between two SDs. Make whole, connect with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. No COI with north half of LASCV or LADNT. COI is with 101 freeway corridor and Santa Monica Mountains.
4langeles_20110701_5	7012011	Barry Weiss	no				yes	Do not split Studio City in half between two SDs. Make whole, connect with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. No COI with north half of LASCV or LADNT. COI is with 101 freeway corridor and Santa Monica Mountains.
4langeles_20110701_6	7012011	Frank Scotto, Mayor	yes	City of Torrance	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Torrance in CD. Redondo beach zip codes are part of Torrance. Split communities could result in changes to service quality and timeliness.
4langeles_20110701_7	7012011	David W. Armenta, Mayor	yes	City of Pico Rivera	Pico Rivera	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Gateway Cities in SD, share transport and housing. Irwindale and Covena are outside Pico Riveras sphere of involvement. Move SD south and West to get a better COI for gateway cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110701_2		Glendale, Burbank, Pasadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_3		Studio City, Santa Monica, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_4		Studio City, Santa Monica, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_5		Studio City, Santa Monica, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_6		Torrance, Redondo Beach		no	yes	one voice	
4langeles_20110701_7		Pico Rivera, Irwindale, Covena		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110701_2	geography, cooperative agreements, political identity, history		no				
4langeles_20110701_3	schools, shopping, education, parks, institutions, 405, transportation corridors, LA River		no			No COI with North half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles_20110701_4	schools, shopping, education, parks, institutions, 405, transportation corridors, LA River		no			No COI with North half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles_20110701_5	schools, shopping, education, parks, institutions, 405, transportation corridors, LA River		no			No COI with North half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles_20110701_6	36th district office is familiar with Torrance, working relationships		no				
4langeles_20110701_7	history of close cooperation, transport, housing		no			Irwindale and Covina do not share interests	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110701_8	7012011	Joe Aguilar, Mayor	yes	City of Commerce	Commerce	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Commerce in single SD, CD and AD. Share interest in health and environmental matters, pollution.
4langeles_20110701_9	7012011	Stuart H. Garrison, Chairperson	yes	Westchester Neighbors Association	Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	WNA supports keeping all of Westchester-Playa Del Rey together in redistricting.
4langeles_20110701_10	7012011	James Johnson, Councilmember	yes	City of Long Beach	Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Long Beach should not be divided into different CDs. Residents work, live and play in Long Beach and should not be joined with different communities.
4langeles_20110701_11	7012011	Sam Yebri, President	yes	30 Years After	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Beverly Hills, Westwood, and Pico-Robertson between two ADs, CDs, and SDs. Keep Iranian communities together in single district.
4langeles_20110701_12	7012011	Larry Van Nostran, Mayor,	yes	City of Lakewood	Lakewood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not draw AD Huntington park to Lakewood. Create Downey-Lakewood AD instead, bedroom communities with lower densities and similar interests.
4langeles_20110701_13	7012011	Lisa Berglund, Principal Administrative Analyst	yes	City of Carson	Carson	Los Angeles	yes	Assign Carson to be in same AD, SD and CD with adjacent COIS that have same social, economic, and ethnic make-up.
4langeles_20110701_14	7012011	Marsh Drucker	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada-Flintridge and Montrose with Glendale and Burbank. Share low density housing, wildlife, flora. Suburban commmunities with same watershed

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110701_8		Commerce		no	yes		railroad and truck traffic
4langeles_20110701_9		Westchester, Playa Del Rey		no	no		
4langeles_20110701_10		Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_11		Beverly Hills, Westwood, Pico-Robertson		no	yes	Iranian immigrants, cultural communities	share markets, community centers, businesses
4langeles_20110701_12		Huntington Park, Lakewood, Downey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_13		Carson		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_14		Sunland Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada-Flintridge, Montrose, Glendale, Burbank	210 fwy	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110701_8	diesel pollution, health, environmental justice		no				
4langeles_20110701_9			no				
4langeles_20110701_10	shopping, jobs, strong common identity		no			should not be joined with different communities miles away	
4langeles_20110701_11	synagogues, neighborhoods		no			should not be divided	
4langeles_20110701_12	lower densities, local economic and transportation interests, common fire and law agencies		no				attached plan
4langeles_20110701_13	social, economic, ethnic makeup	districts must comply with VRA	no				
4langeles_20110701_14	low density suburban housing, mountain rangges, shopping, business, entertainment, water retention, aquifers		no			Flatalands are high-density, multi-residential, little in common	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110701_15	7012011	Ron Ostrow	yes	Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council	Griffith Park	Los Angeles	yes	Do not exclude areas to North and West of Griffith Park. Los Feliz and Greater Griffith Park are part of larger Hollywood district. More in common with Burbank, Studio City and Glendale than East and South LA neighborhoods. Share Entertainment industry.
4langeles_20110701_16	7012011	Kathleen Hansell,	yes	Studio City Residents Association	Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio city whole in one SD, LASV, connect to other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. No COI with North LASCV or LADNT. Nest two ADs Thousand Oaks Santa Monica Mountains and West Side Santa Monica Districts into SD
4langeles_20110701_17	7012011	Jim Cohen, Mayor	yes	City of Hidden Hills	Hidden Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu and Westlake village together in all districts. All are contract cities with common goals, shared challenges, and issues.
4langeles_20110701_18	7012011	Aide Castro, Mayor	yes	City of Lynwood	Lynwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Lynwood city boundaries into separate voting districts. Otherwise there are no major objections to first draft maps.
4langeles_20110701_19	7012011	Carryl Lynn and Jack Wilson	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City whole in one district, LASCV, with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. Nest AD Thousand OaksSanta Monica Mountains and West SideSanta Monica into SD
4langeles_20110701_20	7012011	Joanne Farkar	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City whole in one district, LASCV, with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. Nest AD Thousand OaksSanta Monica Mountains and West SideSanta Monica into SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110701_15	Los Angeles	Griffith Park, Los Feliz, Hollywood, Burbank, Studio City, Glendale	10 freeway, LA river	no	yes		Entertainment industry, economic engineq
4langeles_20110701_16		Studio City, san Fernando Valley, Los Angeles	Ventura, 101	no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_17		Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu and Westlake village		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_18		Lynwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_19		Studio city, Thousand Oaks	Ventura, 101	no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_20		Studio city, Thousand Oaks	Ventura, 101	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110701_15	history, griffith park		no			do not share with Neighbors to east and south	
4langeles_20110701_16	commute, schools, shopping, education, parks, mountain roads, environmental and mountain priorities		no			no COI with LASCV of LADNT	
4langeles_20110701_17	public safety, water quality, emergency preparedness, education, transportation, traffic		no				
4langeles_20110701_18	schools		no				
4langeles_20110701_19	COI for 20 years		no			nothing in common with north half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles_20110701_20	COI for 20 years		no			nothing in common with north half of LASCV or LADNT	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110701_21	7012011	Ronald A. Frankle	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City whole in one district, LASCV, with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. Nest AD Thousand OaksSanta Monica Mountains and West SideSanta Monica into SD
4langeles_20110701_22	7012011	Mary Gregory	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City whole in one senate district that will encompass the two ADs. So little in common with santa Clarita, Castaic and Gorman.
4langeles_20110701_23	7012011	Jean Martin Klin	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City whole in one district, LASCV, with other SFV cities along Ventura and 101. Nest AD Thousand OaksSanta Monica Mountains and West SideSanta Monica into SD
4langeles_20110701_24	7012011	Neal F. Harris	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood 90049, redistricting will not be good for community.
4langeles_20110701_25	7012011	Erica Teasley Linnick, Esq., Coordinator	yes	AARC	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	IEAARC was referring to El Rancho Verde MAC, on which CRC ended map-drawing conversation.
4langeles_20110701_26	7012011	Gary S. Maier	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood Glen in CD with Brentwood, not Westwood. 405 freeway is divider, and issues are very different, UCLA
4langeles_20110701_27	7012011	Treacy Colbert	no				yes	Supports proposal by Long Beach 7th district Council member James Johson, keeps district as compact as possible, using major streets as boudaries.
4langeles_20110701_28	7012011	Linda Rarey	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Chatsworth is gerrymandered in current districting

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110701_21		Studio city, Thousand Oaks	Ventura, 101	no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_22		Studio City		no	yes	Residents Association, Neighborhood Council	
4langeles_20110701_23		Studio city, Thousand Oaks	Ventura, 101	no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_24		Brentwood		no	no		
4langeles_20110701_25		El Rancho Verde		no	no		
4langeles_20110701_26		Brentwood, Brentwood Glen, Westwood	405 Freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110701_27		Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110701_28		Chatsworth		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110701_21	COI for 20 years		no			nothing in common with north half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles_20110701_22	Beautification Committee, Open Space		no			So little in common with santa Clarita, Castaic and Gorman.	
4langeles_20110701_23	COI for 20 years		no			nothing in common with north half of LASCV or LADNT	
4langeles_20110701_24			no			will not be good for community	
4langeles_20110701_25			no				Check with Walter Hawkins
4langeles_20110701_26			no			sizable presence of UCLA	
4langeles_20110701_27			no				Urge LB City council to vote in favor on July 6
4langeles_20110701_28			no				Is there another source that details the new boundaries

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110701_29	7012011	Stephen Stark, Client Services Manager	yes	MuniServices, LLC	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Old Orchard 1 into San Fernando district. Majority of Santa Clarita remains together and Old Orchard 1 has nothing in common with SFV.
5sbarbara_20110701_1	7012011	Wendy A. Thompson	no		Mission Hills	Santa Barbara	yes	Do not divide Lompoc and adjacent subdivisions into two districts. Combine with Santa Maria if necessary. Not just federal prison, many other aspects.
5sclara_20110701_1	7012011	Consuelo J. Rodriguez, Ed. D	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Do not divide San Jose COI into three AD and SDs, do not deprive of leadership role. 23rd and 28th AD should be nested together with Santa Clara, Monterey and San Benito Counties similar income, education, culture, transportation corridor.
5sclara_20110701_2	7012011	Rose Herrera, Council Member	yes	City of San Jose	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Do not cut Silver CreekEvergreen neighborhood into two CDs or split retirement communities. Move CD boundary South- residents should not be placed in S. Santa Clara County district. Northern boundary should be Ocala avenue.
5sclara_20110701_3	7012011	Dave Cortese, President	yes	Santa Clara		Santa Clara	yes	Do not divide East from Central San Jose. They are COI with shared socio economic conditions and urban character. Do not divide East San Jose into three ADs.
5slobispo_20110701_1	7012011	Milton J. Batson	no		Arroyo Grande	San Luis Obispo	yes	Keep SLO voting districts whole, so residents can have say in what happens in their own county.
5slobispo_20110701_2	7012011	Charlotte Weinberg	no				yes	Do not split San Luis Obispo up in redistricting. It would be a terrible idea

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110701_29		Santa Clarita		yes	yes		
5sbarbara_20110701_1		Lompoc, Santa Maria		no	yes		Vandenberg Airforce Base, missile launching, La Purisima Mission, wine region.
5sclara_20110701_1	Santa Clara, Monterey, San Benito	San Jose		no	yes	cultural similarities	income and poverty levels, employment needs
5sclara_20110701_2	Santa Clara	San Jose	Ocala Avenue	yes	yes		
5sclara_20110701_3		San Jose		yes	yes	Hispanic voting block, urban character, unified voice	
5slobispo_20110701_1	San Luis Obispo			no	yes		
5slobispo_20110701_2	San Luis Obispo			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110701_29			no			do not split neighborhood from community. No common interests with SFV	
5sbarbara_20110701_1			no			reconsider dissection	
5sclara_20110701_1	educational needs, transportation corridor		no				
5sclara_20110701_2	distinct neighborhods, suburban areas, schools, environment, economy, quality of life		no			should not be forced into district that extends to Newark	
5sclara_20110701_3	cohesive group of neighborhoods	maps violate spirit of VRA bby dividing East San Jose	no				
5slobispo_20110701_1	so SLO residents can have the say and control		no				
5slobispo_20110701_2			no			terrible idea	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5slobispo_20110701_3	7012011	Leslie Halls	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	San Luis Obispo county itself would be best form of representation in all situations. Little in common with Bakersfield. Has been attached with other counties many times.
5ventura_20110701_1	7012011	Andrew P. Fox, Mayor	yes	City of Thousand Oaks	Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	City of Thousand Oaks should remain whole and entirely within Ventura County. Do not divide into two districts for AD and SD. Do not push out into LA County district. Shift coastal cities at west end of County. Split between inland and coastal
5ventura_20110701_2	7012011	Linda Parks, Supervisor, 2nd district	yes	Ventura County Board of Supervisors		Ventura	yes	Keep entire Thousand Oaks united with Ventura rather than dividing into multiple districts. Splits half of city from COI. Would create confusion. Supports CAUSE, who propose not splitting Oxnard and Thousand Oaks
5ventura_20110701_3	7012011	Janice S. Parvin, Mayor	yes	City of Moorpark	Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Do not divide Ventura County. Do not put Moorpark in CD with santa Clarita, Antelope Valley and LA county. E Ventura is seperated from LA County by geography and sense of community.
6merced_20110701_1	7012011	Brandon William	no			Merced	yes	Merced does not share same social or economic interests as Santa Clara county. Redraw District 12 to comprose more of Central Valley, north or south of Merced. Urban vs. Rural issues.
8alameda_20110701_1	7012011	Jean Quand, Mayor	yes	City of Oakland	Oakland	Alameda	yes	Thank you for nesting Assembly and Senate Districts, maintaining urban cohesion in CDs, it is critical for residents accs to funding, neighborhood safety, healthcare and quality of life.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5slobispo_20110701_3	San Luis Obispo	Bakersfield		no	yes		
5ventura_20110701_1	Ventura, Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks		no	yes	master planned community	common interests, economic and social
5ventura_20110701_2	Ventura	Oxnard, Thousand Oaks		no	yes		
5ventura_20110701_3	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Simi Valley		no	yes		
6merced_20110701_1	Santa Clara, Merced			no	no		
8alameda_20110701_1	Alameda	Oakland		no	yes	quality of life	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5slobispo_20110701_3	county by itself is best form of representation		no				
5ventura_20110701_1	protect military operations, and supporting homeland security		no			Thousand Oaks is different from SFV in distance and Density	
5ventura_20110701_2	common interest		no			splitting would create confusion and would be detriment to residents	
5ventura_20110701_3	sense of community		no			separate counties	
6merced_20110701_1			no			Merceds unemployment rate is double Santa clara, rural agricultural vs. urban, different air and water quality issues	
8alameda_20110701_1	education, healthcare, transport		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110701_2	7012011	Marilyn Campbell	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Thank you for creating Hayward-Fremont-Milpitas CD. Pleased Fremont is rooted in Alameda County, respecting history and institution. Hope this will be the final map.
8alameda_20110701_3	7012011	Anjana Desai	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Thank you for creating Hayward-Fremont-Milpitas CD. Pleased Fremont is rooted in Alameda County, respecting history and institution. Hope this will be the final map.
8alameda_20110701_4	7012011	Jara Dan-Fodio	no		Newark	Alameda	yes	Thank you for creating Hayward-Fremont-Milpitas CD. Pleased Fremont is rooted in Alameda County, respecting history and institution. Hope this will be the final map.
8alameda_20110701_5	7012011	Chu	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Unfair to people in N Fremont for them to have their house price fall because the people in S Fremont Mission San Jose are stuck up . Do not split or take whole of fremont and place in Santa Clara.
8alameda_20110701_6	7012011	Sergio U. Santos, President	yes	UAW Local 2244		Alameda	yes	Thank you for creating Hayward-Fremont-Milpitas CD. Pleased Fremont is rooted in Alameda County, respecting history and institution. Hope this will be the final map.
8ccosta_20110701_1	7012011	Karen G. Stepper, Mayor	yes	Town of Danville	Danville	Contra Costa	yes	Assign Danville an odd number in district renumbering so as to retain a senate represenative and avoid the two year deferral. Avoid this with District 7
8marin_20110701_1	7012011	Sondra Wuthnow	no				yes	Keep all Marin and all of Sonoma County together. Do not include Marin and Sonoma with North Coast counties of Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte and Siskiyou. Does not consider needs of each area. Do not exclude Santa Rosa. Rural vs. suburban.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110701_2	Alameda	Hayward, Fremont, Milpitas, Union City, Newark		no	yes	history and institutions, traditionally represented as one community	
8alameda_20110701_3	Alameda	Hayward, Fremont, Milpitas, Union City, Newark		no	yes	history and institutions, traditionally represented as one community	
8alameda_20110701_4	Alameda	Hayward, Fremont, Milpitas, Union City, Newark		no	yes	history and institutions, traditionally represented as one community	
8alameda_20110701_5	Santa Clara	Fremont, San Jose		no	no		
8alameda_20110701_6	Alameda	Hayward, Fremont, Milpitas, Union City, Newark		no	yes	history and institutions, traditionally represented as one community	
8ccosta_20110701_1		Danville		no	yes		
8marin_20110701_1	Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte			no	yes		agricultural interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110701_2			no				
8alameda_20110701_3			no				
8alameda_20110701_4			no				
8alameda_20110701_5			no			if split people wanted to live in SC county, why not have gotten a house there	
8alameda_20110701_6			no				
8ccosta_20110701_1	issues and concerns of residents		no				
8marin_20110701_1	do not have affordable housing		no			interests of populations are very different	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110701_2	7012011	Wolfgang Zech	no		Kentfield	Marin	yes	Separate Marin County from San Francisco, too many political and social differences exist.
8napa_20110701_1	7012011	Morris A. Curry, Jr	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Wine industry needs American Canyon Warehouse location in proximity to highway 29 and I 80 for distribution purposes rather than for the benefit of general public and representation from congressional point of view
8sfrancisco_20110701_1	7012011	Thomas Agee	no				yes	San Francisco County only needs on Senate seat, should not be gerrymandered. Should occur under odd numbered years beginning in 2012, not 2014
8sfrancisco_20110701_2	7012011	Dennis J. Herrara	yes	City and County of San Francisco	San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Assign an Odd number to San Franciscos remaining State Senate District, so that population will not go without representation. Would be setback to LGBT community.
8sonoma_20110701_1	7012011	Will Shonbrun,	no		Boyes Hot Springs	Sonoma	yes	Current config for North Bays 6th district violates COI mandate. Traditionally composed of Marin and Sonoma. Add sections of Santa Rosa, not San Francisco. San Francisco is not North Bay
8sonoma_20110701_2	7012011	Susan Ackerberg	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not separate Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park and Sonoma from rest of Sonoma. Santa Rosa has nothing in common with Solano, Contra Costa, Sacramento, Yolo, San Joaquin. Share vineyards and daires, ocean with Sonoma and parts of Marin.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110701_2	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8napa_20110701_1	Napa	American Canyon	hwy 29 and I 80	no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110701_1	San Francisco			no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110701_2	San Francisco	San Francisco		no	yes	LGBT community needs representation	
8sonoma_20110701_1	San Francisco, Marin, Sonoma	Santa Rosa, San Francisco		no	yes	shared interest	
8sonoma_20110701_2	Sonoma, Solano, Contra Costa, Sacramento, Yolo, San Joaquin, Marin			no	yes		coastal wine country

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110701_2			no			too many political and social differences	stop being manipulated
8napa_20110701_1			no			base decision on what is fair and equitable for all communities	
8sfrancisco_20110701_1			no				Leland Yee will be term limited out of office
8sfrancisco_20110701_2	historic time		no				
8sonoma_20110701_1	contiguous		no			SF is not North Bay	
8sonoma_20110701_2	ocean, vineyards, dairies, russian river, environmental concerns		no			conservative and rural and have nothingin common	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9humboldt_20110701_1	7012011	Kay Escarda	no			Humboldt	yes	Do not put Humboldt in districts with Bay AreaMarin. Push lines to east. Resources, culture, income, transport and interests are much different.
9sacramento_20110701_1	7012011	Jay E. Hubert	yes	Coffing Oaks Welsh Ponies	Galt	Sacramento	yes	Do not include Galt with East Contra Costa County and other East Bay County on maps for Assembly and Senate. Galts citizens are more aligned with rest of S Sacramento county.
9siskiyou_20110701_1	7012011	Terry	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together, group along I-5, 101, 395, do not cross mountains and group valley with coast, lines should run north-south not east-west
9siskiyou_20110701_2	7012011	Deanna Morrison	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not divide Siskiyou into separate districts, is fiscially unwise. Does not make sense geographically, nor is it economically sound.
9siskiyou_20110701_3	7012011	Dan and Janeane Deppen	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Opposed to the change of the redistricting boundary. Makes no sense and is not practical, especially to those in Scott Valley
9siskiyou_20110701_4	7012011	Dr. David G. Webster	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not combine Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc and Lassen with coastal districts. Siskiyou, Shasta and Tehama should be together.
9siskiyou_20110701_5	7012011	Mary Tasem	no		Fort Jones	Siskiyou	yes	Do not include Siskiyou with counties along the coast. There is nothing in common, and Siskiyou should be with counties that have heavy ranching and farming.
9tehema_20110701_1	7012011	Hank Pritchard	no			Tehama	yes	Do not include Tehama County in with Coastal District

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9humboldt_20110701_1	Humboldt, Marin			no	yes	rural area	
9sacramento_20110701_1	Sacramento, Contra Costa	Galt		no	yes	small population, common interests	
9siskiyou_20110701_1	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama		I-5, 101, US 395	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110701_2	siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110701_3	Siskiyou	Scott Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110701_4	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, Modoc, Lassen			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110701_5	Siskiyou			no	no		
9tehema_20110701_1	Tehama			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9humboldt_20110701_1			no			rural v. urban, resources, culture, economic endeavors	
9sacramento_20110701_1			no				
9siskiyou_20110701_1			no			nothing in common with coastal region	Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition
9siskiyou_20110701_2			no			does not make sense fiscally or geographically	
9siskiyou_20110701_3			no			Makes no sense, is not practical	
9siskiyou_20110701_4			no			is illogical	
9siskiyou_20110701_5			no			nothing in common	
9tehema_20110701_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9trinity_20110701_1	7012011	Valerie Eisman	no		Trinity Center	Trinity	yes	Trinity County needs more of a cooperative relationship with Shasta County to maintain jail. Joining with coast for CD is only based on water, and makes no practical sense. Siskiyou county should not be split, will only heighten water wars.
9yolo_20110701_1	7012011	Betsy Lanone	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep all or most of Yolo County together. Yolo is COI and proposed divisions would dilute community interests, especially agriculture. Yolo bypass createss physical and mental barrier with Sacramento
general_20110701_1	7012011	Donna Harr	no				yes	Lines drawn east-west in North state will not work for Agricultural community. Complexity and differences weigh in heavily. Makes it difficult for Ag community to get heard.
imnmosb_20110701_1	7012011	Lorena Gonzales, Secretary-Treasurer CEO	yes	San Deigo and Imperial Counties Labor Council AFL-CIO			yes	Reconsider ISAND assembly map and senate maps ISAND AND CSAND which link areas in BACOI with parts of San Diego county that are not the same COI. COI is all Imperial County, South San Diego County, and Coachella Valley communities of Riverside County.
imnmosb_20110701_2	7012011	Jim Bagley	no		Twentynine Palms	San Bernardino	yes	Please submit my comment map
ulv_20110701_1	7012011		no				no	attached map
ulv_20110701_2	7012011		no				no	attached map

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9trinity_20110701_1	Trinity, Shasta, Siskiyou			no	yes		maintain its jail, small county
9yolo_20110701_1	Yolo, Sacramento		yolo bypass	no	yes	shopping, word of mouth	preservation of agriculture, university
general_20110701_1				no	yes		agriculture, ranching, farming, tough economy
imnmosb_20110701_1	San Diego, Imperial, Riverside			no	yes	Lower income, Latino families,	per capita income
imnmosb_20110701_2	San Bernardino			no	no		
ulv_20110701_1				no	no		
ulv_20110701_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9trinity_20110701_1			no			makes no sense to join with coast	
9yolo_20110701_1			no				
general_20110701_1			no				
imnmosb_20110701_1	large households, speak language other than english, children population		no				BOCOI
imnmosb_20110701_2			no				map attached
ulv_20110701_1			no				attached map
ulv_20110701_2			no				attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110630_1	6302011	Beverly J Hadley	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City one SD and nest Thousant Oaks Santa Monica Mountains and West Side Santa Monica Districts into SD. COI for 20 years, commute over the mountains for schools, shopping, parks.
4langeles_20110630_2	6302011	Fae Hoffman	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City one SD and nest Thousant Oaks Santa Monica Mountains and West Side Santa Monica Districts into SD. COI for 20 years, commute over the mountains for schools, shopping, parks.
4langeles_20110630_3	6302011	Kathy Cuevas	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City one SD and nest Thousant Oaks Santa Monica Mountains and West Side Santa Monica Districts into SD. COI for 20 years, commute over the mountains for schools, shopping, parks.
4langeles_20110630_4	6302011	Don and Ella Carol Pierce	no		Juniper Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Put all of Juniper Hills into same SD. Not SD 17 but 29. Senator represents south of Gardena.
4langeles_20110630_5	6302011	Dubin	no				yes	Do not split Topanga into two different districts. Violates critera 4 and 5 to respect COIs and be compact.
4langeles_20110630_6	6302011	Sandra Balaram	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Santa Clarita Valley into separate districts. Insular community, rarely visits San Fernando Valley. Newhall should be kept with Santa Clarita to give Hispanic voice in their community.
4langeles_20110628_177	6282011	Mike Bonin	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina del Rey with the Ballona wetlands

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110630_1	Los Angeles	Studio City, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica	101, 405	no	yes	shopping, parks, religious and cultural institutions,	
4langeles_20110630_2	Los Angeles	Studio City, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica	101, 405	no	yes	shopping, parks, religious and cultural institutions,	
4langeles_20110630_3	Los Angeles	Studio City, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica	101, 405	no	yes	shopping, parks, religious and cultural institutions,	
4langeles_20110630_4		Gardena, Juniper Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110630_5		Topanga		no	yes		
4langeles_20110630_6		Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley, Newhall	freeway	no	yes	hispanic population needs to bbe heard where they live	
4langeles_20110628_177	Los Angeles	Venice		no	yes	Water quality concerns	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110630_1	schools, education, highways, environmental priorities		no				
4langeles_20110630_2	schools, education, highways, environmental priorities		no				
4langeles_20110630_3	schools, education, highways, environmental priorities		no				
4langeles_20110630_4			no				Website notes districts incorrectly
4langeles_20110630_5			no				
4langeles_20110630_6	insular community		no			nothing in common with San Fernando Valley, different schools, water	
4langeles_20110628_177	Hyperion Wastewater Treatment Plant affects water quality throughout the region		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_178	6282011	Mark Cantor	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_179	6282011	Elaine Chalfin	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_180	6282011	Gary Borovay	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_181	6282011	Donald Zimring	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_182	6282011	Connie Hyman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_178	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_179	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_180	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_181	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_182	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_178			no				
4langeles_20110628_179			no				
4langeles_20110628_180			no				
4langeles_20110628_181			no				
4langeles_20110628_182			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_183	6282011	David Reizman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_184	6282011	Brian Weinberger	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_185	6282011	Blake Heller	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_186	6282011	Arie Paller	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_187	6282011	Alx Lovi	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_183	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_184	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_185	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_186	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_187	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_183			no				
4langeles_20110628_184			no				
4langeles_20110628_185			no				
4langeles_20110628_186			no				
4langeles_20110628_187			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_188	6282011	Joan Beal	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_189	6282011	John Lemay	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_190	6282011	Gary Barancik	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_191	6282011	Esther Melshenker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_192	6282011	Albert Melshenker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_188	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_189	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_190	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_191	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_192	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_188			no				
4langeles_20110628_189			no				
4langeles_20110628_190			no				
4langeles_20110628_191			no				
4langeles_20110628_192			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_193	6282011	Marla Landis	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_194	6282011	Cathy Oldaker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_195	6282011	Steve Oldaker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_196	6282011	Ashley Berman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_197	6282011	Judie Litzer	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_193	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_194	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_195	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_196	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_197	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_193			no				
4langeles_20110628_194			no				
4langeles_20110628_195			no				
4langeles_20110628_196			no				
4langeles_20110628_197			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_198	6282011	Luisa Barancik	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_199	6282011	Brenda Barton-Lemay	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_200	6282011	Barbara Cantor	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_201	6282011	James Bukowski	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_202	6282011	Melanie Litzer	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_198	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_199	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_200	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_201	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_202	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_198			no				
4langeles_20110628_199			no				
4langeles_20110628_200			no				
4langeles_20110628_201			no				
4langeles_20110628_202			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_203	6282011	Jeff Beal	no			Los Angeles	yes	Use the Valley Redistricting Coalition map; Add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village to West San Fernando Valley; Dont split Eureka, dont split Reseda. Use VICA maps and add Agoura Hills and Westlake Village into WSFV CD.
4langeles_20110628_204	6282011	Jack Lindblad, Marlon Stern	yes	Green of the East Fernando Valley		Los Angeles	yes	Include Tujunga Watershed to the East San Fernando valley (see maps)
4langeles_20110628_205	6282011	Joe Huey	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Los Angeles Chinatown united
4langeles_20110628_206	6282011		no			Los Angeles	yes	See comment for maps
4langeles_20110628_207	6282011	April Halprin Wayland	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina de Rey and Ballona wetlands united
4langeles_20110628_208	6282011	Collin Lai	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Los Angeles Chinatown whole, maintain district lines of East San Gabriel Valley Diamond Bar and West San Gabriel Valley, Palos Verdes Estates; expand east the lines of West San Gabriel to resemble those of East San Gabriel Valley Diamond Bar
4langeles_20110628_209	6282011	Maat Hotep	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110628_210	6282011	Cheng-Sim Lim	no		Los Feliz	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hollywood, Los Feliz, Silverlake, Echo Park, Atwater and Eagle Rock with mid-city and downtown Los Angeles

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_203	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino		no	yes	Common school district	
4langeles_20110628_204	Los Angeles			no	yes	Water resources, watershed use	
4langeles_20110628_205	Los Angeles			no	yes	Cultural interests	
4langeles_20110628_206	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110628_207	Los Angeles	Manhattan Beach		no	yes	Water quality concerns	
4langeles_20110628_208	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Diamond Bar, Chino Hills, Walnut, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_209	Los Angeles	Gardena		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_210	Los Angeles	Hollywood, Silverlake, Los Feliz, Vernon, Maywood, Huntington Park, Commerce, Echo Park, Eagle Rock, Atwater		no	yes	Recreation, rest	Tourism, business

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_203			no				
4langeles_20110628_204			no				
4langeles_20110628_205			no				
4langeles_20110628_206			no				
4langeles_20110628_207			no				
4langeles_20110628_208			no				
4langeles_20110628_209			no			The COBPO letter refers CD 33, was meant to refer to CD 35	
4langeles_20110628_210			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_211	6282011	Louise Lubetkin	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district (see map in comment)
4langeles_20110628_212	6282011	Gary Lasky	no		Fresno	Los Angeles	yes	Include Lake Tahoe and areas northeast of Sacramento and exclude urban Fresno from Foothill Senate district (see map in comment)
4langeles_20110628_213	6282011	Gabriel	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	(See comment for map)
4langeles_20110628_214	6282011	Vanessa Wiarco	no		Chino	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Chino, Montclair, Ontario, Pomona together
4langeles_20110628_215	6282011	Martha Scott Fritz	yes	Calabasas Public Safety Commissioner	Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Calabasas with Malibu, Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village together
4langeles_20110628_216	6282011	Oscar Dominguez	yes	president, Salvadoran Business Corridor	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pico Union, Westlake, South Los Angeles together
4langeles_20110628_217	6282011	Oscar Guzman	yes	Executive Director, Hispanic United Brotherhood USA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pico Union, Westlake and South Los Angeles together
4langeles_20110628_218	6282011	Ahmed Saafir	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Carson, Compton, Long Beach together
4langeles_20110628_219	6282011	Diana Lejins	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach united
4langeles_20110628_220	6282011	Josh Lowenthal	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Long Beach united

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_211	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	Transportation, Environmental preservation,	Water use, similar income
4langeles_20110628_212	Los Angeles, Fresno, Merced, Madera, Kings, Kern	Lake Tahoe, Fresno		no	yes	Cultural unity	
4langeles_20110628_213	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	yes	Cultural unity, school districts	Economic interests
4langeles_20110628_214	Los Angeles	Chino, Montclair, Ontario, Pomona	Highways I10, I15, SR 60, SR 71	no	yes	Cultural unity for Latinos; transportation, geography	
4langeles_20110628_215	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Santa Monica, Calabasas, Malibu, Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village	Highway 101	no	yes	Political, educational, environmental concerns	Economic concerns
4langeles_20110628_216	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	Latino cultural unity,	Business interests
4langeles_20110628_217	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Pico Union, Westlake		no	yes	Historical, cultural unity	Economic interests
4langeles_20110628_218	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Compton		no	yes	Cultural unity	
4langeles_20110628_219	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_220	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_211			no				
4langeles_20110628_212			no				
4langeles_20110628_213			no				
4langeles_20110628_214			no				
4langeles_20110628_215			no				
4langeles_20110628_216			no				
4langeles_20110628_217			no				
4langeles_20110628_218		Adhere to the VRA	no				
4langeles_20110628_219			no				
4langeles_20110628_220			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_221	6282011	Laura Santos	no		Bassett	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110628_222	6282011	Carol Newton	yes	Neighbors for Change	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	(See map in comments)
4langeles_20110628_223	6282011	Peter Jurik	no		San Fernando	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley with Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village not Universial City or Beverly Hills
4langeles_20110628_224	6282011	Armando Gomez	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West Valley with Agoura Hills and Westlake Village
4langeles_20110628_225	6282011	Melissa Gomez	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Agoura Hills and Westlake Village in East Ventura County
4langeles_20110628_226	6282011	Lewis Pu	no		San Fernando	Los Angeles	no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_221	Los Angeles	Bassett		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_222	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, West Hollywood, Los Feliz, Silverlake, Echo Park, City Terrace, South Pasadena, Vernon, Maywood, Huntington Park, Commerce		no	yes		
4langeles_20110628_223	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Beverly Hills, Universal City	101 Corridor	no	yes	Government programs	Aerospace industry
4langeles_20110628_224	Los Angeles	West Valley, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Burbank, Universal City	101 Freeway	no	yes		High-tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_225	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Encino	101 Freeway	no	yes	Educational facilities	
4langeles_20110628_226	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley, Westlake Village, Woodland Hills, Chatsworth, Canoga Park, Granada Hills, Northridge	101 Freeway	no	yes		High-tech industries

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_221			no			Problem stated in previous email was regarding Assembly map, not Congressional map	
4langeles_20110628_222			no				
4langeles_20110628_223			no				
4langeles_20110628_224			no				
4langeles_20110628_225			no				
4langeles_20110628_226			no			Elect member of Congress who will fight for R D tax credit	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_227	6282011	M. Armando Guerra	no		San Fernando	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Northridge, Granada Hills, Chatworth, Woodland Hills together with Calabasas, Agoura Hills, and Westlake Village and remove Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City
4langeles_20110628_228	6282011	Al Sokhanvari	no		San Fernando	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Granada Hills with Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas and Agoura Hills
4langeles_20110628_229	6282011	Belen Anda	no		San Fernando	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Granada Hills with Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills and Westlake Village
4langeles_20110628_230	6282011	Dane Carr	no		San Fernando	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando Valley with the 101 Corridor, take out Sherman Oaks and Studio City
4langeles_20110628_231	6282011	Richard Bloom	yes	Mayor, City of Santa Monica	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Include Santa Monica in West Los Angeles Downtown district
4langeles_20110628_232	6282011	Mary Ann Rush	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando with Agoura Hills and Westlake Village and not with Beverly Hills and Universal City
4langeles_20110628_233	6282011	Michael Ayres	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westlake and Agoura Hills together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_227	Los Angeles	Northridge, Granada Hills, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City	101 Freeway	no	no		Aerospace and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_228	Los Angeles	San Fernando, Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills		no	yes		Technology industry
4langeles_20110628_229	Los Angeles	Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes		Aerospace and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_230	Los Angeles	Sherman Oaks, Studio City, San Fernando, Chatsworth, Canoga Park, Agoura Hills, Woodland Hills		no	yes		Aerospace and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_231	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Los Angeles		no	yes	Urban environment	Economic interests
4langeles_20110628_232	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, West Valley, Westlake Village, Beverly Hills, Universal City, Sherman Oaks, Studio City		no	yes		High tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_233	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills		no	yes		High tech and defense industries

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_227			no				
4langeles_20110628_228			no			Elect member of Congress who will fight for R D tax credit	
4langeles_20110628_229			no			Elect member of Congress who will fight for R D tax credit	
4langeles_20110628_230			no			Elect member of Congress who will fight for R D tax credit	
4langeles_20110628_231			no				
4langeles_20110628_232			no				
4langeles_20110628_233			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_234	6282011	Matt Rush	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando with Agoura Hills and Westlake Village and not with Beverly Hills and Universal City
4langeles_20110628_235	6282011	Jeffrey Rush	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep West San Fernando with Agoura Hills and Westlake Village and not with Beverly Hills and Universal City
4langeles_20110628_236	6282011	Dina Pasternak	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westlake Village with Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Northride and Granada Hills; remove Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City, Beverly Hills
4langeles_20110628_237	6282011	Lin Liao	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Canoga Park, and Woodland Hills with Calabasas, Agoura Hills, and Westlake Village
4langeles_20110628_238	6282011	Hirong Liang	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westlake Village with Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Northride and Granada Hills; remove Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City, Beverly Hills
4langeles_20110628_239	6282011	Rebecca Catterall	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountains with Thousand Oaks, Malibu and Topanga

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_234	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, West Valley, Westlake Village, Beverly Hills, Universal City, Sherman Oaks, Studio City		no	yes		High tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_235	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, West Valley, Westlake Village, Beverly Hills, Universal City, Sherman Oaks, Studio City		no	yes		High tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_236	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Northride, Granada Hills, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City, Beverly Hills		no	yes		High tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_237	Los Angeles	Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, Canoga Park, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes		High tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_238	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Northride, Granada Hills, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Universal City, Beverly Hills		no	yes		High tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_239	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Malibu, Topanga, Santa Clarita	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	Water use, environmental policy	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_234			no				
4langeles_20110628_235			no				
4langeles_20110628_236			no				
4langeles_20110628_237			no				
4langeles_20110628_238			no				
4langeles_20110628_239			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_240	6282011	Frederick Edworthy	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westlake Village with Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Northride and Granada Hills together
4langeles_20110628_241	6282011	Ron and Deanna Perata	no			Los Angeles	yes	San Fernando valley should be separated from mid-valley
4langeles_20110628_242	6282011	Laurie Ekstein	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Brentwood together
4langeles_20110628_243	6282011	Tanii Carr	no		Sun Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Kagel Canyon with Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank
4langeles_20110628_244	6282011	Vickie Trujillo	no		Downey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Downey united
4langeles_20110628_245	6282011	Terry Halberg	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Pasadena united with other San Gabriel Cities
4langeles_20110628_246	6282011	Carlo Basail	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita united with San Fernando Valley and Agua Dulce
4langeles_20110628_247	6282011	Douglas Epperhart	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pedro united
4langeles_20110628_248	6282011	Lyn Goldfarb	no		Los Feliz	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Los Feliz, Hollywood, Silverlake, Echo Park, Atwater, Eagle Rock together
4langeles_20110628_249	6282011	Mark Haskin	no		Marina Del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey together
4langeles_20110628_250	6282011	Sherwood Lee	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep LA Chinatown in a single assembly district
4langeles_20110628_251	6282011	Tom Buckles	no		Chino Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Chino Hills in one congressional district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_240	Los Angeles	Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Northride, Granada Hills		no	yes		High tech and defense industries
4langeles_20110628_241	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110628_242	Los Angeles	Brentwood		no	yes	Geography	
4langeles_20110628_243	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	Income, Education, Housing, Transportation, environment, water use, entertainment, college	jobs
4langeles_20110628_244	Los Angeles	Downey		no	yes	Geographic unity	
4langeles_20110628_245	Los Angeles	Pasadena		no	yes	Environmental and public safety issues, water use, education	
4langeles_20110628_246	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	yes	Water use, public facilites, educational system, transportation	
4langeles_20110628_247	Los Angeles	San Pedro		no	yes	History	
4langeles_20110628_248	Los Angeles	Los Feliz, Hollywood, Silverlake, Echo Park, Atwater, Eagle Rock		no	yes	Cultural unity, community	
4langeles_20110628_249	Los Angeles	Marina Del Rey		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_250	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	Cultural unity	
4langeles_20110628_251	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	Cultural, demographic similarity, public facilities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_240			no				
4langeles_20110628_241			no				
4langeles_20110628_242			no				
4langeles_20110628_243			no				
4langeles_20110628_244			no				
4langeles_20110628_245			no				
4langeles_20110628_246			no				
4langeles_20110628_247			no				
4langeles_20110628_248			no				
4langeles_20110628_249			no				
4langeles_20110628_250			no				
4langeles_20110628_251			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110628_252	6282011	Patrick Lew	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep LA Chinatown in one AD
4langeles_20110628_253	6282011	Diana Nave	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pedro in one AD. San Pedro is part of LA and has more in common with Wilmington, Harbor City, Torrance, Carson. Not Palos Valerdes. LA port should be with San Pedro.
4langeles_20110628_254	6282011	Bill Wong	yes	Executive Director, Asian America Education Institute		Los Angeles	yes	(See comment for maps)
4langeles_20110628_255	6282011	Erich Warkentine	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Include Bixby Knolls with Atlantic Avenue
4langeles_20110628_256	6282011	Karen Cooper	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena and Altadena together in CD, AD and SD
4langeles_20110628_257	6282011	Linda Alexander	yes	Alexander Consulting Services	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Pedro united with Wilmington and Harbor City
4langeles_20110628_258	6282011	Sue Vereb	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City in one SD, with Beverly Hills, Hidden Hills, Sherman Oaks, Westwood, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades, Malibu, Hollywood, Encino, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Calabasas and Agoura Hills together
4langeles_20110628_259	6282011	Tom Kenny	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Studio City whole
4langeles_20110628_260	6282011		no			Los Angeles	yes	(See comment for map)
4langeles_20110628_261	6282011		yes	Women involved in South Pasadena Political Action	South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Pasadena and Pasadena in the same SD and AD
7scruz_20110706_65	7062011	Andrea Mangini	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110706_68	7062011	Danny Keith	yes	Second Harvest Food Bank Santa Cruz County		Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two congressional districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110628_252	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	Cultural unity	
4langeles_20110628_253	Los Angeles	San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City		no	yes	Education, community	
4langeles_20110628_254	Los Angeles	San Pedro, Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Palos Verdes, Gardena, Carson		no	yes	Cultural unity	
4langeles_20110628_255	Los Angeles	Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_256	Los Angeles	South Pasadena		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_257	Los Angeles	San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City		no	yes	Racial and ethnic diversity	
4langeles_20110628_258	Los Angeles	Studio City, Beverly Hills, Hidden Hills, Sherman Oaks, Westwood, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades, Malibu, Hollywood, Encino, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills		no	yes	Shopping, education, environmental concerns	Work
4langeles_20110628_259	Los Angeles	Studio City		no	no		
4langeles_20110628_260	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110628_261	Los Angeles	South Pasadena		no	yes	Similar demographics	
7scruz_20110706_65	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_68	Santa Cruz			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110628_252			no				
4langeles_20110628_253			no				
4langeles_20110628_254			no				
4langeles_20110628_255			no				
4langeles_20110628_256			no				
4langeles_20110628_257			no				
4langeles_20110628_258			no				
4langeles_20110628_259			no				
4langeles_20110628_260			no				
4langeles_20110628_261			no				
7scruz_20110706_65	Split would make Santa Cruz voice weak.		no				
7scruz_20110706_68	Split would affect ability to receive funding for social services.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110706_1	7062011	Isidoor Bornstein	no				yes	Do not include Marin C. with parts of San Francisco.Different interests.Marin is agricultural.
8napa_20110706_1	7062011	Sandra L. Rombough	yes	GSMOL			yes	Keep American Canyon with Napa County in Assembly,Senate,Congressional districts.It is not North Vallejo
9amador_20110706_1	7062011	Susan Irwin	no				yes	Support lines that incorporate Amador,Calaveras,Tuolumne Counties in same districts.
9amador_20110706_2	7062011	Susan Irwin	no				yes	Better represented together.Support lines that incorporate Amador,Calaveras,Tuolumne Counties in same districts.
9humboldt_20110706_1	7062011	Mark Lovelace	yes	Humboldt County Board of Supervisors			yes	Keep Humboldt with Coastal COI.Area needs two voices in Assembly,etc.Keep NapaE.Sonoma in same district for wine purposes.Do not join North Counties with MarinS. Sonoma,because of Urban Vs Rural issues.Do not divide Siskiyou C.
9shasta_20110706_1	7062011	Dennis Mihalka	no				yes	Coastal regions and Shasta C are very different.Shasta will be overwhelmed and have no voice.At least keep Shasta with Sacramento Valley,more common interests.
9shasta_20110706_2	7062011	Linda Finkel	no			Shasta	yes	Do not group Shasta County with Coastal City districts.Very little in common with coast.Much more in common with I 5Hwy 99 corridor neighbors.
9shasta_20110706_3	7062011	Pam Giacomini	no			Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta as Valley or Mountain Region.Not with Coastal region.
9shasta_20110706_4	7062011	Carolyn Keogh	no			Shasta	yes	Support NORCO senate Visualization.Shasta should be with Coastal Community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110706_1	Marin,San Francisco	San Francisco		no	no		
8napa_20110706_1	Napa			no	no		
9amador_20110706_1	Amador,Calaveras,Tuolumne			no	yes		
9amador_20110706_2	Amador,Calaveras,Tuolumne			no	yes		
9humboldt_20110706_1	Siskiyou,Marin,Humboldt,Sonoma,Napa			no	yes	Wine concerns,Water issues	
9shasta_20110706_1	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_2	Shasta			no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_3	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_4	Shasta			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110706_1			no				
8napa_20110706_1			no				
9amador_20110706_1	Face similar issues and better represented together.		no				
9amador_20110706_2	Face similar issues and better represented together.		no				
9humboldt_20110706_1	Urban Vs Rural issues need to be seperated.		no				
9shasta_20110706_1			no				
9shasta_20110706_2	Social, economic and transportation relationships.		no				
9shasta_20110706_3			no				
9shasta_20110706_4	Break stranglehold of republican voting in Shasta.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110706_5	7062011	Patricia Garcia	no			Shasta	yes	Redistricting of Shasta will make it harder to get funding and meet needs.Shasta is agricultural and has separate needs.
9shasta_20110706_7	7062011	Eric Lewis	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not place Shasta with the Coastal Region.Keep Shasta with Tehama County and other similar areas to north and south.
9shasta_20110706_8	7062011	Angelo Andreini III	no			Shasta	yes	Do not group Shasta with Coastal Regions. Nothing in common.
9shasta_20110706_9	7062011	Linda G. White	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta I 5 Corridor Community with the Coast.Nothing in Common.
9shasta_20110706_10	7062011	Nancy Foreit	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta I 5 Corridor Community with the Coast.Nothing in Common.
9shasta_20110706_11	7062011	JB Rose	no			Shasta	yes	Do not place Shasta County with the Coast. Nothing in common.
9shasta_20110706_12	7062011	Ross Jones	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta I 5 Corridor Community with the Coast.Nothing in Common.
9shasta_20110706_13	7062011	Claudia G. Ingeman	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta North inland valleys have nothing in common with Coastal areas.
9shasta_20110706_14	7062011	Linda La Franchise	no				yes	Redding is part of the I 5 corridor and should be included with the coast.
9shasta_20110706_15	7062011	Zoe C Hays	no			Shasta	yes	Do not group Shasta with Coastal regions.Keep with I 5 corridor
9shasta_20110706_16	7062011	Mark Kent	no			Shasta	yes	Do not merge Shasta with Coast. Shasta is part of I 5 COI, nothing in common with the coast.
9shasta_20110706_17	7062011	Gerald Lasserre	no			Shasta	yes	Do not merge Shasta with the coast. Nothing in common.
9shasta_20110706_18	7062011	Thomas A Vodak	no			Shasta	yes	Do not merge Shasta with the coast. Nothing in common.
9shasta_20110706_19	7062011	John Zukowski	no			Shasta	yes	Leave Shasta in the I 5 area.Not with the coast.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110706_5	Shasta			no	yes	Needs,Agricultural County,mental health concerns,help for the low income	
9shasta_20110706_7	Shasta,Tehama			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_8	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_9	Shasta		I 5 corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110706_10	Shasta			no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_11	Shasta			no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_12	Shasta		I 5 corridor	no	yes	farm community	
9shasta_20110706_13	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_14	Shasta	Redding	I 5 corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110706_15	Shasta		I 5 corridor	no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_16	Shasta		I 5 corridor	no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_17	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_18	Shasta			no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_19	Shasta		I 5 corridor	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110706_5	Split will make it harder to get funding for Shasta.		no				
9shasta_20110706_7			no				
9shasta_20110706_8			no				
9shasta_20110706_9			no				
9shasta_20110706_10	If split Shasta will not be represented fairly.		no				
9shasta_20110706_11	If split Shasta will not be represented fairly.		no				
9shasta_20110706_12			no				
9shasta_20110706_13			no				
9shasta_20110706_14			no				
9shasta_20110706_15	Different interests from coast		no				
9shasta_20110706_16	representation will be diminished if combined with coast.		no				
9shasta_20110706_17			no				
9shasta_20110706_18	Split would put Shasta in representation disadvantage.		no				
9shasta_20110706_19			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110706_20	7062011	Jerald W McDaniel	no			Shasta	yes	Do not Group Shasta with Coastal region.
9shasta_20110706_21	7062011	Rocky F Venti	no				yes	Siskiyou,Modoc and Lassen Counties have much more in common with Shasta than the coastal regions.Keep Shasta with I 5 corridor regions.
9shasta_20110706_22	7072011	Ronald Nevins	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta with the Coast. Nothing in common
9shasta_20110706_23	7072011	Kayla Brown	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not redistrict Shasta with the Coast.
9shasta_20110706_24	7072011	Denise Young	no				yes	Do not redistrict Shasta with the coast.
9shasta_20110706_25	7072011	Mercedes Brady	no				yes	Do not redistrict Shasta with the Coastal community.Shasta is a part of I 5 corridor.
9shasta_20110706_26	7072011	Susan Carol Christian	no			Shasta	yes	Do not redistrict Shasta with the Coastal community.Shasta is a part of I 5 corridor.
9shasta_20110706_27	7072011	Wickie Smith	no			Shasta	yes	Do not redistrict Shasta with the Coastal community.Shasta is a part of I 5 corridor.Shasta is a Rural area with common interests with Siskiyou County and other rural areas.
9shasta_20110706_28	7072011	Dorothy I Knight	no			Shasta	yes	Do not redistrict Shasta with the coastal community.
9shasta_20110706_29	7072011	Suzanna Ticket	no			Shasta	yes	Do not redistrict Shasta County with the coastal counties. Instead,group it with neighbors to the south, Tehema,Butte,Sutter.
9shasta_20110706_30	7072011	Vincent Neidlinger	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not redistrict all of northern CA together into one section.Do not put Shasta with coastal cities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110706_20	Shasta			no	yes	Geography,demographics, Agricultural,industrial growth,recreational usess.	
9shasta_20110706_21	Shasta,Siskiyou,Modoc,Lassen		I 5 corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110706_22	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_23	Shasta			no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_24	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_25	Shasta		I 5 corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110706_26	Shasta		I 5 corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110706_27	Shasta, Siskiyou		I 5 corridor	no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_28	Shasta			no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_29	Shasta,Tehama,Butte,Sutter			no	yes		
9shasta_20110706_30	Shasta			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110706_20	Issues will not be met if combined with Coast.		no				
9shasta_20110706_21			no				
9shasta_20110706_22			no				
9shasta_20110706_23	Shasta with the coast would disenfranchise Shasta.		no				
9shasta_20110706_24			no				
9shasta_20110706_25			no				
9shasta_20110706_26			no				
9shasta_20110706_27	Keep Rural community together.		no				
9shasta_20110706_28	being with coast would make it hard to represent Shasta		no				
9shasta_20110706_29	Similar geographic,environmental and populase base.		no				
9shasta_20110706_30			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110706_31	7072011	E.A. Haslam	no		Shingleton	Shasta	yes	Do not place Shasta in a new North coasta voting district.Shasta has nothing in common with coastal communities.Keep it with the I 5 corridor,not the 101.
9shasta_20110706_32	7072011	George R. Clarke	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not place Shasta with counites along the coast.
9siskiyou_20110706_1	7072011	Dan Dorsey	no			Siskiyou	no	
9siskiyou_20110706_2	7072011	Anthony Intiso	no			Siskiyou	yes	There is a mountain range seperating Siskiyou from the coast.Cascade Range.
9sjoaquin_20110706_1	7072011	Rose Benjeinin	no		Stockton	San Joaquin	yes	Stockton should not be in district going from Merced to Fresno counties.San Joaquin county should be in a CD of its own.County should have SD,AD, but not more than two such districts within the county.
9sjoaquin_20110706_2	7072011	Illegible	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Do not put Lodi in Senate or assembly district with Yolo,Napa,Marin, Solano counties.Keep Lodi with San Joaquin.
9tehema_20110706_1	7062011	Carroll Borland	no		Cottonwood	Tehama	yes	Do not put ShastaTehama County in a district with the coast. Keep it with the I 5 corridor.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110706_31	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_32	Shasta			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110706_1				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110706_2	Siskiyou		Cascade Range	no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110706_1	San Joaquin,Fresno,Merced	Stockton		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110706_2	San Joaquin,Yolo,Napa,Marin,Solano	Lodi		no	yes		
9tehema_20110706_1	Shasta,Tehama			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110706_31			no				
9shasta_20110706_32			no				
9siskiyou_20110706_1			no		The comission does not care. Listen to the counties. Listen to us in northern California.		
9siskiyou_20110706_2			no				Redistricting plan is violating the constitution.Article 21, section 1(e). Geographical integrity of any city or county must be respected.
9sjoaquin_20110706_1	preserve city and county boundaries and give residents effective political voice.		no				
9sjoaquin_20110706_2	to give Lodi equal representation in congress.		no				
9tehema_20110706_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9tehema_20110706_2	7072011	Dale and Glynn Ann Fry	no		Red Bluff	Tehama	yes	Red Bluff is part of I 5 corridor.It has nothing in common with the coast. Keep Red Bluff with I 5 corridor.
9yolo_20110706_1	7072011	Betsy LaNone	no			Yolo	yes	Please keep Yolo together, and not grouped with Sacramento County.
general_20110706_1	7052011	Alice A. Huffman	yes	California NAACP			yes	
general_20110706_2	7072011	Kathy Lakey	no		Hat Creek	Shasta	yes	Do not include coastal areas in new Shasta area.Include areas above Sacramento to Yreka ,not coastal areas.
general_20110706_3	7072011	Jim Wright	no			San Jose	no	
supporterssmonicamountain_20110706_1	7062011	Linda Eberle	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Disapprove maps for Senate,CD,districts for Santa Monica Mountains region.West Hills,Hidden Hills,Calabasas,Agoura Hills,Westlake Village,Malibu are all deeply connected.They are a COI together.Do not split this COI apart.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9tehema_20110706_2	Shasta,Tehama			no	no		
9yolo_20110706_1	Yolo,Sacramento	Davis		no	yes	Agricultural,mountain land barrier,	
general_20110706_1				no	no		
general_20110706_2	Shasta	Sacramento,Yreka		no	no		
general_20110706_3				no	no		
supporterssmonicamountain_20110706_1	Los Angeles	West Hills,Hidden Hills,Calabasas,Agoura Hills,Westlake Hills,Westlake Village,Malibu,Venice		no	yes	collaborated governments,disaster management,fire protection,law enforcement,schools,watersewer services	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9tehema_20110706_2			no				
9yolo_20110706_1			no				
general_20110706_1			no				Format for public input during meetings was insufficient.did not allow time for everyone to speak,and organizations representing people were not given enough time.Comission limited the publics input.Consider allowing organizational head more time to speak
general_20110706_2			no				
general_20110706_3			no				Do not hurry voting process for second or final release maps because of follow on scheduled events like news conferences.take all the time you need.
supporterssmonicamountain_20110706_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_66	7062011	Matt Farell	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_67	7062011	Emily Bernard	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two separate districts.
9shasta_20110706_6	7062011	Sharon W. Rogers	no			Shasta	yes	Do not make Shasta a part of a coastal region.Shasta should stay with I 5 Region.Coastal and Shasta are very different.Split would make funding hard to get.
9shasta_20110706_33	7072011	Linda G. White	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not group Shasta with coastal districts. Shasta is a part of the I 5 corridor.
9shasta_20110706_34	7072011	Rocky F. Venti	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Shasta should be grouped with Lassen,Siskiyou,Modoc counties instead of the coastal districts.Keep Shasta in the I 5 corridor.
4langeles_20110706_3	7062011	Jill Thraves	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City.It has no commonalities with North LASCV or LADNT areas.COI with cities along 101Fwy,Northsouth of Santa Monica Mountains.
4langeles_20110706_3a	7062011	Martin Enriquez	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Resubmission.Do not split Pasadena.View census data.keep PasadenaAltadena together.Attached Letter from Martin,Mayor of El Monte
4langeles_20110706_4	7062011	Anonymous	yes	Natural Resources Defense Council			yes	WestSide Santa Monica AD should include more of Santa Monica Mountains,La Virgenes Canyons,exclude Marina Del Rayareas south of Washington Blvd.Marina Del Rey belongs with Palos Verdes E.Beach Cities district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_66	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_67	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
9shasta_20110706_6	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_33	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110706_34	Shasta,Lassen,Siskiyou,Modoc		I 5	no	no		
4langeles_20110706_3	Los Angeles	Calabasas,Agoura,Thousand Oaks,Beverly Hills,Malibu	101 Fwy,Santa Monic Mountains	yes	yes	Shared transportation,schools,shopping,education,religiouscultural institutions,	
4langeles_20110706_3a	Los Angeles	Pasadena,Altadena		yes	yes	Schoolcommunity college districts,Voter polarization,	
4langeles_20110706_4	Los Angeles	Marina Del Rey,Santa Monica,Ballona CreekWetlands,Playa Vista, Playa Del Rey	Las Virgenes Canyons,Santa Monica Mountains,Washington Blvd.	yes	yes	Ecologicalhydrological features,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_66	Need to be represented by one entity.		no				
7scruz_20110706_67			no				
9shasta_20110706_6			no				
9shasta_20110706_33			no				
9shasta_20110706_34			no				
4langeles_20110706_3			no				
4langeles_20110706_3a	Keep latino, minorty groups together.They are high in population in these regions and need to be represented together.		no				
4langeles_20110706_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_4a	7062011	Susan D Amico	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Tujunga with San Fernando Valley.Tujunga should be with La Cresenta and La Canada.
4langeles_20110706_5	7062011	Sual Halpert	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Leave Studio City as one senate district with two assembly districts within its boundaries.
4langeles_20110706_5a	7062011	Patricia Milham Jr.	no				yes	Maintain integrity of San Fernando Valley as a voting entity,connected by 405 Freeway to Calabasas and Woodland Hills
4langeles_20110706_6	7062011	Nancy Traina	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City one senate district,nest pThousand Oaks,Santa Monica Mountains,West side Santa Monica assembly distircts into the senate district.
4langeles_20110706_6a	7062011	David Nelson	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Torrance should be with Redondo Beach and Palos Verdes rather than with area south of Compton district.Put Torrance in yellow(36th?) district and extend Compton dist. South

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_4a	Los Angeles	Tujunga,La Crescenta,La Canada		no	yes		
4langeles_20110706_5	Los Angeles	Studio City		no	no		
4langeles_20110706_5a	Los Angeles	Calabasas,Woodland Hills	405 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110706_6	Los Angeles	Malibu,Pacific Palisades,Brentwood,Westwood,Agoura Hills,Hidden Hills,Calabasas,Woodland Hills,Tarzana,Encino,Sherman Oaks,Studio City,Santa Clarita, Castaic,Gorman.	Ventura Blvd,101 Freeway	yes	yes	School,work,shopping,education,parks,religious and cultural institutions.	
4langeles_20110706_6a	Los Angeles	Torrance,Redondo Beach,Compton		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_4a	Foothill community		no				
4langeles_20110706_5			no				
4langeles_20110706_5a			no				
4langeles_20110706_6			no				
4langeles_20110706_6a	More in common visually		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_7	7062011	Caroline and Bernard Futoran	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City one senate district,nest pThousand Oaks,Santa Monica Mountains,West side Santa Monica assembly distircts into the senate district.
4langeles_20110706_8	7062011	Beverly Hadley	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City one senate district,nest pThousand Oaks,Santa Monica Mountains,West side Santa Monica assembly distircts into the senate district.
7scruz_20110706_1	7062011	Ken Kannappan	no	Plantronics			yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into 2 CDs.
7scruz_20110706_2	7062011	Teresa Thomae	yes	Central Coast Small Business Development Center	Aptos	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep city of Santa Cruz in one district.
7scruz_20110706_3	7062011	Kurt A. Grutzmacher	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz in one district as to not disenfranchise it.It must stay with COI Monterey County,San Benito County,rest of Santa Cruz

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_7	Los Angeles	Malibu,Pacific Palisades,Brentwood,Westwood,Agoura Hills,Hidden Hills,Calabasas,Woodland Hills,Tarzana,Encino,Sherman Oaks,Studio City,Santa Clarita, Castaic,Gorman.	Ventura Blvd,101 Freeway	yes	yes	School,work,shopping,education,parks,religious and cultural institutions.	
4langeles_20110706_8	Los Angeles	Malibu,Pacific Palisades,Brentwood,Westwood,Agoura Hills,Hidden Hills,Calabasas,Woodland Hills,Tarzana,Encino,Sherman Oaks,Studio City,Santa Clarita, Castaic,Gorman.	Ventura Blvd,101 Freeway	yes	yes	School,work,shopping,education,parks,religious and cultural institutions.	
7scruz_20110706_1	Santa Cruz	Santa Crus		no	yes	common interests,tourism concerns,pursuit of higher ed,high tech markets,	
7scruz_20110706_2	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_3	Santa Cruz,San BenitoMonterey County	Santa Cruz		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_7			no				
4langeles_20110706_8			no				
7scruz_20110706_1			no				
7scruz_20110706_2	continue to receive grants and resources we need for economic turnaround.		no				
7scruz_20110706_3	Must stay together to be represented.		yes	Monterey	keep Santa Cruz with Monterey		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_4	7062011	Sue Reynoldson	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not divide city of Santa Cruz.COI with Monterey County,San Benito County
7scruz_20110706_5	7062011	Allison Endert,Neal Coonerty	yes	Santa Cruz City Council,County Supervisor			yes	Do not divide City of Santa Cruz into 2 CDs.Should stay with Monterey Bay CD,San Benito County,rest of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_6	7062011	Collin Brown	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110706_7	7062011	Elizabeth Borlli	no				yes	Do not divide City of Santa Cruz into 2 CDs.Should stay with Monterey Bay CD,San Benito County,rest of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_8	7062011	Jesse Ruben	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz into two CDs.
7scruz_20110706_9	7062011	Larry Wallerstein	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110706_10	7062011	Cynthia Hawthorne	yes	Board President,Santa Cruz City Schools			yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz from Live Oak and Soquel.
7scruz_20110706_11	7062011	Anina Van Alstine	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_12	7062011	David Harrison	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_4	Santa Cruz,San BenitoMonterey County	Santa Cruz		no	yes	media,tourismvisitor services,higher education,high tech converns	local economy
7scruz_20110706_5	Santa Cruz,San BenitoMonterey County	Santa Cruz		no	yes	media,tourismvisitor services,higher education,high tech converns	local economy
7scruz_20110706_6	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_7	Santa Cruz,San BenitoMonterey County	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_8	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_9	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_10	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz,Live Oak,Soquel		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_11	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_12	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_4	Too small to be divided.It would destroy Santa Cruz		yes	Monterey	keep Santa Cruz with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_5	Too small to be divided.It would destroy Santa Cruz		yes	Monterey	keep Santa Cruz with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_6	Already disadvanted by homeless,drug use,refugee populations.		no				
7scruz_20110706_7	Split would hurt ability to compete for federal grants and attention.		no				
7scruz_20110706_8	so small,this would disenfranchise community		no				
7scruz_20110706_9	Split would make it hard to acquire government funding.		no				
7scruz_20110706_10	Split would make it difficult for school district to pass parcel taxes and school bond measues,may risk ability to secure grants.		no				
7scruz_20110706_11			no				
7scruz_20110706_12	Split would dilute political influence of this small city.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_13	7062011	Ron Swenson	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_14	7062011	Nora Hochman	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_15	7062011	Kelsy Ramage	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_16	7062011	David M. Harrington	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_17	7062011	Zach Friend	yes	Santa Cruz Police Department	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_18	7062011	Peter Koht	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.I
7scruz_20110706_21	7062011	Douglas Kellogg	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_22	7062011	Margaret Leonard	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_13	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_14	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_15	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_16	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_17	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_18	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_21	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_22	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	tourism,natural resources	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_13	city is too small to be split,this would make it difficult to survice and pull together resources		no				
7scruz_20110706_14	split would break COI.Small towns need to preserved in order to make an impact of statewide and national legislation.		no				
7scruz_20110706_15	Santa Cruz residents care a lot about working together.		no				
7scruz_20110706_16	this would put up boundaries between the community.weaken ability to obtain funding and attention.		no				
7scruz_20110706_17	Split would affect funding for law enforcement,further lay offs for officers.Police need the funding.		no				
7scruz_20110706_18	equal representation for small city.		yes	Monterey	Monterey and city of Santa Cruz need to be together.		
7scruz_20110706_21	equal representation for small city.		no				
7scruz_20110706_22			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_23	7062011	Gary Reece	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Needs to be with Silicon Valley and Monterey County.
7scruz_20110706_24	7062011	Jim Thoits	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_25	7062011	Edward Ted Altenberg	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_26	7062011	Deborah Thoits	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_27	7062011	Jody Croce	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_28	7062011	Jennifer Wills	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_29	7062011	Nancy Wood	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_30	7062011	Carolyn Livingston	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_31	7062011	Justin Meek	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_23	Santa Cruz,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_24	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_25	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Media, Tourism,high ed and high tech industry.	local economy
7scruz_20110706_26	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_27	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_28	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_29	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_30	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_31	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_23	Needs to be with its surrounding governing units.		yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_24	Shared COI.		yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_25			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_26	Need the unity provided by being with these counties.		yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_27	If split, it will be hard to compete for federal dollars.		no				
7scruz_20110706_28	split would dilute representation.		no				
7scruz_20110706_29	In the past it was split, was very bad and disenfranchised city.		yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_30			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_31	In the past it was split, was very bad and disenfranchised city.		yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_32	7062011	Reyna Ruiz	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_33	7062011	Jessica Perry	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_35	7062011	Jeremy Wolff	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two separate congressional districts.
7scruz_20110706_36	7062011	Donna Blitzer	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_37	7062011	Sandy Skees	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_38	7062011	Casey Protti	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two separate congressional districts.
7scruz_20110706_39	7062011	Judy Warner	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two separate congressional districts and assembly districts.
7scruz_20110706_40	7062011	Marlene Majewska	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_41	7062011	Mary Castro	no				yes	Santa Cruz must be in one congressional district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_32	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_33	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_35	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_36	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_37	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_38	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_39	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	higher education,focal point of marine sciences and environmentally friendly green tech.	economic center
7scruz_20110706_40	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_41	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_32			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_33			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_35			no				
7scruz_20110706_36			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_37			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_38	It is a COI		no				
7scruz_20110706_39			no				
7scruz_20110706_40	Split would disenfranchise city		yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_41	Splitting city from rest of county would disenfranchise the county and the city.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_42	7062011	Allison Endert	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_43	7062011	Stuart Branoff	no				yes	For all districts.Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_44	7062011	Kathryn Tobisch	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	For congressional districts Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_45	7062011	Don Brookes	no				yes	For congressional districts Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_46	7062011	Lysa	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	For congressional districts Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_34	7062011	Joan Akers	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_47	7062011	Micah Posner	yes	People Power	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not divide city of Santa Cruz in half because of a law dealing with Monterey County.
7scruz_20110706_48	7062011	Kathleen Peppard	no				yes	For congressional districts Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_42	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_43	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_44	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_45	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_46	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_34	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_47	Santa Cruz, Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	bicycle advocacy group,similar concerns	
7scruz_20110706_48	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_42			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_43			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_44			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_45			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_46			yes	Monterey	Keep Santa Cruz county with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_34			no				
7scruz_20110706_47			yes	Monterey	Do not split Santa Cruz because of some arcane law dealing with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_48			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_49	7062011	Brian Murtha	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split small town like Santa Cruz. People live here because we are not a COI with San Jose
7scruz_20110706_50	7062011	Pete Shanks	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz.We need to be with the rest of Monterey Bay.
7scruz_20110706_51	7062011	Andrea Cohen	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_52	7062011	Ilse Rowe	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz, at national and state levels.
7scruz_20110706_53	7062011	Sandy Silver	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz City.
7scruz_20110706_54	7062011	Sarah Smith	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz City.
7scruz_20110706_55	7062011	Lynne Wittenberg	no			Santa Cruz	yes	City of Santa Cruz should stay entirely within an Monterey Bay Congressional district.
7scruz_20110706_58	7062011	Chris Arkenberg	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz.for CD.
7scruz_20110706_59	7062011	Cheryl L. Stoops	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_60	7062011	Gary A. Patton	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two congressional districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_49	Santa Cruz	San Jose,Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_50	Santa Cruz,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_51	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_52	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_53	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_54	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_55	Santa Cruz,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_58	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_59	Santa Cruz			no	yes	Tourism,university,high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_60	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_49			no				
7scruz_20110706_50	Marine interests,Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Exploration Center is being built in Santa Cruz.		yes	Monterey	Do not split Santa Cruz because of some arcane law dealing with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_51			yes	Monterey	Do not split Santa Cruz because of some arcane law dealing with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_52			no				
7scruz_20110706_53	Split would disenfranchise the county as a whole.		no				
7scruz_20110706_54	So many challenges as a county, need to be whole.		no				
7scruz_20110706_55			yes	Monterey	City of Santa Cruz should be in CD with Monterey		
7scruz_20110706_58	Undermine ability to be represented.		no				
7scruz_20110706_59			no				
7scruz_20110706_60	Split will discourage political participation of citizens.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110706_61	7062011	Allan Allwardt	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.Keep it with COI of Monterey County,San Benito County and majority of Santa Cruz County.
7scruz_20110706_62	7062011	Cynthia M. Berger(Duplicate)	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110706_64	7062011	Jane R. Schwickerath	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110706_19	7062011	Janet Swann	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_20	7062011	Leslie Steiner	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110706_56	7062011	Heather Mietz Egli	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz.
7scruz_20110706_57	7062011	Jane Forbes	no				yes	Do not split City of Santa Cruz.for CD.
1sdiego_20110706_1	7062011	Andrew Farrow	no				yes	CA51 should not extend from Ocean to Colorado River.Imperial C. has more in common with E.Riverside than with San Diego C.Do not split Chula Vista into 2 districts.Coastal,Inland San Diego,Imperial C. each need separate representation
1sdiego_20110706_1	7062011	Andrew Farrow	no				yes	CA51 should be kept to Imperial and East Riverside Counties.CA45 should have Chula Vista,Imperial Beach,San Yisidro,Otay Mesa.CA52 should have area lost by CA51 in San Diego C.
1sdiego_20110706_2	7062011	Andrew Farrow	no				yes	Mistake in earlier comment,I had confused CA 45 with CA53,I meant to say CA53 instead of CA45.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110706_61	Santa Cruz,San Benito,Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Tourism,Visitor services,higher ed and high tech.	
7scruz_20110706_62	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_64	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110706_19	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_20	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_56	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110706_57	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110706_1	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego	Chula Vista,Imperial Beach,San Yisidro,Otay Mesa,Campo,Jacumba,Calexico,El Centro,Oglby		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110706_1	Riverside,Imperial,San Diego	Chula Vista,Imperial Beach,San Yisidro,Otay Mesa,Campo,Jacumba,Calexico,El Centro,Oglby		no	yes		
1sdiego_20110706_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110706_61			yes	Monterey	Do not split Monterey and Santa Cruz		
7scruz_20110706_62	Split will water down the voice of Santa Cruz		no				
7scruz_20110706_64			no				
7scruz_20110706_19	One community,need to be represented as such.		no				
7scruz_20110706_20	Split would interfere with local progress.		no				
7scruz_20110706_56	politically and socially whole.		no				
7scruz_20110706_57	Split would disenfranchise county.		no				
1sdiego_20110706_1	Border concerns,coastal Vs Inland communities		no				
1sdiego_20110706_1	Border concerns,coastal Vs Inland communities		no				
1sdiego_20110706_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110706_3	7062011	Clovis Honore	no				no	
2riverside_20110706_1	7062011	Gene Wunderlich	yes	Southwest California Legislative Council			yes	Opposition to divide Temecula in 2 congressional districts.Should be a part of Riverside.
4langeles_20110706_1	7062011	Cameron D. Popkin	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City whole for LASCV,LADNT.Connected with Cities on Ventura Blvd,101Fwy.Nothing in common with Santa Clarita,Castaic,Gorman.
4langeles_20110706_1a	7062011	Gail DeMario	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	CalabasasAgoura are northsouth of 101Fwy,West of 405Fwy,Not Near Beverly Hills.They should be in district going west from 405 to 101.San Fenando Valley is a COI.
4langeles_20110706_2	7062011	A. Ross McCanse	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City.It has no commonalities with North LASCV or LADNT areas.COI with cities along 101Fwy,Northsouth of Santa Monica Mountains.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110706_3				no	no		
2riverside_20110706_1	Riverside	Temecula		no	yes		
4langeles_20110706_1	Los Angeles	Malibu,Pacific Palisades,Brentwood,Westwood,Agoura Hills,Hidden Hills,Calabasas,Woodland Hills,Tarzana,Encino,Sherman Oaks,Studio City,Santa Clarita, Castaic,Gorman.	Ventura Blvd,101 Freeway	yes	yes	School,work,shopping,education,parks,religious and cultural institutions.	
4langeles_20110706_1a	Los Angeles	Calabasas,Agoura,Thousand Oaks,Beverly Hills,Malibu	101,405 Freeways.	yes	yes	police and fire,	
4langeles_20110706_2	Los Angeles	Calabasas,Agoura,Thousand Oaks,Beverly Hills,Malibu	101 Fwy,Santa Monic Mountains	yes	yes	Shared transportation,schools,shopping,education,religiouscultural institutions,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110706_3			no			I am having trouble finding maps with enough detail to determine which district I would be in.Is there a resource which shows specific streetsprecincts?	
2riverside_20110706_1	Need same representation,like the current representative in congress.		no				
4langeles_20110706_1			no				
4langeles_20110706_1a	Beach communities need to be with like, and inland with inland.		no				
4langeles_20110706_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110706_2a	7062011	Martin A. C. Enriquez Marquez	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not Let Western Aldadena,NW Pasadena residents be drowned out by La Canada Flintridge,Burbank,Glendale.Keep them together in one district.View attached datacharts
2riverside_20110707_1	7072011	Anne Taylor	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Use original preliminary maps for Coachella Valley; do not add Imperial Valley to Coachella Valley
2riverside_20110707_2	7072011	Charles Dyson	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not split Coachella Valley into two districts; do not put Coachella Valley with Imperial County
2riverside_20110707_3	7072011	Donna Taylor	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Do not put Imperial Valley with Coachella Valley; use original plan for that area
2sbernardino_20110707_1	7072011	Vicki	no				yes	(SEE MAPS) Nest Adelanto with the Victorville region; endorses lettermaps sent by mayor of Adelanto
2sbernardino_20110707_2	7072011	Rhodes L. Rigsby	yes	City of Loma Linda, Mayor	Loma Linda	San Bernadino	yes	Put Loma Linda in the InyoMonoSan Bernadino CD with Redlands, Highland and Yucaipa, NOT in the RialtoSan Bernadino dist; I-215 and I10 separate RedlandsLoma Linda from San Bernadino, Colton, Rialto, Fontana

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110706_2a	Los Angeles	Altadena,Pasadena,Burbank,Glendale		yes	yes	School district concerns,community college,	
2riverside_20110707_1				no	yes	Coachella Valley has different local issues than Imperial	
2riverside_20110707_2	Imperial			no	no		
2riverside_20110707_3				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110707_1				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110707_2	San Bernadino, Inyo, Mono	Loma Linda, Redlands, Highland, Yucaipa, San Bernadino, Colton, Rialto, Fontana	I-215, I10	no	yes	Loma Linda shares school district, shopping, historical heritage wRedlands; both cities have higher average education level than surrounding communities; has different interests from urban centers (San Bern.ColtonRialtoFontana)	Many employees of medical center in Loma Linda live in Redlands, Highland, Yucaipa

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110706_2a	High latino,african american and minority communities in these two areas need to be united and represented.		no				
2riverside_20110707_1			no				
2riverside_20110707_2			no				
2riverside_20110707_3			no				
2sbernardino_20110707_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110707_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110707_3	7072011	Michael Murphy	no		Highland	San Bernadino	yes	Put Loma Linda, Redlands, and East Highland together wYucaipa, Calimesa; do not split Redlands, NOT w YoloMonoSan BernRialtoColtonFontana; could split Highland along SB City Unified School line, that area is more oriented to communities to the West
2sbernardino_20110707_4	7072011	Michael Murphy	no				yes	Put Highland, Redlands and Yucaipa in same AD
2sbernardino_20110707_5	7072011	Michael Murphy	no				yes	Reject proposed map for San BernadinoBanning; covers very distant cities 29 Palms, mountains, Menifee; put MenifeeLake ElsinoreTemecula with each other, not wRedlands or 29 Palms and Yucca Valley
3orange_20110707_1	7072011	Nikun Khoongumjorn	yes	Thai Association of Southern California, President	Irvine	Orange	yes	Refers to petition submitted by Thai Association of Southern CA, to be read onto record at 7811 meeting; petition not visible or attached
4langeles_20110707_1	7072011	Diana Cauble	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_2	7072011	Daniel Potts	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_3	7072011	Donna and Paul Kasper III	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_4	7072011	T	no				yes	Keep Calabasas and Agoura together, in West San Fernando Dist

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110707_3	San Bernadino, Yolo, Mono	Loma Linda, Redlands, Highland, Yucaipa, Calimesa, San Bernadino, Rialto, Colton Fontana		no	yes	Loma LindaRedlands is attached physically, sociallly, education-wise, and economically to the East Valley area	
2sbernardino_20110707_4		Highland, Redlands, Yucaipa		no	yes	These cities have common interests economically, socially, educationally and geographically	
2sbernardino_20110707_5	San Bernadino	Banning, 29 Palms, Menifee, Lake Elsinore, Temecula		no	no		
3orange_20110707_1				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_1				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_3				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_4		Calabasas, San Fernando		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110707_3			no				
2sbernardino_20110707_4			no				
2sbernardino_20110707_5			no				
3orange_20110707_1			no				
4langeles_20110707_1			no				
4langeles_20110707_2			no				Do not make last minute changes, could raise questions of integrity
4langeles_20110707_3			no				
4langeles_20110707_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110707_43	7072011	Lisa Malgeri	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_44	7072011	Dennis and Karen Dominguez	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes should be one district, not with Orange County
4langeles_20110707_45	7072011	Cindy Lesch	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the districts from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes a straight line
4langeles_20110707_46	7072011	Terry Greenberger	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Put Westchester with the South Bay
4langeles_20110707_47	7072011	Steven Jirucha	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_48	7072011	Selina Wren	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_49	7072011	Leland J. Markle, Teresa Malcom, Jamie Malcom	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not draw the South Bay lines for Marina Del Rey and Palos Verdes Peninsula as they were
4langeles_20110707_50	7072011	Anonymous	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_51	7072011	Alvin Fletcher	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_52	7072011	Karen Dominguez	no				yes	Do not divide Palos Verdes

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110707_43				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_44	Orange			no	no		
4langeles_20110707_45				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_46				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_47				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_48				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_49				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_50				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_51				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_52				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110707_43			no				
4langeles_20110707_44			no				
4langeles_20110707_45			no				
4langeles_20110707_46			no				
4langeles_20110707_47			no				
4langeles_20110707_48			no				
4langeles_20110707_49			no				
4langeles_20110707_50			no				
4langeles_20110707_51			no				
4langeles_20110707_52			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110707_53	7072011	Christine Vinquist	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not use 7211 map for South Bay; use 610 map; put Westchester with South Bay (including Playa Del Rey, El Segundo), not with West LA, Inglewood, and Lennox; do not divide Playa Del Rey among Ads
4langeles_20110707_54	7072011	Christine Vinquist, duplicate	no				no	
6fresno_20110707_1	7072011	Silas K Cha (FILE INCLUDES 32 INDIVIDUAL COPIES OF THE LETTER SIGNED BY DIFFERENT PEOPLE)	no				yes	COUNT AS 32 INDIVIDUALS WHO SUBMITTED THIS SAME COMMENT Keep the Southeast Asian neighborhood together, and wFresno, not Kings County; follow the first draft map, but trade out Sunnyside for the portion of the SE Asian neighborhood directly south of it

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110707_53		El Segundo, Los Angeles, Inglewood		no	yes	Westchester and Playa Del Rey are a COI; common interests include LAX airport, traffic, transportation corridors, demographics; Westchester does not share demographics with Inglewood, Lennox; base districts on where people live, not where they work	
4langeles_20110707_54				no	no		
6fresno_20110707_1	Fresno, Kings	Frenso		yes	yes	Southeast Asian neighborhood in Fresno is a COI, but is also part of Frenso citycounty COI	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110707_53			no				
4langeles_20110707_54			no				
6fresno_20110707_1		the CAPAFR 62811 Senate proposal addresses VRA constraints that keeps the Southeast Asian Community whole, and in a Fresno Section 2 district; the Kings County district on that map also complies wVRA	no				When will the visualization for Frezno be available?

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6mono_20110707_1	7072011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	
7sclara_20110707_1	7072011	Jacquelyn Maruhashi, Sarah Gonzalez, Matthew Mo, Wes Mukoyama, Edwin Torralba	yes	Asian Law Alliance, Asian Americans for Commty Involvement, Asian Pacific American Leadership Inst, Filipino Youth Coalition Commty Dev of Santa Clara Co, International Children Assistance Network, Org. of Chinese Americans Silicon Valley	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Put Mt View,Sunnyvale,Cupertino,Santa Clara together;keep Milpitas Berryessa (including Alviso North planning areas) wNewark Fremont; put Alum Rock East Foothills wdntn San Jose; Keep Little Saigon Evergreen whole, together in E San Jose Dist
7scruz_20110707_1	7072011	Connell Odonovan	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_2	7072011	Catherine Okelly	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz; do not put any of Santa Cruz with San Mateo county
7scruz_20110707_3	7072011	Beth Landry	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz into two voting blocks
7scruz_20110707_4	7072011	Cathy Perez	no				yes	Split Santa Cruz into two CDs so that there will be two separate reps looking out for the city

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6mono_20110707_1				no	yes	Please note that CA HWY 89 connects Mono, Alpine, and El Dorado counties, going through Ebbetts Pass and the city of Markleeville	
7sclara_20110707_1		Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Newark, Fremont, San Jose		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_1		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_2	San Mateo	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_3				no	no		
7scruz_20110707_4				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6mono_20110707_1			no				
7sclara_20110707_1			no				
7scruz_20110707_1			no				
7scruz_20110707_2			no			District should be drawn based on geography, not ethnicity of residents	
7scruz_20110707_3			no				
7scruz_20110707_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110707_5	7072011	Cathy Perez	no				yes	Keep Watsonville with Santa Cruz, not with Salinas, Gilroy
7scruz_20110707_6	7072011	Peggy Overbeck	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_7	7072011	Andy Shapiro	no				yes	Keep Santa Cruz in one district
7scruz_20110707_8	7072011	Richelle Noroyan	no				yes	Keep Santa Cruz in one district
7scruz_20110707_9	7072011	Rose Filicetti	no				yes	Keep Santa Cruz in one CD; put with central coast
7scruz_20110707_10	7072011	Brooke Towne	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_11	7072011	John Kettles	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_12	7072011	Tony Russomanno	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110707_5	Santa Cruz	Watsonville, Santa Cruz, Gilroy, Salinas		no	yes	Watsonville is fastest growing city in Santa Cruz county; has more in common with Santa Cruz (city) than with ruralagricultural cities Salinas, Gilroy	
7scruz_20110707_6		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_7		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_8		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_9		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_10		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_11		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_12		Santa Cruz		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110707_5			no				
7scruz_20110707_6			no				
7scruz_20110707_7			no				
7scruz_20110707_8			no			Having two CDs would be too burdensome for local government, would reduce influence of voters there, rep would not have timeresources to adequately serve Santa Cruz constituents	
7scruz_20110707_9			no				
7scruz_20110707_10			no				
7scruz_20110707_11			no			Santa Cruz is in a budget crisis, cannot afford additional costs associated with being split into two CDs	
7scruz_20110707_12			no			Santa Cruz is one of the smallest cities proposed to be split; would reduce the citys ability to compete for federal grants	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110707_13	7072011	Crystal Birns	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_14	7072011	Jim Brown	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz; Monterey Bay area is a COI
7scruz_20110707_15	7072011	Joseph Eugene	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs; include Live Oak if necessary; Freedom Blvd in Aptos is the dividing line between white North County, and Hispanic South County; draw lines further east, not north, if you need to include more minority voters
7scruz_20110707_16	7072011	Allison Geuvara	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_17	7072011	Chrissann McCann	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs
general_20110707_5	7072011	Jeff Valdez	no				yes	Use 1st map for redistricting
7scruz_20110707_18	7072011	Elizabeth L. Burton	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two districts.
7scruz_20110707_19	7072011	Chrissann McCann, duplicate	no				no	
7scruz_20110707_20	7072011	Steven D. Penrose	no				yes	Do not divide Santa Cruz among CDs or ADs; Put all of Santa Cruz with the rest of Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito Counties

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110707_13		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_14	Monterey	Santa Cruz, Monterey		no	yes	Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay are a COI for business, education and tourism	Santa Cruz, Monterey Bay share tourism industry and common businesses
7scruz_20110707_15		Santa Cruz	Freedom Blvd	no	yes	Santa Cruz is very white, would tip balance of Monterey district toward white majority; consider including cities to the east if the objective is to include more minority voters	
7scruz_20110707_16		Santa Cruz		no	yes	Santa Cruz is a COI	
7scruz_20110707_17		Santa Cruz		no	no		
general_20110707_5				no	no		
7scruz_20110707_18		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_19				no	no		
7scruz_20110707_20	Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito	Santa Cruz		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110707_13			no			Santa Crus is one of the smallest cities to be split; would hurt the citys ability to be heard nationallly, compete for federal grants	
7scruz_20110707_14			no				
7scruz_20110707_15			no				
7scruz_20110707_16			no				
7scruz_20110707_17			no				
general_20110707_5			no				
7scruz_20110707_18			no				
7scruz_20110707_19			no				
7scruz_20110707_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110707_21	7072011	Connell Odonovan	no				yes	REPEAT COMMENT, SENT AT LATER TIME Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_22	7072011	Don Honda	no				yes	Split Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_23	7072011	Peg Flechtner	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_24	7072011	Crissann McCann	no				yes	REPEAT COMMENT, SENT AT LATER TIME Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_25	7072011	Christopher Wolters	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_26	7072011	Janis Baldwin	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_27	7072011	Germaine Akin	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_28	7082011	Doug Urbanus	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_29	7082011	Christopher DiMaio, M.D.	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz county or city
7scruz_20110707_30	7082011	Chris Niemitz	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz; do not join Scotts Valley with Orange County
7scruz_20110707_31	7082011	Shirley Lopez	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz, or any city
7scruz_20110707_32	7082011	Rita Hester	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs
7scruz_20110707_33	7082011	Steve Trujillo	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_34	7082011	Skip Spitzer	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_35	7082011	Stephanie Mendoza	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two districts, keep it the way it is

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110707_21				no	no		
7scruz_20110707_22		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_23		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_24		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_25		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_26		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_27		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_28		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_29	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_30	Santa Cruz, Orange	Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_31		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_32		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_33		Santa Cruz		no	yes	City of Santa Cruz shares city gov and mayor, county supervisor, school district; shared interest in Monterey Bay, UCSC, natural resources, HWY 1 and 17	
7scruz_20110707_34		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_35		Santa Cruz		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110707_21			no				
7scruz_20110707_22			no				
7scruz_20110707_23			no			Santa Cruz is too small to be split up	
7scruz_20110707_24			no				
7scruz_20110707_25			no				
7scruz_20110707_26			no				
7scruz_20110707_27			no				
7scruz_20110707_28			no				
7scruz_20110707_29			no				
7scruz_20110707_30			no				
7scruz_20110707_31			no				
7scruz_20110707_32			no				
7scruz_20110707_33			no				
7scruz_20110707_34			no				
7scruz_20110707_35			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110707_36	7082011	Wolfgang Rosenberg	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_37	7082011	Brandon McCord	no				yes	Do not split Santa Cruz
7scruz_20110707_38	7082011	Rob Oatey	yes	Santa Cruz City Firefighters, L1716, President		Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz; keep it in the MONTEREY CD, CD 17

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110707_36		Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110707_37		Santa Cruz		no	yes	Santa Cruz has minority population, splitting the city would make it harder for minority non-profits to get federal grants	
7scruz_20110707_38		Santa Cruz		no	yes	Santa Cruz is one of the smallest cities to be split; city is a COI based on media, tourism economy, higher education, and high tech; splitting county seat disenfranchises entire county, impairs ability to get essential federal grants for public safety	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110707_36			no				
7scruz_20110707_37			no				
7scruz_20110707_38			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110707_1	7072011	(THIRTEEN PEOPLE SIGNED LETTER) Albert Wang, Arnie Fong, Cheng L. Liao, David Kakishiba, Diane T. Chin, Emily Chang, Jean Fong, Jason E. Fong, Jennifer Neira Heystek, Jennifer Pae, Kenneth Pon, Lillian Galedo, Louis Heystek	yes	Citizens for Better Community; Asian Pacific Islander American Public Affairs Assn, Bay Area Chapter; Chinese American Political Assn; Oakland Unified School Dist; East Bay Asian Youth Center; East Bay Asian Voter Education Consortium			yes	Oakland flats, Alameda, Emeryville and part of Berkeley are a COI; put San Leandro wSan Lorenzo, Cherryland, Ashland, Castro Valley, Hayward, and Union City; do not split Fremont
8ccosta_20110707_1	7072011	Carolyn Phinney	no		Orinda	Contra Costa	yes	Put LafayettMoragaOrinda wBerkeley and North Oakland, and put Richmond wGeorge Millers dist, not with Berkeley; do not put LafayettMoragaOrinda wAlamo, San Ramon and Danville

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110707_1		Oakland, Alameda, Emeryville, Berkeley, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, Castro Valley, Hayward, Union City, Fremont		no	yes	Oakland flatsAlamedaEmeryvilleBerkeley share socioeconomic needs; San LeandroSan LorenzoHayward etc share high immigrant pop, lower English proficiency, have social, cultural, historical ties; splitting Fremont fragments the citys Asian American pop.	
8ccosta_20110707_1		Lafayette, Moraga, Orinda, Berkeley, Oakland, Richmond, San Ramon		no	yes	Berkeley is a strong COI and would completely overpower Richmond, which would be better in George Millers District; LafayetteMoragaOrinda are closer to Berkeley than other Contra Costa cities along I-680 corridor, many residents there went to UCB	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110707_1			no				
8ccosta_20110707_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110707_2	7072011	Toni Favila	no				no	
8ccosta_20110707_3	7072011	Vanessa Moreno	no				yes	Do not put Oakley with Santa Rosa, Stockton, Yolo County, or San Joaquin
8ccosta_20110707_4	7072011	Evan Ayers	yes	Contra Costa County, Elections Services SpecialistSupervisor		Contra Costa	yes	Opportunities exist regarding COIs in Contra Costa county; comment mentions suggested changes for ADSDCD, but no actual suggestions attached to comment
8napa_20110707_1	7082011	Alan Philp	no				yes	Use Yuba visualization 3, not 3a; do not use original map which drew two Bay Area districts into the Central Valley
9dnorte_20110707_1	7072011	Bill McWhirter	no				yes	Put Del Norte county with area to the east (Butte, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc, Siskiyou), not to the south of it along the coast
9glenn_20110707_1	7072011	Frank Treadway	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Keep Glenn county intact, especially Orland and Willows; Keep Nevada county intact, especially Truckee

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110707_2				no	no		
8ccosta_20110707_3	Yolo, San Joaquin	Oakley, Santa Rosa, Stockton		no	no		
8ccosta_20110707_4	Contra Costa			no	no		
8napa_20110707_1	Yuba			no	no		
9dnorte_20110707_1	Del Norte, Butte, Shasta, Trinity, Modoc, Siskiyou			no	yes	Del Norte is rural, has more in common with rural counties to the east	
9glenn_20110707_1	Glenn, Nevada	Orland, Willows, Truckee		no	yes	Hispanic communities of Orland and Willows are a COI	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110707_2			no				Will the city of Richmond be split under the current redistricting proposal? What are the criteria for redistricting?
8ccosta_20110707_3			no				
8ccosta_20110707_4			no				
8napa_20110707_1			no				
9dnorte_20110707_1			no				
9glenn_20110707_1		Hispanic communities in Orland and Willows should be kept together to comply wVRA	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110707_5	7072011	Chanchanit Martorell	yes	Thai Community Development Center, Executive Director	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Supports keeping Thai Town together; Do not put Thai Town with Malibu, Beverly Hills; Put Thai Town and East Hollywood Business Improvement Dist in LAELA, or LADNT, and SD LADNT
4langeles_20110707_6	7072011	Kristy and James Knowlton	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_7	7072011	Sheila Oneill	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_8	7072011	MM Baron	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_9	7072011	Gary Aven	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_10	7072011	Brian Cull	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_11	7072011	Laura Mericle	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110707_5	Los Angeles	Beverly Hills, Malibu		no	yes	Thai Town is a COI, thank you for keeping it whole; Thai Town has low per capita income of 18k, do not put it waffluent MalibuBeverly Hills; shares socioeconomic characteristics, high rates of foreign-born residents, and language needs wsuggested dist	
4langeles_20110707_6				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_7				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_8				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_9				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_10				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_11				no	yes	South Bay has common needs, goals, challenges, environmental concerns, natural disaster plans	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110707_5			no				
4langeles_20110707_6			no				
4langeles_20110707_7			no				
4langeles_20110707_8			no				
4langeles_20110707_9			no				
4langeles_20110707_10			no				
4langeles_20110707_11			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110707_12	7072011	Warren Scheinin	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_13	7072011	Diana Gomez	no		South El Monte	Los Angeles	yes	Do not use 610 map for South El Monte; do not split South El Monte into two Ads; put it in East San Gabriel ValleyCovina AD; keep in current CD (East San Gabriel Valley-Diamond Bar CD); do not put wGateway cities
4langeles_20110707_14	7082011	Gifford Rodine	no		El Segundo	Los Angeles	yes	Draw South Bay dist on straight lines Washing Blvd. on the North, Hawthorne Blvd. on the East, and as far south as the population requirements dictate.
4langeles_20110707_15	7072011	Sandra Gyetvay	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Change the way Dist 36 goes around Palos Verdes; put Palos Verdes with the rest of the South Bay; draw straight district lines
4langeles_20110707_16	7072011	Flora Plumb	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
9sacramento_20110707_1	7072011	Ken Cooley	yes	City of Rancho Cordova, Councilmember	Rancho Cordova	Sacramento	yes	Do not put Rancho Cordova with rural areas to the north (Yuba) and southeast (Foothills)
9sacramento_20110707_2	7072011	Ken Cooley, duplicate	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110707_12				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_13		South El Monte		no	yes	South El Monte has more in common with San Gabriel Valley area than with affluent Gateway cities	
4langeles_20110707_14			Washing Blvd., Hawthorne Blvd.	no	yes	South Bay is a diverse group with common business, environmental and governance desires	
4langeles_20110707_15				no	yes	Palos Verdes, South Bay share values	
4langeles_20110707_16				no	no		
9sacramento_20110707_1	Yuba	Rancho Cordova		no	yes		Rancho Cordova is a large job center; 50k employed within the city, focus on professionalbusiness services, financial activities, education, health services, trade, transportation, businessmanufacturing; much more similar to urban centers than rural
9sacramento_20110707_2				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110707_12			no				
4langeles_20110707_13		610 map does not provide sufficient opportunity for Latino representation under VRA	no				
4langeles_20110707_14			no				
4langeles_20110707_15			no				
4langeles_20110707_16			no				
9sacramento_20110707_1			no				
9sacramento_20110707_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110707_1	7072011	Kathie and Ed Woodring	no				yes	Do not change districts for Shingletown
9shasta_20110707_2	7072011	Michael R. Tandy	no				yes	Do not put Shasta county with central coast district; keep with I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110707_3	7072011	Genevieve Seely	no				yes	Do not put Humbold with coastal communities
9shasta_20110707_4	7072011	Howard Covington	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area, keep it in the central district
9shasta_20110707_5	7072011	Richard B. Booth	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area, keep with I-5 corridor and upper Sacramento Valley
9shasta_20110707_6	7072011	Rudolph Carver	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta with Humboldt, Mendocino, Lake, Sonoma, and Del Norte; put Shasta with I-5 corridor and north eastern counties including Siskiyou, Tehama, Modoc andor Lassen

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110707_1				no	no		
9shasta_20110707_2	Shasta			no	yes	Shasta is economically, geographically, and culturally distinct from coastal communities, fits in better with I-5 corridor area	
9shasta_20110707_3	Humboldt			no	yes	Unique regoinal issues relating to illegal drug industry; Gods country has gone to the devil.	
9shasta_20110707_4	Shasta			no	yes	I-5 corridor has unique issues use of water from dams, Sacramento River, need elected reps who are familiar with local issues	
9shasta_20110707_5				no	no		
9shasta_20110707_6	Shasta, Humboldt, Mendocino, Lake, Sonoma, and Del Norte, Siskiyou, Tehama, Modoc, Lassen			no	yes	Shasta shares lifestyle, economy with I-5 corridor and northeastern counties	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110707_1			no				
9shasta_20110707_2			no				
9shasta_20110707_3			no				
9shasta_20110707_4			no				
9shasta_20110707_5			no				
9shasta_20110707_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110707_7	7072011	Linda L. Roberts	no				yes	Do not put Shasta with Humboldt, Mendocino, and Del Norte; put Shasta with Siskiyou, Modoc, and Lassen, or Tehama, Butte, and Glenn counties along the I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110707_8	7072011	Mary Todd	no				yes	Likes the proposed redistricting for Shasta
9shasta_20110707_9	7072011	Lois Williamson	no				yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area, put it with I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110707_10	7072011	Robert Burchfield	no				yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area, put it with I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110707_11	7072011	Juliebelle Nadon	no				yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area, keep it with I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110707_12	7082011	Margaret Cantrell	no				yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area, keep it with Central Valley; Shasta interest is more important than the preference of the small population of Siskiyou County
9shasta_20110707_13	7082011	James R. Castro	no				yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area, keep it with I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110707_14	7072011	Laron Johnson	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta with coastal area
9siskiyou_20110707_1	7072011	Betty Adkins	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou district as it is
9tehama_20110707_1	7082011	Frank Treadway	no				yes	Keep Glenn county intact, especially Orland and Willows; Keep Nevada county intact, especially Truckee
general_20110707_1	7072011	Joseph Lordeon	no				yes	Do not change the boundaries of District 36

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110707_7	Shasta, Humboldt, Mendocino, Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Tehama, Butte, Glenn			no	yes	Shasta has more in common whigh desert (Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen) because of dryer climate and winter snowfall; shares growing season wTehama, Butte, Glenn; has little in common wHumbold, Mendocino, Del Norte and coastal communities	
9shasta_20110707_8	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110707_9	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110707_10	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110707_11	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110707_12	Shasta; Siskiyou			no	yes	Shasta has ties with Central Valley, and no commonality with coastal regions	
9shasta_20110707_13	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110707_14	Shasta			no	yes	Shasta has nothing in common with coastal area in economy, agriculture, or politics	
9siskiyou_20110707_1	Siskiyou			no	no		
9tehama_20110707_1	Glenn, Nevada	Orland, Willows, Truckee		no	yes	OrlandWillows is a COI of people of color	
general_20110707_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110707_7			no				
9shasta_20110707_8			no				
9shasta_20110707_9			no				
9shasta_20110707_10			no				
9shasta_20110707_11			no				
9shasta_20110707_12			no				
9shasta_20110707_13			no				
9shasta_20110707_14			no				
9siskiyou_20110707_1			no				
9tehama_20110707_1		Must keep these areas intact to comply wVRA	no				
general_20110707_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110707_2	7072011	R. D. Hernandez	no				yes	Keep Southern CA coastal districts as they are in the first draft maps;
general_20110707_3	7072011	Frank Tallerico	no				yes	Do not put coastal Northern counties with inland ones; unite counties along I-5 corridor; use the 1990 district maps
general_20110707_4	7072011	Teal S.	no				no	
4langeles_20110707_17	7072011	Karen Lorton-Vella	no		El Segundo	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_19	7072011	Chancee Martorell	yes	Thai Community Development Center	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Same attached letter as above comment from same person Supports keeping Thai Town together; Do not put Thai Town with Malibu, Beverly Hills; Put Thai Town and East Hollywood Business Improvement Dist in LAELA, or LADNT, and SD LADNT
4langeles_20110707_20	7072011	Steve Felstein	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110707_2				no	yes	Coastal areas have interests in beach clean-up, diverse population, in opposition to inland interests	
general_20110707_3				no	yes	Inland counties have different climate, interests, employment needs, culture, customs	
general_20110707_4				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_17				no	yes	South Bay has common needs, goals, challenges re environmental concerns and natural disaster plans	
4langeles_20110707_19	Los Angeles	Beverly Hills, Malibu		no	yes	Thai Town is a COI, thank you for keeping it whole; Thai Town has low per capita income of 18k, do not put it waffluent MalibuBeverly Hills; shares socioeconomic characteristics, high rates of foreign-born residents, and language needs wsuggested dist	
4langeles_20110707_20				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110707_2			no				
general_20110707_3		Use 1990 maps to comply wVRA	no				
general_20110707_4			no				Draw lines according to geography, not for political reasons
4langeles_20110707_17			no				
4langeles_20110707_19			no				
4langeles_20110707_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110707_21	7072011	Joan Brenner	no				yes	Put Silverlake with Hollywood Hills, both should be included with Griffith Park area
4langeles_20110707_22	7072011	Vicki Medina	no				yes	Supports map submitted by city of Adelanto; Nest Adelanto with Victorville; put Rosamond and Mojave with Antelope Valley
4langeles_20110707_23	7072011	Lucia Affatato	no				yes	Put Silver Lake (90039 zip) into the July 3 LAGBP district; keep Hollywood together
4langeles_20110707_24	7072011	Judith Mintz	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Palos Verdes peninsula and Westchester back in ADCD with Torrance beach cities; Remove Santa Monica Venice from beach cities dist
4langeles_20110707_25	7072011	Bridget McCann	no		Burbank	Los Angeles	yes	Put Silver Lake with Griffith Park and Hollywood Hills; current dist proposal is underpopulated
4langeles_20110707_26	7072011	Josh Ochs	no		Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Palos Verdes peninsula with Torrance and the Beach Cities
4langeles_20110707_27	7072011	Chris Youra	no				yes	Keep Palos Verdes peninsula with Torrance and the Beach Cities
4langeles_20110707_28	7072011	Kelly	no				yes	Likes change to Palos Verdes and Santa Monica; do not separate UC Santa Cruz from Santa Cruz county, do not put it with cities up HWY 1 from there.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110707_21				no	yes	These neighborhoods share Senior Clubs, street fairs	
4langeles_20110707_22		Adelanto, Victorville		no	yes	RosamondMojave residents travel to Antelop Valley daily for work and shopping	
4langeles_20110707_23				no	yes	Silverlake shares shopping, media, outlook, culture, and geographic continuity with neighborhoods in the July 3 LAGBP district	
4langeles_20110707_24		Torrance, Santa Monica		no	yes	Santa Monica and Venice have nothing in common economically or demographically wbeach cities	
4langeles_20110707_25				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_26		Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110707_27		Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110707_28	Santa Cruz	Santa Monica, Santa Cruz		no	yes	Removing UC Sant Cruz from SC county will disenfranchise the student vote; students have nothing in common with agricultural communities to the north along HWY 1	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110707_21			no				
4langeles_20110707_22			no				Thank you for your time and consideration, the maps are almost perfect.
4langeles_20110707_23			no				
4langeles_20110707_24			no				
4langeles_20110707_25			no				
4langeles_20110707_26			no				
4langeles_20110707_27			no				
4langeles_20110707_28			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110707_29	7072011	Elektra G.M. Kruger	no				yes	Put Kagel Canyon, all of Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, Sunland, all of Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, and Burbank in a district together
4langeles_20110707_30	7082011	Agi Orsi	no				yes	Create single dist for Santa Monica Mountains
4langeles_20110707_31	7072011	Robert Vinquist	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Put Westchester wBeach Cities; do not divide the Playa Del Rey neighborhood; do not put Westchester with LA or InglewoodLennox to the east of the 405 freeway
4langeles_20110707_32	7072011	Mike Westra	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_33	7072011	Robin La Tourette	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_34	7072011	Carol Wood	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_35	7072011	Robert Kalmey	no				yes	Redraw 36th district - Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_36	7072011	Richard R. Johnson	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110707_29		La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes	These communities share interest in retaining low-density housing, envrionmental concerns, native habitat, watershed, transportation corridor (I-210), historically connected in maintaining lifestyle in the area	
4langeles_20110707_30				no	yes	Area has fragile, unique natural environment	
4langeles_20110707_31		Los Angleles, Inglewood	I-405	no	no		
4langeles_20110707_32				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_33				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_34				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_35				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_36				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110707_29			no				
4langeles_20110707_30			no				
4langeles_20110707_31			no				
4langeles_20110707_32			no				
4langeles_20110707_33			no				
4langeles_20110707_34			no				
4langeles_20110707_35			no				
4langeles_20110707_36			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110707_37	7072011	Thomas Perry and Julie Busch	no		El Segundo	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_38	7072011	Arthur J. Plourde	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Redraw 36th dist - bring all the South Bay cities together in one new 36th dist, from Marina Del Rey to San Pedro, to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines; to Pac Ocean on west, to Wilmington on East, southwest to San Pedro, north to Culver City
4langeles_20110707_39	7072011	Steven Felstein	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	REPEATED COMMENT, sent again at later time Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_40	7072011	Maureen Johnson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Redraw 36th dist - put all South Bay cities together in 36th dist, from Marina Del Rey to San Pedro, to Palos Verdes Peninsula; from Pac Ocean on west, to Wilmington on East, southwest to San Pedro, north to Culver City
4langeles_20110707_41	7072011	E Merideth	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110707_42	7072011	Evan Chase	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
4langeles_20110709_6	7092011	Katherine and Karl Poehlmann	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay 36th district intact from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula. Residents work, live, shop, play in these districts. Schools within connected districts are better matched. Do not split up the south bay

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110707_37				no	yes	South Bay has common needs, goals, challenges re environmental concerns, natural disaster plans	
4langeles_20110707_38		San Pedro, Culver City		no	no		
4langeles_20110707_39				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_40		San Pedro, Culver City		no	no		
4langeles_20110707_41				no	no		
4langeles_20110707_42				no	no		
4langeles_20110709_6		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	yes	stores operated by residents, churches, sporting events, social programs	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110707_37			no				
4langeles_20110707_38			no				
4langeles_20110707_39			no				
4langeles_20110707_40			no				
4langeles_20110707_41			no				
4langeles_20110707_42			no				
4langeles_20110709_6	schools better connected, living, work, shopping		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110709_8	7092011	Trevor Jones	no		Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Antelope Valley is strong Community of visionaries with population of over 400,000. Need elected local voices speaking on behalf.
4langeles_20110709_9	7092011	James Michael Wieck	no		Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Do not link Antelope Valley in Lancaster with San Fernando, Pacoima, and Sylmar. Lancaster and Palmdale should remain together in northern LA county with East Kern and the Victor Valley cities in same SD.
4langeles_20110709_10	7092011	Tonya Wieck	no		Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Do not link Antelope Valley in Lancaster with San Fernando, Pacoima, and Sylmar. Lancaster and Palmdale should remain together in northern LA county with East Kern and the Victor Valley cities in same SD.
4langeles_20110709_11	7092011	Michael Mullen	no				yes	Keep Southbay district lines from Marina del Rey to Palos Verdes straight.
4langeles_20110709_12	7092011	Tami S. French	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale represented together, in northern LA county with East Kern and Victor Valley Cities in San Bernardino in same SD
4langeles_20110709_13	7092011	Michael Malgeri	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Southbay district lines from Marina del Rey to Palos Verdes straight.
4langeles_20110709_14	7092011	Gerry Stark	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay as it is, together, do not change lines. Give reason to believe there is still integrity in politicians
4langeles_20110709_15	7092011	Brett A. Nelson, Sr.	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale represented together, in northern LA county with East Kern and Victor Valley Cities in San Bernardino in same SD. SDF in first draft was excellent.
4langeles_20110709_16	7092011	Louise Meehan	no				yes	Keep Southbay district lines from Marina del Rey to Palos Verdes straight.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110709_8		Antelope Valley		no	yes	strong community	
4langeles_20110709_9		Lancaster, San Fernando, Pacoima, Sylmar, Kern, Victor Valley		no	yes	High Desert communities	
4langeles_20110709_10		Lancaster, San Fernando, Pacoima, Sylmar, Kern, Victor Valley		no	yes	High Desert communities	
4langeles_20110709_11		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110709_12	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Kern, Victor Valley		no	yes	same interests	
4langeles_20110709_13		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110709_14		South Bay		no	no		
4langeles_20110709_15	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Kern, Victor Valley		no	yes	High Desert communities	
4langeles_20110709_16		Marina Del Ray, Palos Verdes		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110709_8	population		no				
4langeles_20110709_9			no				
4langeles_20110709_10			no				
4langeles_20110709_11			no				
4langeles_20110709_12			no				
4langeles_20110709_13			no				
4langeles_20110709_14			no				I am losin my faith in my leaders
4langeles_20110709_15			no				
4langeles_20110709_16			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110709_17	7092011	Joseph and Amy Gazal	no				yes	Keep Southbay district lines from Marina del Rey to Palos Verdes straight and together
4langeles_20110709_18	7092011	Tom Penland,	yes	Greenline-Financial LLC	Culver City	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines. Complete redistricting as it should logically be done.
4langeles_20110709_19	7092011	Rolandf Ilsen	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Rancho Palos Verdes has no problems in common with areas north of LAX. Transportation, environment, crime fighting, school, go West from Palos Verdes- El Segundo line. Keep contiguous.
4langeles_20110709_20	7092011	Kay Austen	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Topanga in two, do not attach to Santa Clarita, 40 miles away. Prides itself on liberalism and environmentalism. Do not take hatchet to Topanga and Malibu, do not sever from Westside or attach to conservative districts.
5ventura_20110709_1	7092011	Roger Davis	no				yes	Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and Simi Valley with Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110709_2	7092011	Nancy Guinn	no				yes	Link E Ventura County to Santa Clarita in state Senate seat. I want my voice heard.
5ventura_20110709_3	7092011	Suzanne Paroski	no				yes	Keep Moorpark and Simi Valley with Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110709_4	7092011	Donna Irons-McGue	no				yes	Simi Valley should be with Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110709_5	7092011	William Buol	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Lives in Ventura to get away from LA. Moorpark is less metropolitan like Antelope Valley. Do not link to L.A. County.
5ventura_20110709_6	7092011	Robert L. Chiarelli	no				yes	Keep E Ventura county and Santa Clarita connected

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110709_17		Marina Del Ray, Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110709_18		Marina Del Ray, Palos Verdes		no	yes	logically together	
4langeles_20110709_19		Rancho Palos Verdes, El Segundo	West from line	no	yes		
4langeles_20110709_20		Topanga, Santa Clarita, Malibu, Westside, Santa Monica	Santa Monica Mountain	no	yes		
5ventura_20110709_1		Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_2	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_3		Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_4		Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_5	Ventura, Los Angeles	Moorpark, Antelope Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_6	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110709_17			no				
4langeles_20110709_18			no				
4langeles_20110709_19	transportation, environment, schooling, crime fighting, civic relations		no			nothing in common with areas north of LAX	
4langeles_20110709_20	liberalism and environmentalism, representatives		no			liberal communities vs. conservative districts	
5ventura_20110709_1			no				
5ventura_20110709_2			no				
5ventura_20110709_3			no				
5ventura_20110709_4			no				
5ventura_20110709_5			no			less metropolitan	
5ventura_20110709_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110709_7	7092011	Barbra Conway	no			Ventura	yes	Keep E Ventura cities in Ventura County
5ventura_20110709_8	7092011	Dan R. Smith	no				yes	Link East Ventura County to Santa Clarita in State senate seat. Linking us to Ventura blvd and Malibu guarantees that LA representation is out of touch with needs. Santa Clarita is a similar community that will share needs.
5ventura_20110709_9	7092011	Doug Wieben	no			Ventura	yes	Keep E Ventura county seat with Santa Clarita, similar interests. Do not put with Ventura Blvd in SFV.
5ventura_20110709_10	7092011	Margy Ochsner	no			Ventura	yes	Do not put east County with Malibu. Put with Santa Clarita. Same area, terrain, philosophy
5ventura_20110709_11	7092011	Lorraine Jacoby	no				yes	Connect east County with Santa Clarita. Linking with Malibu, Pacific Palisades and along 101 goes against public testimony. Linking Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and Simi Valley to Santa Clarita in Senate Seat will keep inland valleys together.
5ventura_20110709_12	7092011	Glen and Janet Willingham	no				yes	E Ventura Co. should continue to be linked with Santa Clarita, inner vallys better represented together than would be if linked to LA.
5ventura_20110709_13	7092011	Inge Tretner	no				yes	Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in senate seat. Keep inland valleys together. Historically represented together in Senate seat
5ventura_20110709_14	7092011	Joann Cordia	no				yes	Please draw a district that will link East Ventura County to Santa Clarita for representation
5ventura_20110709_15	7092011	Jerrell Thomas	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	District simi Valley with Santa Clarita

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110709_7	Ventura			no	no		
5ventura_20110709_8	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu	Ventura Blvd	no	yes	share interests, similar community, connected in Senate for 30 years	
5ventura_20110709_9	Ventura	Santa Clarita	Ventura Blvd	no	yes	similar interests	
5ventura_20110709_10	Ventura	Malibu, Santa clarita		no	yes	same area, terrain, philosophy	
5ventura_20110709_11	Ventura	Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Malibu, Moorpark	101	no	yes	public testimony, historically	
5ventura_20110709_12	Los Angeles, Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	yes		
5ventura_20110709_13	Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi valley, Santa Clarita		no	yes	historically connected	
5ventura_20110709_14	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_15	Ventura	Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110709_7			no				
5ventura_20110709_8			no			out of touch with needs	
5ventura_20110709_9			no				
5ventura_20110709_10			no				
5ventura_20110709_11	inland valleys		no			no good reason for change	
5ventura_20110709_12	inner valleys, representation		no				
5ventura_20110709_13			no				
5ventura_20110709_14			no				
5ventura_20110709_15			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110709_16	7092011	Caroline Richard	no			Ventura	yes	Ventura is not like LA. Do not want to be connected with LA attitudes. More in tune with Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110709_17	7092011	Clell and Hal Goldstein	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley with Santa Clarita, since not allowed to stay within own county
5ventura_20110709_18	7092011	Sheryl Misenhimer	no			Ventura	yes	Pair Ventura with Santa Clarita, similar demographics. Malibu is not a good fit. Do not place with group that has little concern for agriculture and a lower socio-economic base
6kern_20110709_1	7092011	Judy Weaver	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Ridgecrest should remain in Kern County with Bakersfield. All services are connected with Kern county
8alameda_20110709_1	7092011	Ruel and Mavis Brown	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Happy with Fremont CD map. Supports district that includes Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Newark, and Milpitas. Keep Fremond in Alameda County anchored district. Hope this is final map
8alameda_20110709_2	7092011	Antonio Loura	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	San Leandro should not be part of Oakland. Put with Castro Valley, South Alameda county. Will have no voice with elected officials from Oakland.
8alameda_20110709_3	7092011	Antonio Loura	no		San Leandro	Alameda	yes	San Leandro should not be part of Oakland. Put with Castro Valley, South Alameda county. For last 15 years have been ruled by crazys.
8ccosta_20110709_1	7092011	Catherine McRoberts	no				yes	Keep senate district 7 odd numbered. An even number would be devestating

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110709_16	Ventura, Los Angeles	Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_17		Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110709_18	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		
6kern_20110709_1	Kern	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield		no	yes	all of our services are connected	
8alameda_20110709_1	Alameda	Fremont, Hayward, Newark, Union City, Milpitas.		no	yes	history and institutions,	
8alameda_20110709_2	Alameda	San Leandro, Oakland, Castro Valley		no	no		
8alameda_20110709_3	Alameda	San Leandro, Oakland, Castro Valley		no	no		
8ccosta_20110709_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110709_16			no			not like LA	
5ventura_20110709_17			no				
5ventura_20110709_18			no			little concern for agriculture, lower-socio-economic base	
6kern_20110709_1			no				
8alameda_20110709_1			no				
8alameda_20110709_2			no			do not want to be part of Oakland, the elections are rigged, they do not want us to have plastic bags	
8alameda_20110709_3			no			do not want to be part of Oakland, the elections are rigged, they do not want us to have plastic bags	
8ccosta_20110709_1			no				the good of the voter is the primary concern

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110709_2	7092011	Lisa Scheffer	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do no partition the city of Richmond into separate CDs or absorb city of San Pablo into 10th district. This would put richmond in competition for scarce funds, double effort of officials.
8marin_20110709_1	7092011	Stephen Wilsey	no		Tiburon	Marin	yes	Group Marin County with Sonoma county. San Francisco adjoins Marin, but the two have little in common
8marin_20110709_2	7092011	Tom Dicker	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	Marin has interests and concerns with Northern counties, not metropolitan San Francisco
8marin_20110709_3	7092011	Priscilla Bull	no			Marin	yes	Marin should be combined with part of San Francisco. SF is economic, political, cutural center for Marin residents, esp central and southern Marin
8marin_20110709_4	7092011	Carol Sheerin	no			Marin	yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma together in redistricting. More like sonoma, including Santa Rosa, than San Francisco. Need representatives that will work for suburban and ag interests. Not urban.
8marin_20110709_5	7092011	Walter Shank	yes	Society of Mayflower Descendants			yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma Counties together for all offices. If pop count is too small, add sections of SW Napato insure needs of district will be met without urban vs suburb fighting.
9shasta_20110709_1	7092011	Carl Pieplow Jr.	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Redding is not coastal CA, but Northern, I-5 corridor. Economy, culture and political stands are different from coast.
9shasta_20110709_2	7092011	Patricia Hunt Nelson	no			Shasta	yes	Do not want Shasta county redistricted with coastal counties. Listen to the people

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110709_2		Richmond, San Pablo		no	yes	Urban, minority-population city of San pablo has more in common with Richmond	
8marin_20110709_1	San Francisco, Sonoma, marin			no	no		
8marin_20110709_2	Marin	San Francisco		no	no		
8marin_20110709_3	Marin, San Francisco	San Francisco		no	yes		
8marin_20110709_4	Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco	Santa Rosa, San Francisco		no	yes	suburban	agricultural interests
8marin_20110709_5	Marin, Napa, Sonnoma			no	yes	suburbs	
9shasta_20110709_1		Redding	I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110709_2	Shasta			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110709_2	community cohesion, common interests		no			put in competition for scarce funds, double effort of elected officials,	
8marin_20110709_1			no			little in common	
8marin_20110709_2			no			interests are not those of metro area	
8marin_20110709_3	economic, political, cultural center		no				Senator Mark Leno
8marin_20110709_4			no			not urban	
8marin_20110709_5			no			no urban Vs. suburb fighting	
9shasta_20110709_1			no			economy, culture, political stands different from coast	
9shasta_20110709_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110709_3	7092011	Joe Gassaway	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Redding has nothing in Common with Coast. Should be part of central Valley I-5 district. Divide Humboldt and Del Norte counties and put them with Napa, not Redding.
9sutter_20110709_1	7092011	Dalve Klever	no			Sutter	yes	Sutter should be with Napa and Sonoma in CD maps, similar agricuture, proximity to Big Cities. Agree with this alignment of district.
9sutter_20110709_2	7092011	Jeannie Klever	no				yes	Keep Yuba and Sutter counties together. Keep Sonoma with Sutter and Yuba in CD. Ties to agriculture, transport issues, fog, fishing, nonprofits, environmental preservation. Politics. Keep east-west congressional lines
9tehama_20110709_1	7092011	Sharon Young	no				yes	Keep Glenn county intact for MTCAPNewCD2, fits COI and VRA for hispanic households in Willows and Orland. Keep Truckee in Nevada County for MTCAPNewCD2, meeting COI for native americans
general_20110709_1	7092011	Trudy Schafer, senior Director for Program	yes	League of Woman Voters of California			yes	Supports goal of giving mappers time to get it right. Make the process interactive with the public and that input from all Californians is welcomed.
general_20110709_2	7092011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	One strong reason for releasing second draft maps is the numbering of senate districts
general_20110709_3	7092011		no				yes	Keep High Desert communities together in one districts, have interests and needs in common, need to elect one who can properly represent in state legislature

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110709_3	Humboldt, Napa, Del Norte	Redding	I-5	no	no		
9sutter_20110709_1	Napa, Sutter, Sonoma			no	yes		agriculture, grapes, orchards, rice, beans
9sutter_20110709_2	Napa, Yuba, Sonoma, Sutter			no	yes		agriculture, farms,
9tehama_20110709_1	Glenn, Nevada	Willows, Orland, Truckee		no	yes	Hispanic households, Native Americans	
general_20110709_1				no	no		
general_20110709_2				no	no		
general_20110709_3				no	yes	interests and needs in common	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110709_3			no			nothing in common	
9sutter_20110709_1	close to big cities		no				
9sutter_20110709_2	population, fog, audobon society, fishinng, environmental preservation		no				
9tehama_20110709_1		meet VRA criteria	no				
general_20110709_1			no				We wish you the best
general_20110709_2			no				
general_20110709_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110709_1	7092011	William Gourlay	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_2	7092011	Ron and JoAnn Talamantes	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_3	7092011	Lenore Lewis	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_4	7092011	John Davis	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_5	7092011	Jennifer Johnson	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110709_1	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_2	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_3	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_4	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_5	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110709_1	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_2	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_3	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_4	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_5	historically connected for over 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110709_6	7092011	Robert Carmanb	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_7	7092011	Connie Carman	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_8	7092011	Donald Morris	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_9	7092011	Shirley Joan Morris	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_10	7092011	Kim Carmichael	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110709_6	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_7	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_8	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_9	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_10	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110709_6	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_7	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_8	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_9	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_10	historically connected for over 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110709_11	7092011	Kerry Gallacher	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_12	7092011	Richard and Brenda Coplin	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_13	7092011	Jennifer McCarthy	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_14	7092011	Anthony Howard	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_15	7092011	Tamara Howard	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110709_11	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_12	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_13	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_14	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_15	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110709_11	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_12	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_13	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_14	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_15	historically connected for over 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110709_16	7092011	Mike Judge	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_17	7092011	Diane Hawkins	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_18	7092011	Linda Benham	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_19	7092011	Kathy Whitmire	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_20	7092011	Peggy Sadler	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110709_16	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_17	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_18	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_19	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_20	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110709_16	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_17	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_18	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_19	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_20	historically connected for over 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110709_21	7092011	Ted Baehr	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_22	7092011	Laura G. Villoria	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_23	7092011	Jean Desilets	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_24	7092011	Elinor and Donald E. Mueller	no				yes	Instead of East Ventura County with Malibu or Ventura Blvd in the Valley, you should draw the Santa Clarita area with E Ventura county
supporterseventura_20110709_25	7092011	Sara-Kay Szollsi	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_26	7092011	Bertha Ortega	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110709_21	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_22	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_23	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_24	Ventura	Malibu, Santa Clarita	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_25	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_26	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110709_21	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_22	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_23	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_24	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_25	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_26	historically connected for over 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110709_27	7102011	Jonathan M. Perry	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_28	7102011	Ed Clark	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_29	7102011	Melissa Clark	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_30	7102011	Mike Lazerus	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporterseventura_20110709_31	7102011	Fred Ansaldi	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110709_27	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_28	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_29	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_30	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
supporterseventura_20110709_31	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110709_27	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_28	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_29	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_30	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
supporterseventura_20110709_31	historically connected for over 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110709_32	7102011	Elana Daley	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not with Malibu or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate Seat, as they have been for 30 years.
1sdiego_20110709_1	7092011	Letty Garcia Chavaje	no			San Diego	yes	Latino Communities of South San Diego and Imperial county should be represented by one member. Share cultural and economic ties. Latino community is a COI that should be together in CD
1sdiego_20110709_2	7092011	John Sexton, Assistant Director of Admissions	yes	Art Institute of California	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Do not put center city San Diego with La Mesa and El Cajon. Is very diverse with respect to ethnicity and sexual orientation and votes liberal vs. El Cajon, etc which are conservative. CD is fine including border, but not Eastern San Diego county
2riverside_20110709_1	7092011	Janet Pffeiffer	no		Sky Valley	Riverside	yes	New maps are better than those of 2001, better reflect interests of citizens of Coachella Valley and satellite areas like Sky Valley.
2sbernardino_20110709_1	7092011	Francisco Estrada	no				yes	Add Chino to ONTPM CD, even if Upland is removed, or Rancho Cucamonga.
4langeles_20110709_1	7092011	Martin A.C. EnriquezMarquez (duplicate)	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Reservations about manner Pasadena is split in LASGF and LAGBP. Line drawn in NE corner of Pasadena threatens to open old wound. Colorado Blvd is line of demarcation. Swap LASGF and LAGBP. Pleased that Hispanic corridor along 210 has been ameliorated

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110709_32	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura Blvd	no	yes		
1sdiego_20110709_1		San Diego		no	yes	Latino population	
1sdiego_20110709_2	San Diego	San Diegeo, La Meja, El Cajon		yes	yes	Diversity	
2riverside_20110709_1		Sky Valley, Coachella Valley		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110709_1		Chino, Upland, Rancho Cucamonga		no	no		
4langeles_20110709_1		Pasadena	Colorado Blvd, 210	yes	yes	Chicano, Hispanic, and Latin voters	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110709_32	historically connected for over 30 years		no				
1sdiego_20110709_1	border issues, immigration, transportation, commerce		no				
1sdiego_20110709_2	votes very liberal		no			liberal vs. conservative voting orientation	
2riverside_20110709_1			no				thank you for your work
2sbernardino_20110709_1			no				
4langeles_20110709_1	splitting would disenfranchise voters		no				many wounded souls will recall the anguish of decades

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110709_2	7092011	Walt Stoufer	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay togeter with lines stretching from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes. Do not gerrymander 36th district, renders convictions of residents null and void.
4langeles_20110709_3	7092011	Susan Abato	no				yes	Keep Calabasas and Agoura with SFV, not Beverly Hills, West LA, West Hollywood, Malibu. Different demographics, housing types, schools. Seat both cities in West SFV CD. Sherman Oaks and Studio city do not have COI with West SFV. Belong on east side of 405
4langeles_20110709_4	7092011	Barbara Burgess	no				yes	Keep South Bay 36th district intact from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes. Keep straight line
4langeles_20110709_5	7092011	Theresa Pitiak	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay 36th district intact from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes. Keep straight lines
2riverside_20110710_1	7102011	Jeff and Linda Davis	no			Riverside	yes	Use map for CD 45 that keeps Coachella Valley desert cities in Riverside, not with Imperial county
3orange_20110710_1	7102011	John Bowen	no		Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Do not put Los Alamitos with Long Beach
3orange_20110710_2	7102011	Julie Dobyns	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra with Los Angeles county
4langeles_20110710_1	7102011	Carol Harris	no				yes	Make new lines leaving out Venice

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110709_2		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	yes	philosophy and convictions of residents	
4langeles_20110709_3		Agoura, Calabasas, Beverly Hills, West LA, Hollywood, Malibu, Sherman Oaks, Studio City	405	no	yes		
4langeles_20110709_4		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110709_5		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	no		
2riverside_20110710_1	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes		Coachella Valley cities are based on tourism and recreational activities, while Imperial is rural and agricultural
3orange_20110710_1		Los Alamitos, Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110710_2	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra is part of the Orange county COI, shares political views with conservatives in Orange county, not with liberal LA county residents	
4langeles_20110710_1				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110709_2			no			gerrymandering	
4langeles_20110709_3	schools, sports, shopping, dinner, job connections		no			hours of travel, no common interests	
4langeles_20110709_4			no				
4langeles_20110709_5			no				
2riverside_20110710_1			no				
3orange_20110710_1			no				
3orange_20110710_2			no				
4langeles_20110710_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110710_2	7102011	Machael Barry	no				yes	Include Palos Verdes and Marina Del Ray in CD 36
4langeles_20110710_3	7102011	Ouida Peterson	no				yes	Please create one district from Palos Verdes peninsula to Marina del Rey
4langeles_20110710_4	7102011	Juanita Kirkpatrick	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep High Desert, Palmdale, Lancaster, Victorville and others in one district, not with San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110710_5	7102011	Hariett and Joel Ringold	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes with straight lines; do not put Rancho Palos Verdes with Watts, Long Beach, and San Pedro
4langeles_20110710_6	7102011	Tony Mercadante	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes with straight lines
4langeles_20110710_7	7102011	Anonymous	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together; do not change the District lines of 36th CD.
4langeles_20110710_8	7102011	Diane Wilson	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together; put Palos Verdes and Marina Del Rey with the South Bay
4langeles_20110710_9	7102011	Lori Weatherbie	yes	Juniper Hills Town Council, Vice President; Juniper Hills Community Association, President		Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Juniper Hills and Wrightwood wDuarte, San Dimas, and Azusa; Draw line along the Angeles Crest Hwy (2)
4langeles_20110710_10	7102011	Kathleen Forseth	no				yes	Redistrict in straight lines from Marina Del Rey to San Pedro; Los Angeles area is not part of the South Bay
4langeles_20110710_11	7102011	Teri Knafla	no				yes	Reject visualization presented on 7811 that created blended SD that included AVSCVSFV; create SCV and east Ventura County district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110710_2				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_3				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_4		Palmdale, Lancaster, Victorville		no	no		
4langeles_20110710_5		Rancho Palos Verdes, Long Beach, San Pedro		no	no		
4langeles_20110710_6				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_7				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_8				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_9		Duarte, San Dimas, Azusa	HWY 2	no	yes	There is not such thing as the San Gabriel Mountain Foothill Community, most of that area is Angeles National Forest and Pleasantview Ridge Wilderness	
4langeles_20110710_10	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, San Pedro		no	no		
4langeles_20110710_11	Ventura			no	yes	These communities have been in the same SD for decades	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110710_2			no				
4langeles_20110710_3			no				
4langeles_20110710_4			no				
4langeles_20110710_5			no				
4langeles_20110710_6			no				
4langeles_20110710_7			no				
4langeles_20110710_8			no				
4langeles_20110710_9			no				
4langeles_20110710_10			no				
4langeles_20110710_11			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110710_12	7102011	Chris Hamilton	no				yes	Do not separate Palmdale from Lancaster; do not put them with Sylmar and San Fernando; keep Antelope Valley in one district
4langeles_20110710_13	7102011	Tom Proffitt	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale together; keep High Desert communities of LancasterPalmdale in northern LA county together wEast Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernadino; use first draft of SD map, as it unified High Desert COI
4langeles_20110710_14	7112011	Frustrated Citizen	no				no	
4langeles_20110710_15	7112011	Brian Raber	no		Carson	Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110710_16	7112011	Charles and Mary Athas	no				yes	Reject 7911 maps; Do not put N. LA ctyAntelope Valley cities (LancasterPalmdale) wSylmar, Pacoima, and San Fernando; use first draft map for Antelope Valley, which unified High Desert; put PalmdaleLancaster weast Kern and Victor Valley in San Bern.
4langeles_20110710_17	7102011	Michael A Otnisky	no				yes	Visualization for Santa Clarita does not reflect COI testimony; keep the watershed in one district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110710_12		Palmdale, Lancaster, San Fernando		no	yes	Antelope valley is a COI	
4langeles_20110710_13	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Palmdale, Lancaster		no	yes	High Desert is a COI	
4langeles_20110710_14				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_15				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_16	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, San Fernando		no	yes	High Desert COI is homogenous, has similar interests and economic makeup as San BernardinoEast Kern	
4langeles_20110710_17		Santa Clarita		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110710_12			no				
4langeles_20110710_13			no				
4langeles_20110710_14			no				Where can I complain about the commisions work? Why cant we have a computer draw district lines based upon population only?
4langeles_20110710_15		Carson should be in a district wmajority Latino population	no				Unable to see map of what ADCDSD Carson is in
4langeles_20110710_16			no				
4langeles_20110710_17			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110710_18	7102011	Chitta Thiagarajah	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep same lines for PalmdaleLancaster, joining them with eastern Kern, Victorville, and San Bernardino; do not put PalmdaleLancaster with Sylmar and San Fernando Valley
4langeles_20110710_19	7102011	Judith Mintz	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep El SegundoManhattan Beach together, wbeach cities; Do not put WestchesterPlaya Del Rey wInglewood; keep Lomita wbeach cities; use 1st draft map El SegundoLomitaWestchesterPlaya Del Rey in, remove Carson, Harbor Gate, Gardena, Hawthorne
4langeles_20110710_20	7102011	Geraldine A. Jones	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Use first draft map; keep northern LA county cities PalmdaleLancaster together, put them weast Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino for SD; unite High Desert community
4langeles_20110710_21	7102011	David Schrader	no		Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the South Bay together, current map makes no sense
4langeles_20110710_22	7102011	David Hadley	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Use preliminary map, keeping South Bay together, from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes peninsula;
4langeles_20110710_23	7102011	Jean Wiltfong	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together with straight lines from Marina Del ReyVenice to Torrance and Palos Verdes; do not keep the lines as they currently are
4langeles_20110710_24	7102011	Van Anh Dastur	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Brentwood, keep with rep Henry Waxman
4langeles_20110710_25	7102011	Bonney Larson	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the districting lines as they currently are
4langeles_20110710_26	7102011	Nell Holder	no				yes	Keep the South Bay together in a direct line from Marina Del Rey to the Palos Verdes peninsula

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110710_18	Kern, San Bernardino	Palmdale, Lancaster, San Fernando		no	no		
4langeles_20110710_19		El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Lomita, Gardena, Hawthorne		no	yes	Westchester and Playa del Rey have nothing in common with Inglewood, they are separated by industrial zone and two freeways	
4langeles_20110710_20	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Palmdale, Lancaster		no	no		
4langeles_20110710_21				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_22				no	yes	South Bay is a COI	
4langeles_20110710_23		Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110710_24				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_25				no	no		
4langeles_20110710_26				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110710_18			no				
4langeles_20110710_19			no				
4langeles_20110710_20			no				
4langeles_20110710_21			no				
4langeles_20110710_22			no				
4langeles_20110710_23			no				
4langeles_20110710_24			no				
4langeles_20110710_25			no				
4langeles_20110710_26			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110710_27	7102011	Robert Hecht	no		Ranchos Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Rancho Palos Verdes to its old district; do not put it wMarina Del Rey and Palos Verdes peninsula
4langeles_20110710_28	7102011	William and Sheryl Dunn	no				yes	Keep High Desert (LancasterPalmdaleAntelope ValleyVictorvilleApple ValleyVictor Valley) as one district; do not put them with Los Angeles metro area; use original plan
5sbarbara_20110710_1	7112011	Hugh Thompson	no				yes	Do not divide Lompoc
5ventura_20110710_1	7102011	George Sylvester	no				yes	Leave Thousand Oaks and Simi Valley as they are; do not put LA county and Ventura county in same district
5ventura_20110710_2	7102011	Jerry L. Conrow	no				yes	Do not link Eastern Ventura county with LA via Malibu; keep with inland valleys; put Eastern Ventura with Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110710_3	7102011	Vera Kratochwill	no				yes	Do not join Ventura with LA county; put it with Santa Clarita instead
5ventura_20110710_4	7102011	Phyllis Melampy	no				yes	Connect east Ventura county with Santa Clarita
5ventura_20110710_5	7102011	Michael Zapf	no			Ventura	yes	Put Calabasas, Agoura, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Thousand Oaks, and Newbury Park together; could put them wcities to the west (Camarillo, Oxnard, Ventura), or wcities to the north (Simi Valley, Moorpark)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110710_27		Rancho Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110710_28		Lancaster, Palmdale, Victorville, Los Angeles		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110710_1		Lompoc		no	no		
5ventura_20110710_1	Los Angeles, Ventura	Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110710_2	Los Angeles, Ventura	Malibu, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110710_3	Losa Angeles, Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110710_4	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110710_5		Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo, Oxnard, Ventura, Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes	The Las Virgenes, Oak Park and Conejo Valley school districts join these cities; listed communities to be kept together share identity, schools, philosophy and concerns.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110710_27			no				
4langeles_20110710_28			no				
5sbarbara_20110710_1			no				
5ventura_20110710_1			no				
5ventura_20110710_2			no				
5ventura_20110710_3			no				
5ventura_20110710_4			no				
5ventura_20110710_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110710_6	7102011	Douglas Singleton	no				yes	Do not put Simi Valley (Ventura County) with Santa Clarita, Antelope Valley, or with LA county; keep Simi Valley with Wood Ranch.
7scruz_20110710_1	7102011	David Baskin	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz; if possible, do not split Santa Cruz county either; if county must be split, put part of it closest to Monterey with Monterey county
8marin_20110710_1	7102011	Anne Wagner	no		San Anselmo	Marin	yes	Put Marin with Sonoma, and if necessary, with North and Coastal areas
8marin_20110710_2	7102011	Patricia A. Field	no				yes	Keep Marin and Sonoma together; do not split up Marin; could add Point Richmond, Albany
8sfrancisco_20110710_1	7102011	111 INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS, RESIDENTS of Visitacion Valley, San Francisco	yes	Asian Law Caucus			yes	Put SF neighborhoods Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, Outer Mission and Crocker Amazon in Eastern SF AD, with Chinatown, Bayview, Mission and Bernal Heights

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110710_6	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Ventura community differs from LA county, has small town feel, residents do not want to associate wLA county problems like crime, traffic, corruption	
7scruz_20110710_1	Santa Cruz, Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	no		
8marin_20110710_1	Marin, Sonoma			no	yes	Marin and Sonoma share environmental protection history, depth of experience in preserving agricultural lands; this is of value to coastal areas	
8marin_20110710_2	Marin, Sonoma	Albany		no	yes	Marin and Sonoma share economies, rural desires, culture	
8sfrancisco_20110710_1		San Francisco		yes	yes	Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, Outer Mission and Crocker Amazon are a cohesive COI; share high poverty and unemployment rates, high pop born outside US, low education levels, transport corridors, need for svcs protection of rghts; also shared wChinatown	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110710_6			no				
7scruz_20110710_1			no				
8marin_20110710_1			no				
8marin_20110710_2			no				
8sfrancisco_20110710_1		Mission, Bernal Heights, Outer Mission, Excelsior, Visitacion Valley are Latino COI, should be kept together	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110710_1	7102011	Laura Barnett	no				yes	Do not put Shasta County with coastal counties from Del Norte dow the the Bay Area; Shasta citizens more closely related to Northern Central Valley; some connection to Sacramento, Bay Area, but no connection to north coastal region
9shasta_20110710_2	7102011	Robert Exter	no				yes	Do not put Redding with the coast
9shasta_20110710_3	7102011	Marilyn Opp Evers	no				yes	Put Shasta County with the I-5 corridor, not with coast
9shasta_20110710_4	7102011	Patricia Hunt Nelson	no			Shasta	yes	Do not put Shasta County with the coast
general_20110710_1	7102011	Linda Lawler Freitag	no				no	
general_20110710_2	7102011	Christine Vinquist	no				no	
supporterseventura_20110710_1	7102011	Marsha Brunner	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita
supporterseventura_20110710_2	7102011	Susan Kline	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110710_1	Shasta, Del Norte	Shasta		no	yes	Shasta shares industry, economy, employment, leisure with northern central valley, not with the coast	
9shasta_20110710_2		Redding		no	no		
9shasta_20110710_3	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110710_4	Shasta			no	no		
general_20110710_1				no	no		
general_20110710_2				no	no		
supporterseventura_20110710_1	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Keep inland valleys together; they have been connected in a SD for 30 years	
supporterseventura_20110710_2	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Keep inland valleys together; they have been connected in a SD for 30 years	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110710_1			no				
9shasta_20110710_2			no				Disappointed in CA government; The map shows liberal bias
9shasta_20110710_3			no				
9shasta_20110710_4			no				
general_20110710_1			no			Keep reasonable and straight lines in determining districts	
general_20110710_2			no			Consider where people live, not where they work, in drawing districts	
supporterseventura_20110710_1			no				
supporterseventura_20110710_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110710_3	7102011	Pam Dolin	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita
supporterseventura_20110710_4	7102011	John Absmeier	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita
supporterseventura_20110710_5	7102011	Joan Lopez	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita
supporterseventura_20110710_6	7102011	Matthew Hintlian	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita
supporterseventura_20110710_7	7102011	Ken	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110710_3	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Keep inland valleys together; they have been connected in a SD for 30 years	
supporterseventura_20110710_4	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Keep inland valleys together; they have been connected in a SD for 30 years	
supporterseventura_20110710_5	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Keep inland valleys together; they have been connected in a SD for 30 years	
supporterseventura_20110710_6	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Keep inland valleys together; they have been connected in a SD for 30 years	
supporterseventura_20110710_7	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes	Keep inland valleys together; they have been connected in a SD for 30 years	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110710_3			no				
supporterseventura_20110710_4			no				
supporterseventura_20110710_5			no				
supporterseventura_20110710_6			no				
supporterseventura_20110710_7			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110710_8	7102011	Robert Caughey	no				yes	Comply wpublic testimony do not put East Ventura county wMalibu, Pacific Palisades, and 101 corridor in the valley; put East Ventura wSanta Clarita; keep Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark wSanta Clarita
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_1	7102011	Vanessa Safoyan	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_2	7102011	Matthew Hicks	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_3	7102011	Richard Tomasheski	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_4	7102011	Maynard N. Davis	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110710_8	Ventura	Malibu, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	no		
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_1	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_2	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_3	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_4	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110710_8			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_1			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_2			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_3			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_5	7102011	Scott Wilk Jr.	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_6	7102011	Dianne Van Hook	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_7	7102011	Richard Sandnes	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_8	7102011	Marian Sandnes	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_9	7102011	Jane Leach	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_5	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_6	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_7	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_8	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_9	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_5			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_6			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_7			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_8			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_9			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_10	7102011	Danielle Smith	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_11	7102011	Diane Gross	no				yes	Do not use 7811 map for AVSCVSFV (Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, San Fernando Valley) SD; These lines do not represent a COI; Connect Santa Clarita Valley with communities in East Ventura
supporterseventura_20110708_3	7082011	Elaine Smith	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_4	7082011	Janice Wurschum	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_5	7082011	Ernest Wurschum	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_6	7082011	William Mors	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_10	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_11	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are a COI, have been together since 1982	
supporterseventura_20110708_3	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_4	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_5	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_6	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_10			no				
supporterssclaritavalley_20110710_11			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_3			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_4			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_5			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110708_7	7082011	Michael Davidson	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_8	7082011	Josie Hirsch	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_9	7082011	Ken Hirsch	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_10	7082011	Pamela Faulkner	no			Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_11	7082011	Pamela Faulkner	no			Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_12	7082011	Larry D. Faulkner	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110708_7	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_8	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_9	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_10	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_11	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_12	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110708_7			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_8			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_9			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_10			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_11			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_12			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110708_13	7082011	Carol Traver	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_14	7082011	Kate Morgan	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_15	7082011	Tom Dolz	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_16	7082011	Linda J. Dusky	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_17	7082011	Richard L. Senate	no			Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_18	7082011	Michael Eiseman	no				yes	Do not connect East Ventura Co. with Encino,Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110708_13	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_14	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_15	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_16	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_17	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_18	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades,Encino		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110708_13			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_14			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_15			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_16			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_17			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_18			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110708_19	7082011	Joanne Wright	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_20	7082011	Terry Howard	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_21	7082011	Guido Pipia	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_23	7082011	Mark Savalla	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_24	7082011	Vondel McGrath	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_25	7082011	La Donna Martinez	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110708_19	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades,Encino		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_20	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_21	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_23	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_24	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_25	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110708_19			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_20			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_21			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_23			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_24			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_25			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110708_26	7082011	John Kallimani	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_27	7082011	John Kallimani	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_28	7082011	Annette Hines	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_29	7082011	Cheyenne Robertson	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
5ventura_20110708_9	7082011	Carol Munselle	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita.Not with Pacific Palisades.
6merced_20110708_1	7082011	Dawn M. Daniels Brown	no		Merced	Merced	yes	Extend Merced borders to the south vice to the east.Use Coastal ranges as national boundary for 12th dist.Keep Stanislaus,Merced,Madera,Fresno,Tulare,Kern Counties together.If needed,add San Benito or Mariposa because of similar interests.
7sclara_20110708_1	7082011	Eve Bukowski	yes	TechNet			yes	Keep Silicon Valley intact.Keep previous maps,do not group it with Alameda Co.Silicon Valley needs one voice in congress.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110708_26	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_27	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_28	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_29	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
5ventura_20110708_9	Ventura,Los Angeles	Pacific Palisades		no	yes		
6merced_20110708_1	Merced,Mariposa,Stanislaus,San Benito,Madero,Fresno,Tulare,Kern		coastal ranges	no	yes	Agriculture,water concerns,air quality issues,Rural	
7sclara_20110708_1	Santa Clara,Alameda	Silicon Valley,San Jose		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110708_26			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_27			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_28			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_29			no				
5ventura_20110708_9	Similar issues and concerns.		no				
6merced_20110708_1	Similar interests,agricultural and rural.		yes	Merced	Keep Merced with listed communities		
7sclara_20110708_1	Industrial high tech area, needs to be together to work well.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110708_2	7082011	Chris Arriola	yes	La Raza Lawyers of Santa Clara County			yes	Keep Congressional districts in Santa Clara Co. keep significant Latino Presense.View Attached Map.
7sclara_20110708_3	7082011	Brian Brennan	yes	Silicon Valley Leadership Group			yes	Attached letter from Org. CEO Carl Guardino.Santa Clara Co and San Mateo Co. are Silicon Valley and need to be in CD. Do not change this, do not put with Alameda.
7scruz_20110708_1	7082011	Velma	no				yes	It is fine to split Santa Cruz.It will be fine.
7scruz_20110708_2	7082011	Ross Clark	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole.
7scruz_20110708_3	7082011	Melanie Premo	no				yes	Please split city of Santa Cruz.Santa Cruz dominates the entire county.
7scruz_20110708_4	7082011	Mary Flodin	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz into two CDs.
7scruz_20110708_5	7082011	Howard Schneider	no				yes	Do not divide City of Santa Cruz,it is a COI.
7scruz_20110708_6	7082011	Cherie Mietz	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two CDs.
7scruz_20110708_7	7082011	Marilyn Rigler	no				yes	Reconsider split of Santa Cruz county.DO not split it into two districts.
8alameda_20110708_1	7082011	Aref Aziz	no				yes	Do not split Fremont in two and lump pieces with Santa Clara County and East San Jose.This would dilute growing South Asian COI in Bay area.Do not revert back to 1st draft maps.Unify Tri Cities in Alameda County district.for Congress.
8alameda_20110708_2	7082011	Donna Olson	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Pleased with New visualizations for congressional map for Tri Cities area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110708_2	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	no		
7sclara_20110708_3	Santa Clara,Alameda,San Mateo	San Jose,Silicon Valley		no	no		
7scruz_20110708_1	Santa Cruz			no	no		
7scruz_20110708_2	Santa Cruz			no	yes		
7scruz_20110708_3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110708_4	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110708_5	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110708_6	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110708_7	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
8alameda_20110708_1	Alamada,Santa Clara	Fremont		yes	yes		
8alameda_20110708_2	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110708_2			no				
7sclara_20110708_3			no				
7scruz_20110708_1			no				
7scruz_20110708_2	active political community that should be allowed to be represented as a community.		no				
7scruz_20110708_3			no				
7scruz_20110708_4	Split would hurt community.		no				
7scruz_20110708_5	It is one COI.		no				
7scruz_20110708_6	Residents benefit from single,strong voice.		no				
7scruz_20110708_7	No different is demographics,income or voting patterns between city.		no				
8alameda_20110708_1	Keep Asian community together, give equal representation.		no				
8alameda_20110708_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110708_3	7082011	Jacob Eapen	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Pleased with new visualizations.Support Hayward,Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas CD in Alameda Co.
8alameda_20110708_4	7082011	Luck Chart	no				yes	Pleased with new visualizations.Support Hayward,Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas CD in Alameda Co.
8alameda_20110708_5	7082011	Rakesh Sharma	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Pleased with new visualizations.Support Hayward,Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas CD in Alameda Co.
8alameda_20110708_6	7082011	Charlie Scribner	no				yes	Pleased with new visualizations.Support Hayward,Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas CD in Alameda Co.
8alameda_20110708_7	7082011	Janet Crocker	no		Newark	Alameda	yes	Keep map that groups Tri City area of Fremont,Union City,Newark together.
8alameda_20110708_10	7082011	Carol Dutra Vernaci	no		Union City	Alameda	yes	Thank you for Keeping Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas together in same CD.
8alameda_20110708_11	7082011	Charlie Scribner	no				yes	Pleased with new visualizations.Support Hayward,Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas CD in Alameda Co.
8ccosta_20110708_1	7082011	Toni Favila	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond together in one CD.
8ccosta_20110708_2	7082011	Amy Ukena	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Richmond in Contra Costa, and do not redistrict it into Alameda
8marin_20110708_1	7082011	Lynn Woolsey	no				yes	Sixth District should be all of Marin, and extend more into Sonoma,north toward Mendocino Co Line or East through Sonoma Valley.Should start at SonomaMendocino Border,Include Santa Rosa,stop at Golden Gate Bridge in Marin.
8marin_20110708_2	7082011	Colleen Kern	no			Marin	yes	San Francisco should not be included with Marin.Keep our district north of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110708_3	Alameda	Hayward,Union City,Fremont,Newark,Milpitas		no	yes		
8alameda_20110708_4	Alameda	Hayward,Union City,Fremont,Newark,Milpitas		no	yes		
8alameda_20110708_5	Alameda	Hayward,Union City,Fremont,Newark,Milpitas		no	yes		
8alameda_20110708_6	Alameda	Hayward,Union City,Fremont,Newark,Milpitas		no	yes		
8alameda_20110708_7	Alameda	Fremont,Union City,Newark		no	no		
8alameda_20110708_10	Alameda	Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas		no	no		
8alameda_20110708_11	Alameda	Hayward,Union City,Fremont,Newark,Milpitas		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110708_1	Contra Costa	Richmond		no	yes	Urban,green business concerns	
8ccosta_20110708_2	Contra Costa,Alameda	Richmond		no	no		
8marin_20110708_1	Marin,Sonoma,Mendocino	Santa Rosa	Golden Gate Bridge	no	no		
8marin_20110708_2	Marin		Golden Gate Bridge	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110708_3	Gives voice to Tri City area.		no				
8alameda_20110708_4	Gives voice to Tri City area.		no				
8alameda_20110708_5	Gives voice to Tri City area.		no				
8alameda_20110708_6	Gives voice to Tri City area.		no				
8alameda_20110708_7			no				
8alameda_20110708_10			no				
8alameda_20110708_11	Gives voice to Tri City area.		no				
8ccosta_20110708_1			no				
8ccosta_20110708_2			no				
8marin_20110708_1			no				
8marin_20110708_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8napa_20110708_1	7082011	John Beatty	no			Napa	yes	Do not group Napa with Vallejo or Solana Co.
8sfrancisco_20110708_1	7082011	Carlo De La Cruz	yes	Asian Law Caucus			yes	Attached letter for San Francisco AD.Excelsior,Visitacion Valley,Outer Mission,Crocker Amazon must be placed in East San Francisco AD.Along with Chinatown,Bay View,Mission,Bernal Heights.
9shasta_20110708_1	7082011	Frieda A. Smith	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is a part of the I 5 community.Not a part of the coast.
9shasta_20110708_2	7082011	Lawrence Schuler	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is a part of the I 5 community.Not a part of the coast.
9shasta_20110708_3	7082011	Lois M. Schuler	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is a part of the I 5 community.Not a part of the coast.
9shasta_20110708_4	7082011	Marjorie Lawrence	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Redding is a part of I 5 corridor.not a part of the pacific coast.Leave Redding in CA valley district of I 5 for Assembly, Senate and Congress
9shasta_20110708_5	7082011	Fred Erickson	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is a part of the I 5 community.Not a part of the coast.
9shasta_20110708_6	7082011	Marjorie Duey	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is a part of the I 5 community.Not a part of the coast.
9shasta_20110708_7	7082011	Norma Comnick	yes	Mayor of Anderson	Anderson	Shasta	yes	We should remain Shasta,Tehams,Siskiyou and Trinity counties for I 5 corridor.Do not redistrict Shasta to the coastal communities.
9yolo_20110708_1	7082011	Kerry Wicker	no		Esparto	Yolo	yes	Move Esparto into one of two neighboring Ads,and proposed neighboring CD.View Attached Maps.Esparto belongs in a progressive,not conservative district with EastSouth Yolo,greater Sacramento region.Suggest WSAC dist., or at least in ECC dist.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8napa_20110708_1	Napa,Solano,Vallejo			no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110708_1	San Franciso	San Francisco		yes	yes	Asian American population,LGBT Community,second language,foreign born status,low rates of educational attainment,	
9shasta_20110708_1	Shasta		I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110708_2	Shasta		I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110708_3	Shasta		I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110708_4	Shasta	Redding	I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110708_5	Shasta		I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110708_6	Shasta		I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9shasta_20110708_7	Shasta,Tehams,Siskiyou,Trinity		I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9yolo_20110708_1	Yolo	Esparto,Sacramento		no	yes	Progressive community,	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8napa_20110708_1			no				I will not pay taxes if redistricted out of Napa.
8sfrancisco_20110708_1	Keep ethnic group together in one district.		no				
9shasta_20110708_1			no				
9shasta_20110708_2			no				
9shasta_20110708_3			no				
9shasta_20110708_4			no				
9shasta_20110708_5			no				
9shasta_20110708_6			no				
9shasta_20110708_7			no				
9yolo_20110708_1	Get Esparto out of Conservative district and with less rural area.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110708_1	7082011	Erica Teasley Linnick	yes	CAPAFR, MALDEF, African American Redistricting Collaborative (AARC)			yes	Do not group African Americans in many dist.;lines in LA have ignored hard work of AARC,CAPAFR,MALDEF. You cannot split these Los Angeles communities of interest. They are protected.You must redraw to give minority groups some kind of influence.
general_20110708_2	7082011	Bob Richmond	no				no	
general_20110708_3	7092011	Cheryl Fisher	no				no	
general_20110708_4	7082011	Marisa Hewitt	no				yes	Keep Glenn Co intact for MTCAPNEWCD2. Retain Truckee in Nevada Co for MTCAPNEWCD2.
general_20110708_5	7082011	Jerry Roads	no				yes	Populations are way off in newest BOE maps for LAOrange County district.It has 6 million,should have 14 million.
general_20110708_6	7082011	Drag Dutina	no				yes	Continue to leave Fremont together as one entity.
supporterseventura_20110708_1	7082011	Kathy Ellis	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
supporterseventura_20110708_2	7082011	Elaine Smith	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110708_1	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	no		
general_20110708_2				no	no		
general_20110708_3				no	no		
general_20110708_4	Glenn,Nevada	Truckee,Willows,Orland		no	yes	Native American Population and Hispanic Households	
general_20110708_5	Los Angeles,Orange			no	no		
general_20110708_6	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_1	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
supporterseventura_20110708_2	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110708_1		Guilty of Racially Polarized Voting.The CRC lacks experience with enforcing the VRA. Including enforcement of sections 2 and 5.	no				
general_20110708_2			no				Good luck,this process is messed up.
general_20110708_3			no			Rezoning will end up costing public more money.I was told it was to eliminate prop 13 and and spend more money.	
general_20110708_4			no				
general_20110708_5			no				
general_20110708_6			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_1			no				
supporterseventura_20110708_2			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterseventura_20110708_22	7082011	Joy A. Coe	no				yes	Connect East Ventura Co with Santa Clarita. Not with Malibu, Pacific Palisades.Important to keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley together with Santa Clarita in Senate Seat.
4langeles_20110708_4	7082011	Robert Branch	no				yes	Keep SouthBay together.Keep lines straight from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Penninsula.
4langeles_20110708_6	7082011	Michael DeLeeuw	no				yes	Keep Pasadena together under one congressman.Do not put Pasadena with Chino Hills.Keep Upland in a district with its county.Assembly,senate districts look good for Pasadena.
4langeles_20110708_7	7082011	Nina Royal	no			Los Angeles	yes	Sunland Tujunga Community should be with La Crescent Montrose Glendale,Burbank area.
4langeles_20110708_8	7082011	R. Goldberg	no			Los Angeles	yes	Westwood,Fairfax,Miracle Mile should be in district with Beverly Hills.Take out Venice and Santa Monica.Put Santa Monica in a distict with the mountains,exclude east of Brentwood.
4langeles_20110708_9	7082011	Andrew Lachman	yes	Mid City West Neighborhood Council		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide the council in half.Keep Miracle Mile,Melrose,Beverly Fairfax,Burton Way Corridor together.
4langeles_20110708_10	7082011	J. Sullivan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Pico Robertson and Westwood from Beverly Hills.
4langeles_20110708_11	7082011	Cindy Cleghorn	no				no	
4langeles_20110708_12	7082011	Nina Royal	no			Los Angeles	yes	Sunland Tujunga foothill district should be with GlendaleBurbank.Not with San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110708_13	7082011	Ray Pendergraft	no			Los Angeles	yes	South Bay needs to be kept together with Palos Verdes and Marina Del Rey.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterseventura_20110708_22	Ventura,Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita,Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	no		
4langeles_20110708_4	Los Angeles	Marina Dey Rey	Palos Verdes Peninsula	no	no		
4langeles_20110708_6	Los Angeles	Pasadena,Chino Hills,Glendale,Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110708_7	Los Angeles	La Crescent,Montrose,Burbank,Glendale		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110708_8	Los Angeles	Los Angeles,Santa Monica,El Segundo,Venice,Westwood,Fairfax,Miracle Mile.		yes	yes	Shopping,social interaction,shared government officials.	
4langeles_20110708_9	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes	Parks,Museum,social centers,Jewish communities,	
4langeles_20110708_10	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110708_11				no	no		
4langeles_20110708_12	Los Angeles	Burbank,Glendale		yes	yes	Non spanish speaking	
4langeles_20110708_13	Los Angeles	Palos Verdes,Marina Del Rey,Los Angeles		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterseventura_20110708_22			no				
4langeles_20110708_4			no				
4langeles_20110708_6			no				
4langeles_20110708_7	Need to be with COI neighbors.		no				
4langeles_20110708_8	Keep Beach cities together.		no				
4langeles_20110708_9			no				
4langeles_20110708_10	this would divide Persian American and Armenian American COIs in half.		no				
4langeles_20110708_11			no				
4langeles_20110708_12	We will lose our voice if grouped with San Fernando		no				
4langeles_20110708_13			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110708_14	7082011	Rosanna Libertucci	no				yes	South Bay needs to be kept together with Palos Verdes and Marina Del Rey.
4langeles_20110708_15	7082011	Ms. Weber	no				yes	Keep South Bay Area from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes together with straight lines. Do not include Santa Monica and Carson Areas.
4langeles_20110708_16	7082011	Barbara S. Stones	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Hacienda Heights should stay with Puente Hills,La Habra,Whittier,La Mirada.Keep Whittier based district with Southeast Los Angeles Co.
5ventura_20110708_1	7082011	Bob Gutierrez	yes	Latino Policy Forum			yes	Senate East Ventura county should be witth Santa Clarita.Not with Malibu and Encino.
5ventura_20110708_2	7082011	Ronald Golden	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Place Simi Valley with Santa Clarita Valley and not with Los Angeles Coastal Cities like Malibu,Topanga,Pacific Palisades.
5ventura_20110708_3	7082011	Cathi Scheurn	no			Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura County to Santa Clarita.Current maps do not show what the community looks like.
5ventura_20110708_4	7082011	Kathleen Parsa	no				yes	Connect East Ventura County to Santa Clarita. In the state senate seat.
5ventura_20110708_5	7082011	William Hicks	no				yes	Connect Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita Valley together in Senate Seat.Not with Los Angeles Malibu, San Fernando,Santa Monica
5ventura_20110708_6	7082011	Mike Gratland	no				yes	Connect Thousand Oaks,Simi Valley area with Santa Clarita area.
5ventura_20110708_7	7082011	Katherine Styers	no				yes	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks should be kept together.Should not be linked with Malibu,Pacific Palisades along 101 Corridor.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110708_14	Los Angeles	Palos Verdes,Marina Del Rey,Los Angeles		yes	no		
4langeles_20110708_15	Los Angeles	Santa Monica,Carson,Marina Del Rey,Palos Verdes		yes	no		
4langeles_20110708_16	Los Angeles	Puente Hills,Hacienda Heights,Whittier,La Habra,La Mirada		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110708_1	Los Angeles,Ventura	Simi Valley,Malibu,Encino,Santa Clarita		yes	no		
5ventura_20110708_2	Ventura,Los Angeles	Malibu,Simi Valley,Topanga,Pacific Palisades		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110708_3	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110708_4	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110708_5	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Santa Clarita,Malibu,San Fernando,Santa Monica		yes	yes		
5ventura_20110708_6	Ventura	Simi Valley,Thousand Oaks,Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110708_7	Ventura,Los Angeles	Simi Valley,Moorpark,Thousand Oaks,Malibu,Pacific Palisades	101 corridor	yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110708_14			no				
4langeles_20110708_15			no				
4langeles_20110708_16	Keeps similar areas together.		no				
5ventura_20110708_1			no				
5ventura_20110708_2	Much more in common		no				
5ventura_20110708_3			no				
5ventura_20110708_4			no				
5ventura_20110708_5	splitting COI would hurt our lifestyle and commonality.		no				
5ventura_20110708_6			no				
5ventura_20110708_7	would be best represented by the same senator		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110708_8	7082011	Gladys Johnson	no				yes	Keep Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita.
6kern_20110708_1	7082011	Lois Beres	no			Kern	yes	Do not put Ridgecrest and Eastern Sierra in a district.Rethink Option number 5 as opposed to number 6.
6kern_20110708_2	7082011	Martha Jauregui	no			Kern	yes	First map is fine.Bakersfield has never been kind to Ridgecrest.Do not group them.
8alameda_20110708_8	7082011	Anonymous	no				yes	Thank you taking Tri City Input into consideration
8alameda_20110708_9	7082011	Michelle W. Snowden	no				yes	Pleased with new visualizations.Support Hayward,Fremont,Newark,Union City,Milpitas CD in Alameda Co.
9shasta_20110708_8	7082011	Frieda Smith	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is a part of the I 5 community.Not a part of the coast.
9siskiyou_20110708_1	7082011	Lina Tallerico	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Please return to 1900 maps. Interior counties are not connected to the lifestyle of Coast counties.
2sbernardino_20110708_1	7082011	Edward G. Shea	no		Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	yes	Do not place Rancho Cucamonga with San Gabriel Mountain district.Keep it with the rest of the city.
2sbernardino_20110708_2	7082011	Walter Hawkins	no				no	
3orange_20110708_1	7082011	Steven Choi	yes	Irvine City Council	Irvine	Orange	yes	Keep Irvine with South Orange County.Not with Coastal cities like Huntington beach.Irvine is COI with Lake Forest,Mission Viejo,Laguna Hills,El Toro.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110708_8	Ventura	Thousand Oaks,Moorpark,Simi Valley,Santa Clarita		yes	yes		
6kern_20110708_1	Kern	Ridgecrest,Sierra		no	yes		
6kern_20110708_2	Kern	Ridgecrest,Bakersfield		no	no		
8alameda_20110708_8	Alameda			no	no		
8alameda_20110708_9	Alameda	Hayward,Union City,Fremont,Newark,Milpitas		no	yes		
9shasta_20110708_8	Shasta		I 5 Corridor	no	no		
9siskiyou_20110708_1	Siskiyou			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110708_1	San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga		yes	no		
2sbernardino_20110708_2				no	no		
3orange_20110708_1	Orange	Lake Forest,Mission Viejo,Laguna Hills,El Toro, Irvine, Huntington Beach.		no	yes	Airport concerns,water district,inland community.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110708_8	Historically connected,link will better represent us.		no				
6kern_20110708_1	Keep military happy,city people Vs military		no				
6kern_20110708_2			no				
8alameda_20110708_8			no				
8alameda_20110708_9	Gives voice to Tri City area.		no				
9shasta_20110708_8			no				
9siskiyou_20110708_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110708_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110708_2			no				Please release second draft maps so they can be distributed through communities.for San Bernardino County in particular, high density maps should be released to public for review.
3orange_20110708_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110708_2	7082011	P. Laird	no			Orange	yes	Los Alamitos,Cypress,Rossmoor should be in Orange County district.
3orange_20110708_3	7082011	Julie Colombero	no		Aliso Viejo	Orange	yes	Do not split Aliso Viejo.
3orange_20110708_4	7082011	Carolyn Cavecche	no			Orange	yes	CD map 2011.07.08 STHOC works well for Orange.Use this map and do not use City of Orange as a bridge between AnaheimSanta Ana.
3orange_20110708_5	7082011	Bijan Mazarji	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Keep Irvine with South Orange Co. COI with Lake Forest,Aliso Viejo.Huntington Beach is not similar.
4langeles_20110708_1	7082011	Curt and Monica Siverts	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep SouthBay together.Keep lines straight from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Penninsula.
4langeles_20110708_2	7082011	Laurie Mills	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep SouthBay together.Keep lines straight from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Penninsula.
4langeles_20110708_3	7082011	Eric Lawrence	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep the SouthBay together.
4langeles_20110708_5	7082011	Keith Chatprapachai	yes	Thai American Chamber of Commerce			yes	Do not divide Thai Town into two separate Assembly districts.It should not be in an upper inome assembly or senate distrit with Beverly Hills and Malibu.Place Thai Town in LADNT or LAELA assembly,whole.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110708_2	Orange	Los Alamitos,Cypress,Rossmoor.		no	no		
3orange_20110708_3	Orange	Aliso Viejo		no	no		
3orange_20110708_4	Orange	Orange,Anaheim,Santa Ana		no	no		
3orange_20110708_5	Orange	Irvine,Lake Forest,Aliso Viejo,Huntington Beach		no	yes	Safe,Urban community with planned communities.	
4langeles_20110708_1	Los Angeles	Marina Dey Rey	Palos Verdes Peninsula	no	no		
4langeles_20110708_2	Los Angeles	Marina Dey Rey	Palos Verdes Peninsula	no	no		
4langeles_20110708_3	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110708_5	Los Angeles	Beverly Hills,Malibu,Thai Town		yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110708_2			no				
3orange_20110708_3			no				I cannot tell where on the maps my home is. Can someone please help ?
3orange_20110708_4			no				
3orange_20110708_5			no				
4langeles_20110708_1			no				
4langeles_20110708_2			no				
4langeles_20110708_3			no				
4langeles_20110708_5	Keep Thai town with other asian COIs.Particular needs based on Income,english as second language		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110708_1	7082011	Palma Hooper,Ofelia Dirige,Benjamin Macapugay,Crisabel Ramos,Florfina Arce,Ernie Sasis,Kristina Fuerte,Luz Labsan,Marcel Ocampo,Reymon Padilla,Ryan Gabrintina,Teddora Cajucom,Eduardo Alfonso,Edwin Bisco	yes	SCAPAL,We Are One Filipino,Filipino American Chamber of Commerce,COPAO,Kalusugan Community Services			yes	Do not split Asian AmericanPacific Islander COI in National City,Paradise Hills,Chula Vista,Bonita,Bay Terrace.Redraw lines similar to CAPAFR MALDEF AARC.Do not put Linda Vista with a coastal district.Poway should not be split from Mra Mesa,Sorrento

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110708_1	San Diego	Poway,Mra Mesa,Kearny Mesa,Sorrento Valley,Rancho Penasquitos,Carmel Valley,Rancho Bernardo,Chula Vista,National City,Paradise Hills,Bay Terrace,Bonita		yes	yes	Federal issues,equity for Filipino world war II veterans and families,immigration reform concerns,Health, Education concerns.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110708_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110708_1	7082011	Palma Hooper,Ofelia Dirige,Benjamin Macapugay,Crisabel Ramos,Florfina Arce,Ernie Sasis,Kristina Fuerte,Luz Labsan,Marcel Ocampo,Reymon Padilla,Ryan Gabrintina,Teddora Cajucom,Eduardo Alfonso,Edwin Bisco	yes	SCAPAL,We Are One Filipino,Filipino American Chamber of Commerce,COPAO,Kalusugan Community Services			yes	Valley,Rancho Penasquitos,Rancho Bernardo.
1sdiego_20110708_2	7082011	Marie Waldron	yes	Escondido City Council			yes	Unite Escondido into one assembly seat and include with COI of Valley Center,San Marcos,Hidden Meadows,Fallbrook,Poway,Ramona.Do not stretch this district up into Riverside County.
1sdiego_20110708_3	7082011	Valerie Sanfilippo	no				yes	For Linda Vista urban low income included with Pt. Loma Do not make cuts at 163-805 cross.Include Clairemont Linda Vista,Serra Mesa,Boundaries should be 5 on west,52 on north,15 on east,8 on south.For Linda Vista,Central San Diego put with El Cajon East

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110708_1	San Diego	Poway,Mra Mesa,Kearny Mesa,Sorrento Valley,Rancho Penasquitos,Carmel Valley,Rancho Bernardo,Chula Vista,National City,Paradise Hills,Bay Terrace,Bonita		yes	yes	Federal issues,equity for Filipino world war II veterans and families,immigration reform concerns,Health, Education concerns.	
1sdiego_20110708_2	San Diego,Riverside	Escondido,Valley Center,San Marcos,Hidden Meadows,Fallbrook,Poway ,Ramona		no	no		
1sdiego_20110708_3	San Diego,	Linda Vista,Pt. Loma,Clairemont,Serra Mesa,El Cajon,San Diego	163805 Interstate crossing,5,52,15,8,94	yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110708_1			no				
1sdiego_20110708_2			no				
1sdiego_20110708_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110708_3	7082011	Valerie Sanfilippo	no				yes	County suburban,not part of San Diego C.Keep Clairemont,Linda Vista,Serra Mesa boundaries 5 on West,52 North,15 on East,94 South.
1sdiego_20110708_4	7082011	Nicholaus W. Norvell	no				yes	Support July 8 version of Chula Vista National City CD,because it unifies San Diego LGBT COI by including Mission Hills and Balboa Park.Interstate 5 provides natural diving line.Retain the July 8th verstion.
2riverside_20110708_1	7082011	Rita Drahos	no		Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Do not split Cathedral City form other Desert cities.Keep Desert Hot Springs through Coachella together and with Riverside.Riverside has nothing in common with Imperial Co.Imperial goes with San Diego.
2riverside_20110708_2	7082011	Benjamin Guitron	no				yes	View Attached Map.
2riverside_20110708_3	7082011	Mary Helen Kelly	no			Riverside	yes	Do not put Coachella Valley with Imperial County.Keep it with Riverside.
2riverside_20110712_8b	7122011	Dennis M. Stratton,	no			Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley is tourism. Is not agriculture COI. All cities must remain intact. No COI with Imperial. Valley shares education, health care, emergency communications
2riverside_20110712_9b	7122011	Randall Morton	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not remove W half of valley and include with Imperial. Prefer to have entire valley in 80th AD. Imperial and Coachella interests are vastly different, agricultural vs. resorttourist area. Imperial watns to be with San Diego

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110708_3	San Diego,	Linda Vista,Pt. Loma,Clairemont,Serra Mesa,El Cajon,San Diego	163805 Interstate crossing,5,52,15,8,94	yes	no		
1sdiego_20110708_4	San Diego	Chula Vista,National City,Mission Hills,Balboa Park,Talmadge	interstate 5	yes	yes		
2riverside_20110708_1	San Diego,Riverside,Imperial	Cathedral City,Desert Hot Springs,Coachella,Palm Springs,		yes	yes	Salton sea concerns,not agricultural,	
2riverside_20110708_2	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110708_3	Riverside,Imperial			yes	yes	tourism,lawfire protection,medical and court systems.	
2riverside_20110712_8b	Riverside, Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110712_9b	San Diego, Imperial	Coachella Valley,		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110708_3			no				
1sdiego_20110708_4	Unifies San Diego LGBT community.		no				
2riverside_20110708_1			no				
2riverside_20110708_2			no				
2riverside_20110708_3			no				
2riverside_20110712_8b	education, health care, emergency systems		no			no COI with imperial	
2riverside_20110712_9b			no			agriculture vs. resortseniortourism	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110712_10b	7122011	Charlene Stover	no		Hemet	Riverside	yes	Keep first maps drawn for Hemet San Jacinto area with Coachella Valley. Agrees with competitive districts. SJV has been divided between 2 CDs for ten years and will now be united. Interests lie with semi-rural Coachella vs. industrial, business Riverside
2riverside_20110712_11b	7122011	Doris M. Ellis	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley and Imperial County should ot be divided. Share desert, history, water, utilities, tourism, climate, agriculture, green energy, Salton Sea
2riverside_20110712_12b	7122011	Doris	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley and Imperial County should ot be divided. Share desert, history, water, utilities, tourism, climate, agriculture, green energy, Salton Sea
3orange_20110712_1b	7122011	Kathleen Fay	no			Orange	yes	There is area of Aliso Viejo that has more in common with Laguna Beach than rest of Aliso Viejo school districts, sports teams, boards, etc. South of Calle Corte, East of El Toro, North of Aliso creek, west of Westwing.
3orange_20110712_2b	7122011	Diane Rush	no				yes	Do not assign Rossmoor to Richardsons Long Beach District. Politics of Long Beach are notorious as is Richardson as a congresswoman
4langeles_20110712_1b	7122011	Clay Baker	no		Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Is it true committee is re-gerrymandering 36th CD in favor of one party?
4langeles_20110712_2b	7122011	Joe Vinatieri, Councilmember	yes	City of Whittier	Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Whittier and SE LA together, but do not spread core COI of Whittier, La Habra, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, La Mirada. Include Cerritos in CD, SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110712_10b	Riverside	Hemet, San Jacinto, Coachella Valley,		no	yes		competitive districts
2riverside_20110712_11b	Imperial	Indio		no	yes		
2riverside_20110712_12b	Imperial	Indio		no	yes		
3orange_20110712_1b		Aliso Viejjo, Laguna Beach	Aliso Creek, El Toro, Calle Corte, Westwing	no	yes		
3orange_20110712_2b		Rossmor, Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_1b				no	no		
4langeles_20110712_2b		Whittier, Cerritos, La Habra, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, La Mirada		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110712_10b	high percentage of retirees, agricultural workers, Salton Sea		no			rural vs. industrial	
2riverside_20110712_11b	desert, history, water, utilities, tourism, climate, agriculture, green energy, Salton Sea		no			dividing will result in lack of representation	
2riverside_20110712_12b	desert, history, water, utilities, tourism, climate, agriculture, green energy, Salton Sea		no			dividing will result in lack of representation	
3orange_20110712_1b	school district, school boards		no				
3orange_20110712_2b			no				
4langeles_20110712_1b			no				
4langeles_20110712_2b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110712_3b	7122011	Pamela M. Edminister	no		Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale together, in Northern LA County with East Kern and Victor Valley San Bernardino in same SD. Keep SD in first draft
4langeles_20110712_4b	7122011	Ernestine S. Elster, Ph.D, Research Fellow	yes	Cotson Institute of Archaeology UCLA	Marina de Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Ridiculous to separate Marina Del ReyVenice from Santa Monica into separate CDAD. Contiguous beach communities tourism, coastal, run-off, fragile ecosystem, water quality
4langeles_20110712_5b	7122011	Jan Book Meyers	no		Marina de Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Opposes separation of Santa Monica, Venice, and Marina del Rey share tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile coastal ecosystem, water quality concerns, mutual interests. SM Bay has little in common with inland communities
4langeles_20110712_6b	7122011		no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes, including Torrance, with straight lines. Maintain community
4langeles_20110712_7b	7122011	Marc Mitchell	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Mar Vista and South Bay together in same district, similar economic interests.
4langeles_20110712_8b	7122011	Jose Cornejo	no		Panorama City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Panorama City in same AD with Studio City and Valley Village. Poor community has more in common with Winnetka, Canoga Park, Reseda than Studio City. Home values are very different. SFV deserves own Senate seat.
4langeles_20110712_9b	7122011	Marisela Cervantes	no				yes	Nest AD s within Senate, have compact districts around downtown LA. Sante Fe Springs, Artesia, and Cerritos share local economy. Initial Draft had better districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110712_3b	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, East Kern, Victor Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_4b		Santa Monica, Marina Del Rey, Venice		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_5b		Santa Monica, Venice Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_6b		South Bay, Marina del Rey, Palos Verdes, Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_7b		Mar Vista, South Bay		no	yes		similar economic interests
4langeles_20110712_8b		Panorama City, Studio City, Winnetka, Canoga Park, Reseda		no	yes		working poor community
4langeles_20110712_9b	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Santa Fe Springs, Artesia, Cerritos		no	yes		local economy

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110712_3b	high desert COI		no				
4langeles_20110712_4b	Contiguous beach communities tourism, coastal, run-off, fragile ecosystem, water quality		no				
4langeles_20110712_5b	share tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile coastal ecosystem, water quality concerns, mutual interests.		no			nothing in common with inland communities	
4langeles_20110712_6b	sense of community		no				
4langeles_20110712_7b			no				
4langeles_20110712_8b			no			home values very different	
4langeles_20110712_9b			no			Artesia and Cerritos are not Orange County	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110712_10b	7122011	Margo L. Thomas	no				yes	Release all studies considered when drawing lines. Be true to process you laid out. With general transparency, consider community testimony
4langeles_20110712_11b	7122011	Eugene McCarthy	no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with Straight Lines
4langeles_20110712_12b	7122011	Sandra Peterson	no		Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Palos Verdes Peninsula belongs in map with Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox, beach communities. Nothing in common with Venice and Santa Monica.
4langeles_20110712_13b	7122011	Marcia Hanscom	no		Ballona	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Ballona wetlands ecosystem. Washington Blvd to N, 90 fwy to East , Imperial Highway to South. Put in one district for Assembly, Senate and Congress.
4langeles_20110712_14b	7122011	Inez M. Carlson	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Long Beach for racial reasons. Want lines drawn to reflect residency, not gerrymandering. Where are independent majority districts?
4langeles_20110712_15b	7122011	Randy Ryan	no				yes	Keep Santa Clarita with E Ventura County, similar communities together in SD sind 1982.
4langeles_20110712_16b	7122011	Blair H. Taylor, President and CEO	yes	Los Angeles Urban League	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Maps unnecessarily divide south Los Angeles. Will make it impossible for residents to participate in community meetings. Use maps by AARC and unity map. Historic communities should not be in districts with different interests

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110712_10b				no	no		
4langeles_20110712_11b		South Bay, Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_12b		Palos Verdes, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, Venice, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_13b		Ballona	Washington, 90 fwy, Imperial Highway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_14b		Long Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_15b	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_16b		Los Angeles	Central Ave, La Cienega, Olympic, 105 fwy	no	yes	historic communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110712_10b			no				
4langeles_20110712_11b			no				
4langeles_20110712_12b			no			nothing in common with Venice, Santa Monica	
4langeles_20110712_13b	wetlands		no				
4langeles_20110712_14b			no				
4langeles_20110712_15b	similar communities, together since 1982		no				
4langeles_20110712_16b			no			vastly different histories, interests, living conditions	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110712_17b	7122011	Rosalin P Villarreal	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Antelope Valley, keep Lancaster and Palmdale together. Does not make sense to have not part of northern LA county with East Kern, as most are employed at the base. First draft was good
4langeles_20110712_18b	7122011	John May, Citizen	no		Palos Verdes Peninsula	Los Angeles	yes	Palos Verdes Peninsula should be part of coastal strip and excluding it is evidence of departure from ethics for political motives.
4langeles_20110712_19b	7122011	Terry Fredrickson	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with Straight Lines, including Torrance
4langeles_20110712_20b	7122011	Stephen J. Donnell, President	yes	Jalmar Properties, Inc	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Current AD maps divides Santa Monica Bay COI into 3 districts, will weaken COI. Shares Coastal tourism, recreation, urban runoff, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality. Keep Marina del Rey in costal AD
4langeles_20110712_21b	7122011	Fanya Baruti	no		West AdamsCrenshaw	Los Angeles	yes	Do not reduce 33rd congressional seat, will cut off long-time African American stronghold of power. Do not throw into coastal districts or South Gate, Maywood. Museum, AME church, and LAX will be removed. Do not divide people, undermines hard work
4langeles_20110712_22b	7122011	Jackie Young	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up West hills. Connect to San Fernando Valley, not Kern. Part of LA and have own neighborhood council
4langeles_20110712_23b	7122011	Barbara S. Stone, Ph.D, Emerita Professor	yes	CSU Fullerton	Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Whittier is part of COI that includes La Mirada, Whittier, La Habra Heights, La Habra, Hacienda Heights. Do not put La Puenta with Whittier in AD. July 2 visualization was excellent. SE LA County shares broad interests.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110712_17b	Kern, LA	Lancaster, Palmdale, Antelope Valley		no	yes		employment
4langeles_20110712_18b		Palos Verdes Peninsula		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_19b		Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_20b		Santa Monica, Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_21b		West Adams, Crenshaw, South Gate, Maywood		no	yes	African American population	
4langeles_20110712_22b	Kern	Los Angeles, West Hills, SFV		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_23b	Los Angeles	La Mirada, Whittier, La Habra Heights, La Habra, Hacienda Heights	60 fwy	no	yes	broad interests	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110712_17b	High Desert		no				
4langeles_20110712_18b			no				
4langeles_20110712_19b			no				
4langeles_20110712_20b	Coastal tourism, recreation, urban runoff, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality.		no				
4langeles_20110712_21b	museum, church, LAX		no			should not be torn away	
4langeles_20110712_22b	needs are similar, neighborhood council		no				
4langeles_20110712_23b			no			La Puente has nothing in common	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110712_24b	7122011	Joan Baumann	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Santa clarita is one valley, not part of SFV. Newhall was first city in Santa Clarita and does not belong in SFV
4langeles_20110712_25b	7122011	Betty and Frank Anderson	no		SCV	Los Angeles	yes	Do not district SCV with San fernando Valley
4langeles_20110712_26b	7122011	Fran Diamond	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay COI into three AD s, will weaken. Marianal Del Rey and Venice should be part of coastal AD and not go to Inglewood. Shares coastal toursim, recreation, urban runoff, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality.
4langeles_20110712_27b	7122011	Cindy Walker	no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with straight lines
5ventura_20110712_1b	7122011	Carol Sherman	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley and Moorpark within Ventura County district. Nothing in common with LA County or Antelope Valley. If joined, concerns will not receive attention.
5ventura_20110712_2b	7122011	Nick Iosue	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley should be included with Santa Clarita Valley. More like-minded with them than Beverly Hills, Encino
5ventura_20110712_3b	7122011	Joyce Frank	no			Ventura	yes	Connect East Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not Malibu, Pacific Palisades, 101, Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as with history
5ventura_20110712_4b	7122011	Jacob Clark	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Join Simi Valley in Senate Seat with Santa Clarita and not LA County. Similar communities connected for 30 years

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110712_24b		Newhall, Santa Clarita, SFV		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_25b		SCV, San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110712_26b		Santa Moica, Marina Del Rey, Venice, Inglewood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110712_27b		South Bay, Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes Peninsula		no	no		
5ventura_20110712_1b	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110712_2b		Simi Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, Beverly Hills, Encino		no	no		
5ventura_20110712_3b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibbu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
5ventura_20110712_4b	Los Angeles	Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110712_24b			no			not part of SFV	
4langeles_20110712_25b			no				
4langeles_20110712_26b	coastal toursim, recreation, urban runoff, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality.		no			no COI more important than Santa Monica COI	
4langeles_20110712_27b			no				
5ventura_20110712_1b			no			concerns will not receive representation	
5ventura_20110712_2b			no			more in common than with Beverly Hills	
5ventura_20110712_3b	inland valleys better represented, history		no				
5ventura_20110712_4b	similar interests, connected in senate for 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110712_5b	7122011	Carol Inglis	no			Ventura	yes	Ventura county should not be drawn to include parts of LA County, lifestyles and needs are very different. Group Oxnard, Santa Paula and Fillmore; Ventura and Santa Barbara; Simi Valley and Moorpark; Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village and Oak Park.
5ventura_20110712_6b	7122011	Alan Fechser	no				yes	Simi Valley should be with peers in Ventura County, not entire North end of LA county. What an example of laziness
7scruz_20110712_1b	7122011	Holly Costa	no		Soquel	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz County congressional voting power for 15th district. Am excluded from right to vote every year.
7scruz_20110712_2b	7122011	Terri Cesari	yes	Small Business Development Center at Cabrillo College		Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz county in state assembly, will not have fair representation. Votes support research, infrastructure, highways, state parks, planing, transportion, housing
8ccosta_20110712_1b	7122011	Marguerite Lawry	no		Bethel Island	Contra Costa	yes	Bethel Island, East Contra Costa should be in same district as Oakley. Bethel Island and Oakley should not be central valley with Stockton. Live, work, play to the West, not East
8marin_20110712_1b	7122011	Steve Kinsey	no			Marin	yes	Marin has more in common with sonoma than SF, suburban and rural vs. urban. Than Napa, vineyards vs. dairy. Marin and Sonoma share Water and coastal shoreline, transportation.
8napa_20110712_1b	7122011	Dorothy Kaye Hall	no			Napa	yes	Napa has nothing in common with Richmond, Martinez, bay area. Do not split off from other wine regions and join with high population urban areas with different interests

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110712_5b	Ventura, Los Angeles	Oxnard, Santa Paula and Fillmore; Ventura and Santa Barbara; Simi Valley and Moorpark; Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village and Oak Park.		no	yes		
5ventura_20110712_6b	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley		no	no		
7scruz_20110712_1b	Santa Cruz	Soquel		no	no		
7scruz_20110712_2b	Santa Cruz			no	yes		
8ccosta_20110712_1b	Contra Costa	Bethel Island, Oakley, Stockton		no	yes		
8marin_20110712_1b	Marin, Napa,Sonoma	San Francisco		no	yes		jobs within county, livestock, dairy, water, coast, tourism, transportation
8napa_20110712_1b	Napa	Richmond, Martinez		no	yes		wine agriculture

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110712_5b	community needs, lifestyles		no			needs, services, lifestyles are different	
5ventura_20110712_6b			no				
7scruz_20110712_1b			no			vote is never counted	
7scruz_20110712_2b	research, infrastructure, highways, state parks, planing, transportion, housing		no				
8ccosta_20110712_1b	Live, work, play		no			no connection to central valley	
8marin_20110712_1b			no			suburban vs. urban, different industries	
8napa_20110712_1b			no			rural vs. urban, different economies	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8solano_20110712_1b	7122011	Elizabeth Patterson, Mayor	yes	City of Benicia	Benicia	Solano	yes	Keep Benicia in Bay Area and redesign 7th CD to include Benicia. Small city, historic relationship, linked with Contra Costa and Bay Area. Geographic location, waterfront, commuting, oil refining.
9edorado_20110712_1b	7122011	Ann Adams, OTRL	no		Cameron Park	El Dorado	yes	Cameron Park, Elk Grove, El Dorado Hills and Rancho Cordova should be in same AD and SD. Not seperated by American River and are along Hwy 50 corridor
9edorado_20110712_2b	7122011	Gene and Roberta Altshuler	no		Placerville	El Dorado	yes	Cameron Park, Elk Grove, El Dorado Hills and Rancho Cordova should be kept together, they are COI with layers of histories and common interests. Share geography, economy, community, social histories.
9edorado_20110712_3b	7122011	Eva Wright, MPA	no		Placerville	El Dorado	yes	Cameron Park, Elk Grove, El Dorado Hills and Rancho Cordova should be kept together along Hwy 50 corridor, COI with shared histories. Has geographic, economic, community, social histories. Keep separate from Western Placer communities.
9edorado_20110712_4b	7122011	Della M. Clavere	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Do not put El Dorado Hills in Placer district. Identify with Folsom, Rancho Cordova and Sacramento, more than up the hill to Placerville. Concerned El dorado hills would not be well represented in redistricting

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8solano_20110712_1b	Contra Costa	Benicia, Bay Area		no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_1b		Cameron Park, Elk Grove, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova	American River, Highway 50	no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_2b		Cameron Park, Elk Grove, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova		no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_3b	Placer	Cameron Park, Elk Grove, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova	Highway 50	no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_4b	Placer, El Dorado	El Dorado Hills, Folsom, Rancho Cordova, Sacramento, Placerville		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8solano_20110712_1b	Small city, historic relationship, linked with Contra Costa and Bay Area. Geographic location, waterfront, commuting, oil refining.		no			franchise is lost if Benicia is pulled to east in CD	
9edorado_20110712_1b	along highway 50 corridor		no				
9edorado_20110712_2b	geography, economy, community, social histories		no				
9edorado_20110712_3b	geography, economy, community, social histories		no				
9edorado_20110712_4b			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9edorado_20110712_5b	7122011	Pamela Smith	no		Cameron Park	El Dorado	yes	Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills should remain included with Rancho Cordova. Connected via route 50, as opposed to Roseveille, Lincoln, which are along route 80 in W Placer. Include El Dorado in Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove SD
9edorado_20110712_6b	7122011	Leslie Hill	no		Placerville	El Dorado	yes	Western part of El Dorado County should remain in district ith Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, El Dorado Hills, and Cameron Park along HWY 50 corridor. Share economic, historical and geographic influences.
9edorado_20110712_7b	7122011	Hardev Singh Shergill	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Group El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park with Elk Grove and Rancho Cordova, natural region bounded by Highway 99 and highway 50. Citrus Heights, Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln are all along Hwy 80 corridor, group Citrus Heights with neighboring communities.
9edorado_20110712_8b	7122011	Sandra Blinn	no		Cameron Park	El Dorado	yes	Keep Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove COI together, along HWY 50. Shared interests, land usewater, economies, challenges. Different than those of Western Placer; Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln.
9edorado_20110712_9b	7122011	Jennifer Gentry	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Highway 50 community is diffferent from Highway 80 community. Self-identified, mentally and physically seperated. American River is natural boundary. Keep Highway 50 corridor intact, and include El Dorad Hills and Cameron Park with it.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9edorado_20110712_5b	Placer, El Dorado	Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, Roseville, Lincoln	50, 80	no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_6b	El Dorado	Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, Roseville, Lincoln	50 corridor	no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_7b		El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Elk Grove, Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln	50, 80, 99	no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_8b		Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, Roseville, Lincoln	50, 80	no	yes		
9edorado_20110712_9b		El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park	Highwy 80, 50	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9edorado_20110712_5b	geographically, corridors		no			more in common than with Roseville, Rocklin	
9edorado_20110712_6b	economic, historical, natural geographic influences, long established		no			fragmented community will give more densely populated areas control over rural and agricultural communities	
9edorado_20110712_7b	natural region along 80		no				
9edorado_20110712_8b	land use, water, economies, social issues, challenges		no				
9edorado_20110712_9b	school, family, shopping, activities		no			separate areas	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9edorado_20110712_10b	7122011	Richard T. Downey	no		Placerville	El Dorado	yes	Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove should remain connected as COIs, share geography, community, neighborhoods, economic interests. Do not put with Placer, Roseville, Rocklin, 80 corridor
9shasta_20110712_1b	7122011	Patrick Pomeroy	no			Shasta	yes	I-5 is Shastas corridor, has little in common with coastal regions. Agriculture and location in N part of valley leading into Siskiyou is unique. Leave voting district in I-5
9shasta_20110712_2b	7122011	Robert Olmstead	no		Fall River	Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta part of I-5 corridor district. Tied economically and socially to I-5, no relationship with coastal areas.
9siskiyou_20110712_1b	7122011	Ed Welin	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou County intact and with Shasta County. Little in common with coastal counties, Modoc, or high desert counties. Small county, common interests and economy
general_20110712_2b	7122011	Kimberly Bloom	no				yes	Keep our community tight knit, hear our voice
general_20110712_3b	7122011	Betty A. Arroyo	no				yes	Keep District lines straight, this is a disgusting miscarriage, God Bless America
general_20110712_4b	7122011	Dan Walters, Tony Quinn	no				yes	CRC has decided to skip second draft, take process behind closed doors. Would be up to Supreme Court if it fails
supporters_eventura_20110712_1b	7122011	Mary A. Land	no				yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9edorado_20110712_10b	Placer, El Dorado	Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, Roseville, Rocklin	50, 80	no	yes		economic interests
9shasta_20110712_1b	Shasta		I-5	no	yes		agriculture
9shasta_20110712_2b	Shasta		I-5	no	yes	socially	economically
9siskiyou_20110712_1b	Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc			no	yes		common interests and economy
general_20110712_2b				no	no		
general_20110712_3b				no	no		
general_20110712_4b				no	no		
supporters_eventura_20110712_1b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9edorado_20110712_10b	geography, community, neighborhoods		no			not communally congruous	
9shasta_20110712_1b	location		no			little in common with coastal regions	
9shasta_20110712_2b			no			no relationship with coast	
9siskiyou_20110712_1b			no			little in common with desert or coast	
general_20110712_2b			no				
general_20110712_3b			no				
general_20110712_4b			no				
supporters_eventura_20110712_1b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_eventura_20110712_2b	7122011	Sandra C. Evans	no				yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporters_eventura_20110712_3b	7122011	Lauralei Valdez	no				yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporters_eventura_20110712_4b	7122011	Mark Volkov	no				yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporters_eventura_20110712_5b	7122011	Rich Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporters_eventura_20110712_6b	7122011	Nick Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_eventura_20110712_2b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		
supporters_eventura_20110712_3b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		
supporters_eventura_20110712_4b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		
supporters_eventura_20110712_5b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		
supporters_eventura_20110712_6b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_eventura_20110712_2b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				
supporters_eventura_20110712_3b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				
supporters_eventura_20110712_4b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				
supporters_eventura_20110712_5b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				
supporters_eventura_20110712_6b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_eventura_20110712_7b	7122011	Sarah Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporters_eventura_20110712_8b	7122011	Alan and Corina Marshall	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporters_eventura_20110712_9b	7122011	Brad Sarian	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Draw East Ventura with Santa Clarita instead of Malibu, Pacific Palisades, along 101 corridor, or Ventura Blvd. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat, as they have been for 30 years.
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_1b	7122011	Dudley Sampson	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_2b	7122011	Lois Terada	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_eventura_20110712_7b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		
supporters_eventura_20110712_8b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		
supporters_eventura_20110712_9b	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	101 corridor	no	yes		
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_1b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_2b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_eventura_20110712_7b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				
supporters_eventura_20110712_8b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				
supporters_eventura_20110712_9b	connected in Senate for 30 years		no				
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_1b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_2b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_3b	7122011	Laura King	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_4b	7122011	Samuel Hughes	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_5b	7122011	Julie Henry	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_6b	7122011	John Mark King	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_7b	7122011	Patricia Kelly	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_3b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_4b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_5b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_6b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_7b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFVSanta Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_3b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_4b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_5b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_6b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_7b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_8b	7122011	Mary D. Hall	no				yes	Connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura County, similar and have been together in SD since 1982. July 8th visualtization of Antelope ValleySanta Clarita Valley NE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony
1sclara_20110712_1b	7122011	Dan Woo, Journalist	yes	Good Times	Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	It is controversial that Gilroy and Morgan Hill were included in CA17, while Watsonville was excluded. Small county to begin with, being divided in state and fed government has been an issue.
1sdiego_20110712_1b	7122011	Tim Tallarida	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Tentative map is unclear whether Duncan Hunter will remain representative, in San Diego
2riverside_20110712_1b	7122011	Don Genhart, Prince of the Desert	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley intact due to Common interests. Imperial Valley should be in San Diego, not with Coachella
2riverside_20110712_2b	7122011	Terry Henderson, Councilmember,	yes	La Quinta	La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Keep Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta, Indio and Coachella together. Do not force political division, need strong voice based on common interests mandate
2riverside_20110712_3b	7122011	Rosa Gonzales	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not divide Imperial County and Coachella Valley. Indio is in 80th district. Are in same climate, industries, agriculture, green energy, Salton Sea. Need single legislator

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_8b	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes		
1sclara_20110712_1b		Santa Cruz		no	no		
1sdiego_20110712_1b		San Diego		no	no		
2riverside_20110712_1b		Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley, San Diego		no	yes		
2riverside_20110712_2b		Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta, Indio and Coachella		no	yes		work together tot produce end line product that is good for residents and businesses
2riverside_20110712_3b	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_scvalley_eventura_20110712_8b	similar communities, connected in SD since 1982		no				
1sclara_20110712_1b			no				Beyond Latinos and whites, what other considerations
1sdiego_20110712_1b			no				
2riverside_20110712_1b	common interests		no				
2riverside_20110712_2b			no			Do not force political division	
2riverside_20110712_3b	desert history, water, utility, climate, tourism, agriculture, green energy, salton sea		no			dividing will result in lack of representation	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110712_4b	7122011	Kathleen DeRosa, Mayor,	yes	Cathedral City	Cathedral City	Riverside	yes	Do not pull Cathedral City away from Coachella Valley, Palms Springs, Desert Hot Springs. Do not put with cities of Imperial County where there is no COI. No ag lands and significant Hispanic population, active GLBT community. Tourism, emergency system.
2riverside_20110712_5b	7122011	Michael A. Colton	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley should be kept one voting district. Needs to grow, should not be mingled with other areas. Negative will outweigh positive, there is a delicate balance.
2riverside_20110712_6b	7122011	Alfred Vasquez	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Do not divide Coachella by plucking out Indio and Coachella and parts of Cathedral City. Indio and Coachella have nothing in common with Imperial Valley. Are in Riverside. Gerrymandering has caused harm
2riverside_20110712_7b	7122011	David H. Barnes	no		Jurupa	Riverside	yes	Do not split Jurupa into two CDs spereated by mountains and county line. Leave in one CD in Riverside county.
4langeles_20110627_172	6272011	Joseph Edmiston	yes	Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA), Executive Officer		Los Angeles	yes	Make a horizontal ordering that keeps communities of interest associated with both sides of Santa Monica Mountains
4langeles_20110627_173	6272011	Fabian Villenas	yes	City of Rancho Cucamonga, Principal Management Analyst	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Rancho Cucamonga whole and entirely within San Bernardino County. Revise AD SBCUCA and SD SBBAN to include entire city of Rancho Cucamonga

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110712_4b	Imperial	Coachella Valley, Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs		no	yes		tourism, economic future
2riverside_20110712_5b		Coachella Valley		no	yes		dynamic growth
2riverside_20110712_6b	Riverside, Imperial	Indio, Coachella, Cathedral City, Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110712_7b	Riverside	Jurpa		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_172				no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_173		Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes	All resources provided by City of Rancho Cucamonga and San Bernardino County, not by Los Angeles.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110712_4b	Emergency communication system,		no			no COI with Imperial county	
2riverside_20110712_5b	delicate voting balance		no				
2riverside_20110712_6b			no			nothing in common with Imperial, gives them reason to ignore us	
2riverside_20110712_7b			no			no representation	
4langeles_20110627_172			no				
4langeles_20110627_173			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_174	6272011	Laura Friedman	yes	City of Glendale, Mayor	Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Glendale whole in one CD with Burbank and Pasadena. Support Pasadena Mayor Bill Bogaards recommendations
4langeles_20110627_175	6272011	Frank Scotto	yes	City of Torrance, Mayor	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Torrance together in CD, please include the parts of Torrance which have a Redondo Beach zip code of 90277
4langeles_20110627_176	6272011	Sam Yebri	yes	Los Angeles Regional Council		Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Beverly Hills, Westwood, Pico-Robertson in AD, SD, CD.
4langeles_20110627_177	6272011	Sam Yebri (duplicate)	no				no	
4langeles_20110627_178	6272011	Mrs. John Carnegie	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Sherman Oaks with Van Nuys in SD and CD.
5sbarbara_20110627_7	6212011	John H. Linn	yes	City Council of City of Lompoc, Mayor	Lompoc	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Lompoc.
5sbarbara_20110627_8	6222011	J. Andrew Caldwell	yes	Coalition of Labor, Agriculture, and Business of Santa Barbara County		Santa Barbara	yes	SD SBWVE Redraw to include all of Santa Barbara County and southernmost portion of San Luis Obispo County. SD CENTRAL COAST All of Santa Barbara County, San Luis Obispo, southern and central Monterey
5sbarbara_20110627_9	6202011	Billie Alvarez	yes	Santa Barbara County, Chief Deputy Registrar of Voters		Santa Barbara	yes	See attached maps. Include in CD SLOSB islands of San miguel, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, Santa Barbara

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_174		Glendale		no	yes	Three cities already have numerous cooperative agreements	
4langeles_20110627_175		Redondo Beach, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_176				no	yes	Iranian-American communities	
4langeles_20110627_177				no	no		
4langeles_20110627_178				no	yes	Sherman Oaks was once part of Van Nuys. Van Nuys-Sherman Oaks War Memorial Park.	Main business district runs between Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys
5sbarbara_20110627_7		Lompoc		no	yes	Thriving, politically-engaged community poplation	
5sbarbara_20110627_8	Monterey, Santa barbara, San Luis Obispo			no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110627_9				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_174			no				
4langeles_20110627_175	Already, 36th district has dealt with Torrance as a whole.		no				
4langeles_20110627_176			no				
4langeles_20110627_177			no				
4langeles_20110627_178			no				
5sbarbara_20110627_7			no				
5sbarbara_20110627_8			no				
5sbarbara_20110627_9			no				Commission has done an excellent jobh in nesting districts which will save election costs and simplify ballot grouping process

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110627_23	6272011	Leigh Nixon	yes	Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce, President and CEO	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	ADSD
5ventura_20110627_24	6272011	Janice S. Parvin	yes	City of Moorpark, Mayor	Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Keep Wood Ranch, which is in Simi Valley, together in ADSDCD.
5ventura_20110627_25	6122011	Ercell M. Stout	yes			Ventura	yes	Keep Moorpark, Simi Valley, other Ventura Counties in same district.
5ventura_20110627_26	6242011	O.L. Schimmel	no		Port Hueneme	Ventura	no	
9siskiyou_20110627_15	6242011	Brad Eslingey	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou together with Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter
9siskiyou_20110627_16		Jack A. Kerfy	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou together
9siskiyou_20110627_17		William	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou together
9siskiyou_20110627_18	6222011	Stanley and Jeanette Loudon	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110627_19		June Salveston	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Etna, Fort Jones, and Happy Camp with Siskiyou
9siskiyou_20110627_20		Randy Michels	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Etna, Fort Jones, and Happy Camp with Siskiyou
9siskiyou_20110627_21		Meredith Perry	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole with Yreka
9siskiyou_20110627_22	6212011	Judy Michels	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9sjoaquin_20110627_1	6172011	Stephen A. Jarrett	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi separate from Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano and with San Joaquin. If must split from San Joaquin, put with Tracy.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110627_23				no	yes	Ventura County Council of local governments to the county judicial system, transportation system, social services, trash disposal	
5ventura_20110627_24		Simi Valley		no	yes		
5ventura_20110627_25	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes		
5ventura_20110627_26				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_15	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Sutter			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_16	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_17	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_18	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_19	Siskiyou	Etna, Fort Jones, Happy Camp		no	yes	Recreation, education	Business, farming, ranching, forestry, mining
9siskiyou_20110627_20	Siskiyou	Etna, Fort Jones, Happy Camp		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_21	Siskiyou	Yreka		no	yes	Rural, country music, Victorian homes	Farming, ranching, mining, fishery, hunting
9siskiyou_20110627_22	Siskiyou			no	yes	beautiful recreational areas	rich in natural resources, timber, mining
9sjoaquin_20110627_1	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	Keeping Lodi with San Joaquin will give Lodi an effective political voice.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110627_23			no				
5ventura_20110627_24			no				
5ventura_20110627_25			no				
5ventura_20110627_26			no				Seems that the lines are drawn in favor of Democratic Party
9siskiyou_20110627_15	Agriculture-centered, with water, timber.		no				
9siskiyou_20110627_16			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_17			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_18	Will destroy the valley otherwise		no				
9siskiyou_20110627_19	Very hard to get to coastal places		no				
9siskiyou_20110627_20	Very hard to get to coastal areas		no				
9siskiyou_20110627_21			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_22			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110627_2	6212011	Danny Fox	yes	City of Escalon, Mayor	Escalon	San Joaquin	yes	Keep San Joaquin County whole in ADCDSDBoe
9sjoaquin_20110627_3	6212011	Bob Slayback	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi separate from Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano and with San Joaquin. If must split from San Joaquin, put with Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110627_4	6212011	Paul S. Verdegaal	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi separate from Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano and with San Joaquin. If must split from San Joaquin, put with Tracy.
9sjoaquin_20110627_5	6212011	Ron McGuire	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Keep Lodi separate from Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano and with San Joaquin. If must split from San Joaquin, put with Tracy.
9trinity_20110627_1	6222011	Selene Sarrel	no			Trinity	yes	Approve of maps containing Trinity
9yolo_20110627_1	6242011	Jan Jurosnich	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110627_2	San Joaquin			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110627_3	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	Keeping Lodi with San Joaquin will give Lodi an effective political voice.	
9sjoaquin_20110627_4	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	Keeping Lodi with San Joaquin will give Lodi an effective political voice.	
9sjoaquin_20110627_5	San Joaquin, Yolo, Napa, Marin, Solano	Lodi		no	yes	Keeping Lodi with San Joaquin will give Lodi an effective political voice.	
9trinity_20110627_1	Trinity			no	no		
9yolo_20110627_1	Yolo			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110627_2	Residents of Escalon and San Joaquin Coutny would be better served by more tightly drawn districts which encompass all of San Joaquin, rather than having more representation (in quantity)		no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_3			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_4			no				
9sjoaquin_20110627_5			no				
9trinity_20110627_1			no				
9yolo_20110627_1	Shared agriculture history, natural geographic boundaries, long history of cooperation and shared values		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110627_1	6242011	Alex Behzadi	no				yes	See letter. Talks about Imperial, San Diego, Los angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Joaquin, Kern, San Francisco, Marin, Solano, Sonoma, Del Norte
general_20110627_2		Anonymous	no				no	
9siskiyou_20110627_12	6272011	Meredith Rony	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou together
9siskiyou_20110627_13	6272011	Jim Craig	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou together
9siskiyou_20110627_14		Howard Tacone	no		Scott Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou together
1imperial_20110627_31	6262011	Ray Nolen	no		Cathedral City	Imperial	yes	Include Imperial County with Coachella Valley, not with San Diego. Do not include Hemet, San Jacinto, Banning, Calimesa with Coachella
1imperial_20110627_32	6262011	Ray Nolen (duplicate)	no		Cathedral City	Imperial	yes	Include Imperial County with Coachella Valley, not with San Diego. Do not include Hemet, San Jacinto, Banning, Calimesa with Coachella
1imperial_20110627_33	6272011	John Petrie	no		Palm Springs	Imperial	yes	Keep Imperial with Riverside. Do not put Imperial with San Diego. Put Banning, Beaumont, San Jacinto, Calimesa, Hemet with Los Angeles
1imperial_20110627_34	6062011	Antonio P. Tirado	no		Calexico	Imperial	yes	Keep Imperial with Riverside. Combine Coachella, with Indio-Thermal and Blythe in Riverside

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110627_1	Imperial, San Diego, Los angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Joaquin, Kern, San Francisco, Marin, Solano, Sonoma, Del Norte			no	no		
general_20110627_2				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_12	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_13	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_14	Siskiyou			no	no		
1imperial_20110627_31	Imperial, San Diego	Hemet, San Jacinto, Banning, Calimesa	Mountain range separating Imperial and San Diego	no	yes	Transportation, Salton Sea, environmental issues	Agriculture
1imperial_20110627_32	Imperial, San Diego	Hemet, San Jacinto, Banning, Calimesa	Mountain range separating Imperial and San Diego	no	yes	Transportation, Salton Sea, environmental issues	Agriculture
1imperial_20110627_33	Imperial, Riverside, Los Angeles	Banning, Beaumont, San Jacinto, Calimesa, Hemet		no	yes	Hispanic population growth	Agricultural, soon will house one of worlds largest alternative energy complexes
1imperial_20110627_34	Riverside, Imperial	Indio-Thermal, Blythe		no	yes	Latinos, New River problem	Share generation of power, share crops

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110627_1			no				
general_20110627_2			no				Do not gerrymander. See attached.
9siskiyou_20110627_12	Supported by ranching, agriculture, mining, occasional logging.		no				
9siskiyou_20110627_13			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_14	Hard to travel far from Siskiyou. Way of life is different.		no				
1imperial_20110627_31	Including Imperial with Coachella would do a major service to Spanish speaking populations of Imperial.	Please try adhere to this more in combining communities of interest	no				
1imperial_20110627_32	Including Imperial with Coachella would do a major service to Spanish speaking populations of Imperial.	Please try adhere to this more in combining communities of interest	no				
1imperial_20110627_33			no				
1imperial_20110627_34			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110627_35	6212011	James L. Strain	yes	Imperial County Board of Education		Imperial	yes	Keep Imperial with eastern part of Riverside including Blythe
6kern_20110626_1	6232011	James Willoughby Dennis Allen Kevin Moe Roxanne Hylton Trent Woodard, Curt Gretlein, Jim Gretlein, Brenda Hefner, Tracy Baker, Lynne Poget, Rachelle Towey, Israel Longira, Jr., Ray Marin, BrianBonnie Hall, Brian Clayton, Sean McRoberts VergieEdward Rupe	no			Kern	yes	Put community near Gretlein Road with current 32 AD, 18 SD, 22 CD, which are tied most closely to Bakersfield

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110627_35	Imperial, Rivereside	Blythe		no	yes	need good migrant education programs, desert cities	high rate of unemployment
6kern_20110626_1		Bakersfield		yes	no	Same schools, worship, volunteer	Work, shop

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110627_35			no				
6kern_20110626_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_21	6272011	9 signatures. Eduardo Aparis, Josie Kabelas, Juan Ruiz, Ludette Palero, Panella Hendricks, Art Arboleda, Reynaldo Monzon, Napoleon B. White, Corazon Aparis	yes	Chula Vista, San Diego, Lemon Grove	Chula Vista, San Diego	San Diego	yes	June 20, 2011 Speakers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
1sdiego_20110627_22	6272011	Ceferina Ruiz	yes	San Diego	San Diego	San Diego	yes	June 20, 2011 Speakers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_21				no	yes	Asian Pacific Islander	
1sdiego_20110627_22				no	yes	Asian Pacific Islander	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_21			no				
1sdiego_20110627_22			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_23	6272011	14 sigs. Erlinda Ortin, Henry Gonzales, Pete Paloma, Acetla Gonzales, Julian Castillo, Elvira Magsarill, Lith Clark, Gina Eslava, Barbara, Jane, Bianca, Arcala, Restituto Magsorili	yes	San Diego, Lemon Grove, Temecula	Chula Vista, San Diego	San Diego	yes	June 20, 2011 Speakers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
1sdiego_20110627_24	6272011	5 sigs. Cristeia Canonizadd, Kui Hing Yan, Paul Petula, Chona Lutap	yes	San Diego, Lemon Grove	Chula Vista, San Diego	San Diego	yes	June 20, 2011 Speakers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_23				no	yes	Asian Pacific Islander	
1sdiego_20110627_24				no	yes	Asian Pacific Islander	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_23			no				
1sdiego_20110627_24			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_25	6272011	7 sigs. Caroline Baliou, Carla Gilstrap, Sonarimi Phrakonekham, Ramon, Maria Camilon, Victoria Berbano	yes	National City, El Cajon, San Diego	Chula Vista, San Diego	San Diego	yes	June 20, 2011 Speakers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
1sdiego_20110627_26	6272011	Renato Galadad, Renalda Bulacan, Frank Lagula, Deogracias Kintanar, Rosada Kintanar, Aida Vargas, Jen Oriel, Roger Agarma, Regina, Zenada Hualgo, Juan Moreno	yes	San Diego, Chula Vista, Vista	Chula Vista, San Diego	San Diego	yes	June 20, 2011 Speakers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 32, 46, 47, 49, 56, 88, 91
1sdiego_20110627_27	6212011	Palma Hooper, Gurinder Singh	yes	Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law SCAPAL, President	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Put Poway with AD RCHMM. Keep together Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos, Sorrento Valley, Carmel Valley, Rancho Bernardo, Kearny Mesa. Make SD northsouth urbansuburban district, see CAPAFR map submission on May 26.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_25				no	yes	Asian Pacific Islander	
1sdiego_20110627_26				no	yes	Asian Pacific Islander	
1sdiego_20110627_27	San Diego			no	yes	Suburban, children attend same schools	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_25			no				
1sdiego_20110627_26			no				
1sdiego_20110627_27			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1sdiego_20110627_28	6202011	Charles Wesley Kim, Jr.	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	See SD maps CAPAFRpresented on May 14.. SANOC keep Orange County separate from Oceanside. CSAND Keep Rancho Santa Fe, Fairbanks Ranch, La Jolla separate from Linda Vista and San Ysidro. NESAN and ISAND mix urbansuburban with rural communities
1sdiego_20110627_29	6202011	Phal Chourp	yes	Asian Community Relations at Cambodian Victoria House Corporation, Diretor	San Diego	San Diego	yes	CAPAFR mapAD. City Heights east, Oak Park, El Cerrito, Redwood Village. SD from South County to north including City Heights east, Oak Park, El Cerrito, Redwood Village, E National City, E Chula Vista, Linda Vista, Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquit
2riverside_20110627_1	6272011	William T. Powers	yes	Palm Springs Desert Resorts CVA, Vice Chairman; McCallum Theatre, Chairman; Coachella Valely Economic Partnership, Past Chairman; City of Indian Wells, Mayor Pro-Term	Indian Wells	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley separate from Imperial. Keep Coachella Valley wholly within Riverside
2sbernardino_20110627_23	6272011	Samuel Crowe	no		Ontario	San Bernardino	yes	Approve of keeping Ontario, Chino, Montclair, Pomona, Rancho Cucamonga together
2sbernardino_20110627_23	6272011	Deborah Hobbs	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Approve of Coachella Valley districts.
2sbernardino_20110627_23	6272011	Al Matta	no		Chino Hills	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Chino Hills with Chino

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1sdiego_20110627_28	Orange, San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110627_29				no	no		
2riverside_20110627_1	Imperial, Riverside			no	yes		Tourism
2sbernardino_20110627_23		Ontario, Chino, Montclair, Pomona, Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110627_23				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_23		Chino Hills, Chino		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1sdiego_20110627_28		CAPAFR map of District 40 respects VRA.	no				
1sdiego_20110627_29			no				
2riverside_20110627_1			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_23			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_23	Military, Transportation, Regional Airports, economics, healthcare		no				
2sbernardino_20110627_23	Share same school district, shopping areas, recreation programs		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110627_23	6272011	Al Matta (duplicate)	no				no	
2sbernardino_20110627_23	6242011	Cari Thomas	yes	City of Adelanto, Mayor	Adelanto	San Bernardino	yes	LAAVV Move Adelanto and additional portions of San Bernardino out and into MISBK, can even move all of Kern County of MISBK into LAAVV
2sbernardino_20110627_23	6242011	Eugene J. Schutten	no		Redlands	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Redlands whole.
3orange_20110627_16	6202011	Bill Thomas	no			Orange	yes	See attached maps.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110627_23				no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_23	San Bernardino, Kern	Adelanto		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110627_23		Redlands		no	no		
3orange_20110627_16				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110627_23			no				
	Residents work, shop, travel through and recreate together. Joint power authorities, shared water basin, many joint projects						
2sbernardino_20110627_23			no				
2sbernardino_20110627_23			no				
3orange_20110627_16			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110627_17	4252011	21 sigs. Kathy Remeika, Gerard Griffin, Robert Sieber, Rebecca Douglas, Suji Chung, Tern Taylor, Ruth HurttHenry Broadbent, Chris MacDonald, Linda Tauchen, Beverly Stunden, Carolyn Summers, Willie Bliss, Tamara Morgan, Everett Demlor, Yvonne Robertson	no		Long Beach	Orange	yes	Keep Long Beach together
3orange_20110627_18	6272011	26 signatures	no		Long Beach	Orange	yes	AD Include small population around LA port and coast line. Can take out Hawaiian Gardens and northern tip touching Compton. CD Include LA port and south of PCH or Anaheim by adjusting Paramount to Compton. SD include LA port

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110627_17		Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110627_18	Los Angeles	Compton, Hawaiian Gardens		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110627_17			no				
3orange_20110627_18	Coastal issues		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_168	6172011	Mary Ann Lutz	yes	City of Monrovia, Mayor	Monrovia	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Monrovia whole with Pasadena in AD. Reduce geographic size of proposed CD containing Monrovia.
4langeles_20110627_169	6232011	Edward E. Vaill	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	See letter and attached maps.
4langeles_20110627_170	6232011	Marsha McLean	yes	City of Santa Clarita, Mayor	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	SD Pair proposed Santa Clarita district with AD located to west in Ventura. Inland and coastal issues are different.
4langeles_20110627_171	6232011	Marsha McLean	yes	City of Santa Clarita, Mayor	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	See attached maps. Keep Santa Clarita together in CD.
6kern_20110627_3	6162011	C. John Di Poi	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Approve of first draft maps which keep Ridgecrest with Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave, and other major communities in Kern County
6kern_20110627_4	6162011	Linda L. Millon	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Approve of first draft maps which keep Ridgecrest with Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave, and other major communities in Kern County
6kern_20110627_5	6162011	Curtis V. Bryan	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Approve of first draft maps which keep Ridgecrest with Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave, and other major communities in Kern County
6kern_20110627_6	6162011	Howard Auld	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Approve of first draft maps which keep Ridgecrest with Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave, and other major communities in Kern County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_168		Monrovia, Pasadena		no	yes	Reduce confusion, improves communication with legislators, encourages alignment of goals for Monrovians. Shared minority communities, emergency services, transportation	
4langeles_20110627_169		Malibu		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_170		Santa Clarita		no	yes	Coastal	
4langeles_20110627_171		Santa Clarita		no	no		
6kern_20110627_3	Kern	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave		no	yes		
6kern_20110627_4	Kern	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave		no	yes		
6kern_20110627_5	Kern	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave		no	yes		
6kern_20110627_6	Kern	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_168			no				
4langeles_20110627_169			no				
4langeles_20110627_170			no				
4langeles_20110627_171			no				
6kern_20110627_3			no				
6kern_20110627_4			no				
6kern_20110627_5			no				
6kern_20110627_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6kern_20110627_7	6162011	Barbara Auld	no		Ridgecrest	Kern	yes	Approve of first draft maps which keep Ridgecrest with Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave, and other major communities in Kern County
6stanislaus_20110627_1	6242011	Jeffrey Bailey	no		Modesto	Stanislaus	yes	Approve of where the split is at Modesto. Southern Modesto is west Highway 99, south Highway 132
6tuolumne_20110627_1	6242011	Paolo Maffel	yes	District 2, Retired Supervisor		Tuolomne	yes	Keep Stanislaus with other foothill counties, not with agricultural areas in Central Valley
6tuolumne_20110627_2	6212011	Sharon Marovich	yes	Democratic Central Committee, Chair	Sonora	Tuolomne	yes	Approve of June 20, 2011 district lines. Keep rural areas together
7sclara_20110627_4	6222011	Jamie L. Matthews	yes	City of Santa Clara, Mayor	Santa Clara	Santa Clara	yes	Approve of June 20, 2011 district lines which keep City of Santa Clara in a single legislative district within Santa Clara County
7sclara_20110627_5	6242011	Susan Valenta	yes	Gilroy Chamber of Commerce, Board of Directors	Gilroy	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Gilroy whole and in Santa Clara region

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6kern_20110627_7	Kern	Ridgecrest, Bakersfield, Tehachapi, California City, Mojave		no	yes		
6stanislaus_20110627_1		Modesto		no	yes		lower household incomes
6tuolumne_20110627_1	Stanislaus			no	no		
6tuolumne_20110627_2				no	yes	Rural, large senior citizen population, shared history dating to Gold Rush, watersheds	large land ownership by federal and state agencies, similar economies
7sclara_20110627_4	Santa Clara	Santa Clara		no	yes	Single school district	Electric, water utilities, city-wide Chamber of Commerce
7sclara_20110627_5	Santa Clara	Gilroy		no	yes	community college system	water, road funding, health care programs, economic and tourism development areas

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6kern_20110627_7			no				
6stanislaus_20110627_1			no				
6tuolumne_20110627_1			no				Do not listen to loud, highly political organizations
6tuolumne_20110627_2			no				
7sclara_20110627_4			no				
7sclara_20110627_5			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110627_1	6252011	Bonnie Mace, Carol Solman, Jeremy Barousse, Joshua Barousse, William Ashmon, Barton V. Savill, Phil Henderson, Maria Henderson, Jim Zito	yes	District 8 Community Round Table Steering Committee	San Jose	Alameda	yes	Keep Evergreen area in San Jose together. Boundaries OcalaMarten to north, end of San Joses residential development in the south
4langeles_20110627_162	6222011	Arthur H. and Janet Lou Connor	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	CD South Bay Include Lawndale, Hawthorne, San Pedro, Lennox, Gardena west, eliminate Venice and Santa Monica
4langeles_20110627_162	6222011	Arthur H. and Janet Lou Connor	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	AD Eliminate Westchester, Marina Del Rey, add Lawndale and section of Del Aire south of El Segundo Blvd
4langeles_20110627_163	6222011	Brad Folb	yes	Paramount Contractors and Developers, Inc., President	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Approve of keeping Hollywood whole in SD 22.
4langeles_20110627_164	6212011	Gay M. Arakawa	yes	Morrison, Larossa, Price Iturrioz, Attorney	Santa Ana	Los Angeles	yes	See maps presented by Chinese American Citizens Alliance June 17, 2011 in Whittier. Keep Gateway Cities together (Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, Bell Gardens)

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110627_1	San Jose	Evergreen	OcalaMarten	no	yes	Traffic, environment, schools, quality of life, community activities	
4langeles_20110627_162		Lawndale, Hawthorne, San Pedro, Lennox, Gardena west, santa Monica, Venice		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_162		Westchester, Marina Del Rey, Lawndale	El Segundo Blvd	no	no		
4langeles_20110627_163				no	no		
4langeles_20110627_164		Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, Bell Gardens		no	yes	Under Gateway Cities Council of Governments	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110627_1			no				
4langeles_20110627_162			no				
4langeles_20110627_162			no				
4langeles_20110627_163			no				
4langeles_20110627_164			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_165	6162011	Bill Bogaard	yes	City of Pasadena, Mayor	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Put entire Pasadena into one CD. For details on how, see letter. Approve of keeping Glendale, Burbank, Pasadena linked to other foothill cities.
4langeles_20110627_166	6272011	Alexandra Squers	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep foothills in one AD (Karl Kanyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujanga, La Crescenta, La Canada, Burbank, Glendale)
4langeles_20110627_167	6272011	Arcadia Association of REALTORS	yes	Arcadia Association of REALTORS	Arcadia	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Gabriel Foothill communities (Arcadia, Bradbury, Duarte, Monrovia, Sierra Madre as well as surrounding communities in county of Los Angeles) together
8ccosta_20110627_1	6222011	Karen Mitchoff	yes	District IV of Contra Costa County, Supervisor		Contra Costa	no	
8ccosta_20110627_2		Michelle Price	no			Contra Costa	no	
8napa_20110627_1	6232011	Kristian Cabugao	no		American Canyon	Napa	yes	Put American Canyon with other citiestowns in Napa
8sonoma_20110627_1	6272011	Efren Carrillo	yes	Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, Chair and Fifth District Supervisor	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Sonoma County south of Santa Rosa with Marin, Sonoma Coast, diary farming region. The rest should be linked with Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte
3orange_20110627_19	4252011	25 signatures.	no		Long Beach	Orange	yes	Keep Long Beach together
3orange_20110627_20	6272011	Alfred Coletta	no			Orange	yes	Keep Rossmoor and Los Alamitos with Orange County-based LHYL1.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_165		Pasadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110627_166		Karl Kanyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujanga, La Crescenta, La Canada, Burbank, Glendale		no	yes	Preservation of nature and equestrian land, quality of education, safety, health issues	
4langeles_20110627_167	Los Angeles	Arcadia, Bradbury, Duarte, Monrovia, Sierra Madre		no	yes	Demographics	Infrastructure, Gold Line Extension
8ccosta_20110627_1				no	no		
8ccosta_20110627_2				no	no		
8napa_20110627_1	Napa	American Canyon		no	no		
8sonoma_20110627_1	Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Lake, endocino, Humboldt, Del Norte	Santa Rosa		no	yes	coastal	wine production, related tourism
3orange_20110627_19		Long Beach		no	no		
3orange_20110627_20	Orange	Los Alamitos		no	yes	Military, share same school system and shopping centers, want same congressman Ed Royce	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_165	Suggestions preserve VRA status of Ontario district		no				
4langeles_20110627_166			no				
4langeles_20110627_167			no				
8ccosta_20110627_1			no				Assign district containing Contra Costa an odd number.
8ccosta_20110627_2			no				Assign EALAM SD an odd number
8napa_20110627_1			no				
8sonoma_20110627_1			no				
3orange_20110627_19			no				
3orange_20110627_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110627_21	6232011	Ralph D. Rodriguez	yes	City of La Palma, Mayor	La Palma	Orange	yes	Keep La Palma with Orange County cities of Cypress, Buena Park, Fullerton, Los Alamitos
3orange_20110627_22	6242011	Bruce Beal	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana Point whole with other south Orange County cities
3orange_20110627_23	6242011	Marlene Beal	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana Point whole with other south Orange County cities
3orange_20110627_24	6192011	Eloise Bodiford	no				no	
3orange_20110627_25	6272011	Russell Kerr	yes	Dana Point Chamber of Commerce, Chairman	Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana Point whole with other south Orange County cities
3orange_20110627_26	6222011	Joe Carachio	yes	City of Huntington Beach, Mayor	Huntington Beach	Orange	yes	Keep Huntington Beach with Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Westminster

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110627_21	Orange	La Palma, Cypress, Buena Park, Fullerton, Los Alamitos		no	no		
3orange_20110627_22	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Ocean water quality, regional transportation, regional land use planning	affordable housing
3orange_20110627_23	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes	Ocean water quality, regional transportation, regional land use planning	affordable housing
3orange_20110627_24				no	no		
3orange_20110627_25	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110627_26	Orange	Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Westminster		no	yes	Parades, surf contests, Tet Festivals, Fountain Valley Founders Day	Police, Fire, Public Works, Information Services

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110627_21	Shares school districts, fire protection services, emergency ambulance providers, coordinated recreation activities, regional water delivery functions, sanitation services, waste and recycling contractors, animal control providers, court liaison services		no				
3orange_20110627_22			no				
3orange_20110627_23			no				
3orange_20110627_24			no				Do not draw based on race. This alienates other people within the same district.
3orange_20110627_25	Common issues, strong working relationships and cooperative arrangements developed over many, many years		no				
3orange_20110627_26			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110627_27	6222011	William I. Thomas	no		Long Beach	Orange	yes	AD Include small population around LA port and coast line. Can take out Hawaiian Gardens and northern tip touching Compton. CD Include LA port and south of PCH or Anaheim by adjusting Paramount to Compton. SD include LA port
4langeles_20110627_157	6162011	Leron Gubler	yes	Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, President and CEO		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hollywood together in one AD. Boundaries are Mulholland on North, Hyperion on East, Melrose on South, West Hollywood on West
4langeles_20110627_158	6232011	Neal Dougherty	no		Altadena	Los Angeles	yes	See attached maps. Keep Altadena with La Canada Flintridge, South Pasadena, Arcadia, Sierra Madre, Pasadena
4langeles_20110627_159	6242011	Carol K. Chen	yes	City of Cerritos, Mayor	Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	AD Cerritos, Artesia, Bellflower, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount; CD Cerritos, Artesia, Bell Gardens, Bellflower, Downey, La Mirada, Montebello, Norwalk, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Whittier;

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110627_27	Los Angeles	Compton, Hawaiian Gardens		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_157		West Hollywood, Hollywood	Mulholland, Hyperion, Melrose	no	yes	Strong identity encompassing unique attitudes and concerns	
4langeles_20110627_158		Altadenta, La Canada Flintridge, South Pasadena, Arcadia, Sierra Madre, Pasadena		no	yes	Culture, education, surface transportation, sports, science and technology, religious, judicial, entertainment interests	
4langeles_20110627_159	Los Angeles	Cerritos, Artesia, Bellflower, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Bell Gardens, Downey, La Mirada, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Whittier,		no	yes	Cerritos involved with Los Angeles associations and projects, Cerritos students attend schools within Los Angeles, Cerritos active in management and production of water with other Los Angeles County cities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110627_27	Coastal issues		no				
4langeles_20110627_157			no				
4langeles_20110627_158			no				
4langeles_20110627_159			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110627_159	6242011	Carol K. Chen	yes	City of Cerritos, Mayor	Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	SD Cerritos, Artesia, Avalon, Bellflower, Downey, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, Long Beach, Norwalk, Paramount, Signal Hill
4langeles_20110627_160	6212011	Charlie Ara	no		Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	Consider maps created by Chinese American Citizens Alliance. Keep Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, Bell Gardens
4langeles_20110627_161	6212011	Jeffrey S. Price	yes	Morrison, Larossa, Price Iturrioz, Attorney	Santa Ana	Los Angeles	yes	See maps presented by Chinese American Citizens Alliance June 17, 2011 in Whittier. Keep Gateway Cities together (Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, Bell Gardens)
9dnorte_20110627_1	6252011	Lise Hamilton	no			Del Norte	yes	Approve of Del Norte County lines

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110627_159	Los Angeles	Cerritos, Artesia, Avalon, Bellflower, Downey, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, Long Beach, Norwalk, Paramount, Signal Hill		no	yes	Cerritos involved with Los Angeles associations and projects, Cerritos students attend schools within Los Angeles, Cerritos active in management and production of water with other Los Angeles County cities	
4langeles_20110627_160	Los Angeles	Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, Bell Gardens		no	no		
4langeles_20110627_161		Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood, Bell Gardens		no	yes	Under Gateway Cities Council of Governments	
9dnorte_20110627_1	Del norte			no	yes	coastal, geography, rivers, harbors, redwood parks, Hwy 101, Caltrans district 1, joint Yurok Native American territories, College of Redwoods district, Coastal Commission district	Salmon and other fisheries, tourism because of redwood parks and tourism industries

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110627_159			no				
4langeles_20110627_160			no				
4langeles_20110627_161			no				
9dnorte_20110627_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9placer_20110627_2	6212020	George Magnuson	yes	City of Rocklin, Mayor	Rocklin	Placer	yes	Keep Rocklin with urbanized communities in Sacramento Region located along I-80 and Hwy 50 Roseville, Lincoln, Citrus Heights, Loomis, Folsom, Granite Bay, Orangevale, Fair Oaks, Gold River, Antelope
9sacramento_20110627_1	6272011	Kathleen Ford	yes	Elmhurst Parents Group, Representative	Elmhurst	Sacramento	yes	Return Elmhurst and other City of Sacramento neighborhoods to ADSD which reflect city boundaries
9sacramento_20110627_2	6272011	Don Troutman	yes	Fair Oaks Chamber of Commerce, President		Sacramento	yes	Divide districts at PlacerSacramento County line
9sacramento_20110627_3	6272011	Paul N. Noble	yes	East Sacramento Improvement Association, President		Sacramento	yes	Do not split East Sacramento
9sacramento_20110627_4	6232011	Marianne Asebedo	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	no	
9siskiyou_20110627_1	6252011	Donna Bacigalupi	no		Montague	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110627_2	6212011	Eric and Rachel Black	no		Scott Valley	Siskiyou	no	
9siskiyou_20110627_3	6212011	Molly V. MacGowan	no		Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110627_4	6242011	Dean Harris	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110627_5		Walter J. Phillips	no		Mt. Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou whole
9siskiyou_20110627_6	6232011	Richard Kliewer	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Weed, Mt. Shasta, McCloud, Dunsmuir with Siskiyou

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9placer_20110627_2	Roseville, Lincoln, Citrus Heights, Loomis, Folsom			no	no		
9sacramento_20110627_1		Sacramento, Elmhurst		no	yes	Socially, culturall	
9sacramento_20110627_2	Placer, Saceramento			no	no		
9sacramento_20110627_3	Sacramento			no	yes	same school boundaries, higher education opportunities, hospital synergy, and general neighborhood connectivity	same business activity, economic development
9sacramento_20110627_4				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_1	Siskiyou			no	yes	school districts, fire protection districts, cemetery districts, transportation system, one newspaper	
9siskiyou_20110627_2				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_3	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_4				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_5				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_6	Siskiyou	Weed, Mt. Shasta, McCloud, Dunsmuir		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9placer_20110627_2			no				
9sacramento_20110627_1			no				
9sacramento_20110627_2			no				
9sacramento_20110627_3			no				
9sacramento_20110627_4			no				Do not gerrymander 6th district
9siskiyou_20110627_1			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_2			no				Keep Doug LaMalfa as representative
9siskiyou_20110627_3			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_4			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_5			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_6			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110627_7	6232011	Lawrence A. Bell	no		Mt. Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	Keep Scott Valley and Happy Camp with Siskiyou
9siskiyou_20110627_8	6232011	Lawrence Castle	no			Siskiyou	yes	Keep Siskiyou separate from coastal counties
9siskiyou_20110627_9	6272011	Sharon Kliewer	no		Mt. Shasta	Siskiyou	yes	Keep communities along I-5 corridor together, without coastal areas.
9siskiyou_20110627_10	6222011	Jim Cook	yes	Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, Chair		Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou.
9siskiyou_20110627_11	6232011	Carol Maplesden	no		Scott Valley	Siskiyou	yes	Scott Valley should be changed into the district with the northern California coast.
1sdiego_20110705_1	7052011	Colleen MacDonald	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Concerned that the neighborhood of Clairemont in San Diego will be split up with the new maps. Clairemont should be placed with San Diego proper, and not with North County (anything north of 52 and north of La Jolla).
1sdiego_20110705_2	7052011	Jan Bement	no		Mt. Helix Rancho	San Diego	yes	Please keep the Mt. Helix Rancho area as one whole area. In the past, it has been badly carved up, such that there was not even a polling place within the neighborhood. The area in question is between Calavo and Avocado Boulevards.
1sdiego_20110705_3	7052011	Trapasso Family	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Please keep the Clairemont area of San Diego intact.
3orange_20110705_1	7052011	Betty Arakawa	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Do not place Rossmoor in LA county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110627_7	Siskiyou	Scott Valley, Happy Camp		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_8	Siskiyou			no	yes	dam removal, expansion of national monuments, suction dredge mining, water and property rights	
9siskiyou_20110627_9				no	no		
9siskiyou_20110627_10	Siskiyou			no	yes	School, special districts	
9siskiyou_20110627_11		Scott Valley		no	no		
1sdiego_20110705_1	San Diego	San Diego	Highway 52	yes	no		
1sdiego_20110705_2	San Diego	San Diego	Calavo Blvd, Avocado Blvd	yes	yes	Mt. Helix Rancho has common school districts, water districts, and fire districts.	
1sdiego_20110705_3	San Diego	San Diego		yes	no		
3orange_20110705_1	Orange, Los Angeles	Rossmoor		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110627_7			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_8			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_9			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_10			no				
9siskiyou_20110627_11			no				
1sdiego_20110705_1			no				
1sdiego_20110705_2			no				
1sdiego_20110705_3			no				
3orange_20110705_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110705_2	7062011	Ida MacMurray	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not divide La Habra along Euclid Ave.
3orange_20110705_3	7052011	Steve Ludwig	no		Rossmoor	Orange	yes	Rossmoor should not be moved into a congressional district with Long Beach.
4langeles_20110705_1	7052011	signature illegible	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Studio City between two senate districts (LASCV and LADNT). Make it a whole district in LASCV, connected to other San Fernando Valley cities along Ventura Blvd and 101 freeway.
4langeles_20110705_2	7052011	Chuck Taylor	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Please revise the senate district lines around Studio City such that they reflect the Assembly line districts. This will also protect the community of interest.
4langeles_20110705_3	7052011	Christine Vinquist	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Please return Westchester to Playa del Rey and the Beach Cities as initially shown on the draft maps. Westchester is part of the Westchester-Playa Neighborhood Council, and its demographics align with that of El Segundo and the Beach Cities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110705_2	Los Angeles	La Habra	Euclid Avenue	no	yes	La Habra has two school districts (one in Orange and one in both Orange and LA counties). La Habra also has a contract with the LA fire department. It is also a middle class community with common cultural roots.	
3orange_20110705_3	Orange	Rossmoor		no	no		
4langeles_20110705_1	Los Angeles	Studio City	Ventura Blvd, 101 Freeway	no	yes	Studio City shares schools, shopping, parks, religious and cultural activities, and more with the cities running along the 101 Freeway and along the north and south sides of the Santa Monica mountains.	
4langeles_20110705_2	Los Angeles	Studio City		yes	no		
4langeles_20110705_3	Los Angeles	Westchester, Playa del Rey, Beach Cities, El Segundo		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110705_2			no				
3orange_20110705_3			no				
4langeles_20110705_1			no				
4langeles_20110705_2			no				
4langeles_20110705_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110705_4	7052011	Jim Henrietta	yes	Zoto International Inc, Director of Sales and Education	Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned that Calabasas and Agoura are not considered part of the West San Fernando Valley. They are west of the 405 freeway, stop at Mulholland Ridge, and are not part of the 101 Freeway. Studio City and Sherman Oaks are not part of this valley.
4langeles_20110705_5	7052011	Sarah K. Foss	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Requests that the CRC consider a return to the 1991 legislative boundaries for the Santa Monica mountain vicinity (West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu).
4langeles_20110705_6	7052011	A W Foss	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Requests that the CRC consider a return to the 1991 legislative boundaries for the Santa Monica mountain vicinity (West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu).
4langeles_20110705_7	7052011	Barbara A Foss	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Requests that the CRC consider a return to the 1991 legislative boundaries for the Santa Monica mountain vicinity (West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu).

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110705_4	Los Angeles	Calabasas, Agoura, Studio City, Sherman Oaks	405 Freeway, Mulholland Ridge, 101 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_5	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	The residents most adjacent to the Santa Monica mountains are the most motivated to preserve and protect its rich natural beauty and history. These communities also share fire and sheriff services.	
4langeles_20110705_6	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	The residents most adjacent to the Santa Monica mountains are the most motivated to preserve and protect its rich natural beauty and history. These communities also share fire and sheriff services.	
4langeles_20110705_7	Los Angeles	West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Topanga, Malibu	Santa Monica Mountains	no	yes	The residents most adjacent to the Santa Monica mountains are the most motivated to preserve and protect its rich natural beauty and history. These communities also share fire and sheriff services.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110705_4			no				
4langeles_20110705_5			no				
4langeles_20110705_6			no				
4langeles_20110705_7			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110705_8	7052011	Adam Litzer	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_9	7052011	Mark Litzer	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_10	7052011	Jeff Berman	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_11	7052011	Sharon Berman	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_12	7052011	Matthew Seyhun	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_13	7052011	Karen Ressner	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_14	7052011	Melanie Litzer	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_15	7052011	Cindy Bisciglia	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110705_8	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_9	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_10	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_11	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_12	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_13	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_14	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_15	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110705_8			no				
4langeles_20110705_9			no				
4langeles_20110705_10			no				
4langeles_20110705_11			no				
4langeles_20110705_12			no				
4langeles_20110705_13			no				
4langeles_20110705_14			no				
4langeles_20110705_15			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110705_16	7052011	Patricia Morton	no		Atwater Village	Los Angeles	yes	Supports the CRC efforts to create more equitable and rational districts. This is demonstrated in the Atwater Village area of Los Angeles.
4langeles_20110705_17	7052011	Laurie Cohn	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110705_18	7052011	Judith Mintz	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Return to draft maps for TorranceBeach Cities. Assembly dist, take out Santa Monica, Venice, and Marina Del Rey (put in Westchester, Playa del Rey, Lomita, Palos Verdes). For cong. Dist, take out Long Beach, Carson (put in same cities plus El Segundo).
4langeles_20110705_19	7052011	Nina Royal	no			Los Angels	no	
4langeles_20110705_20	7052011	Sabine Peterson	no			Los Angeles	yes	Appreciates the efforts to place Griffith Park and Hollywood Hills in the same district. But Silver Lake should be part of the same Assembly seat as its part of the the same hills that go through Burbank.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110705_16	Los Angeles	Atwater Village		no	no		
4langeles_20110705_17				no	no		
4langeles_20110705_18	Los Angeles	Torrance, Beach Cities, Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey, Westchester, Playa del Rey, Lomita, Palos Verdes Peninsula, El Segundo		no	no		
4langeles_20110705_19				no	no		
4langeles_20110705_20	Los Angeles	Griffith Park, Hollywood Hills, Silver Lake, Burbank, Los Angeles		yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110705_16			no				
4langeles_20110705_17			no				When opening the Senate Visualizations for Los Angeles, there are only Assembly Visualizations. There are none for the south San Fernando Valley or West Valley and non for any Senate districts.
4langeles_20110705_18			no				
4langeles_20110705_19			no				Would like to see a video of the meeting held in San Fernando City Hall. Cannot find it on the website.
4langeles_20110705_20			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110705_21	7052011	Cheryl Sullivan	no		Winnetka	Los Angeles	yes	Please include Calabasas and Agoura in the West Valley Assembly and Congressional districts, and keep it west of the 405 Freeway. Those cities east of the 405 (Studio City and Encino) should be in the East San Fernando Valley district.
4langeles_20110705_22	7052011	Lyn Jensen	no			Los Angeles	no	
4langeles_20110705_23	7052011	Andrew Hewiston	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_24	7052011	Kyle Shorten	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
4langeles_20110705_25	7052011	Ronnie Ressner	no			Los Angeles	yes	For congressional districts, Agoura Hills and Calabasas are part of the West San Fernando Valley. Unify Granada Hills in the West San Fernando Valley.
5slobispo_20110705_1	7052011	Duane Picano	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	Does not support splitting San Luis Obispo into two halves.
5ventura_20110705_1	7052011	Jay Bloom	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Redistricting should follow county lines, as Simi Valley and Moorpark are cut off from Ventura County even as Malibu (in LA County) is included. This same process is seen when Lancaster is split and divided between Kern and Losa Angeles counties.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110705_21	Los Angeles	Calabasas, Agoura, Studio City, Encino	405 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_22				no	no		
4langeles_20110705_23	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_24	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	San Fernando Valley	no	no		
4langeles_20110705_25	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Granada Hills	an Fernando Valley	no	no		
5slobispo_20110705_1	San Luis Obispo			no	no		
5ventura_20110705_1	Los Angeles, Ventura, Kern	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Malibu, Lancaster		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110705_21			no				
4langeles_20110705_22			no				Does not see the second draft maps on the website.
4langeles_20110705_23			no				
4langeles_20110705_24			no				
4langeles_20110705_25			no				
5slobispo_20110705_1			no				
5ventura_20110705_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110705_2	7052011	Lauren (no last name listed)	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Opposes locating Simi Valley within Los Angeles county. There is a natural boundary between Simi Valley and Los Angeles County.
5ventura_20110705_3	7052011	Vanessa Settle	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Simi Valley should remain in Ventura county.
5ventura_20110705_4	7052011	Scott Sobel	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Does not want the lines within and around Simi Valley to be redrawn.
5ventura_20110705_5	7052011	Margaret Sergus	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not split Simi Valley.
6merced_20110705_1	7052011	Adam Cox	yes	Merced City School Board, Member	Merced	Merced	yes	The Merced and Foothills seats need to be altered so as to give each area a united voice.
7sbenito_20110705_1	7052011	Jennifer L Bagley	no		Hollister	San Benito	yes	San Benito is part of the central coast and it should not be placed with the central valley. Morgan Hill and Gilroy (w. 101 corridor, Salinas, Prunedale) is connected to San Benito county and Hollister,not Santa Cruz. Does not support current draft maps.
7sclara_20110705_1	7052011	Rachel Dann	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Cruz between two congressional districts - it is the county seat and a community of interest.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110705_2	Los Angeles, Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110705_3	Los Angeles, Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110705_4	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110705_5	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
6merced_20110705_1	Merced	Merced		no	yes	The Merced and Foothills areas have unique needs due to a high immigrant population, and the school districts are particularly in need of a strong and united voice in order to keep the best and the brightest thriving in Merced.	
7sbenito_20110705_1	San Benito	Salinas,Prunedale, Hollister,Morgan Hill, Gilroy	101 Freeway	no	no		
7sclara_20110705_1	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Santa Cruz should remain whole because of the tourism industry, the university, and local media.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110705_2			no				
5ventura_20110705_3			no				
5ventura_20110705_4			no				
5ventura_20110705_5			no				
6merced_20110705_1			no				
7sbenito_20110705_1			no				
7sclara_20110705_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110705_2	7052011	Celia Scott	yes	City of Santa Cruz, former mayor and council member	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Reconsider splitting Santa Cruz into two congressional districts. Dividing the city would disconnect the city from the communities (of interest) of Monterey Bay, San Benito County, and Santa Cruz county.
7sclara_20110705_3	7052011	Don Lane	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Cruz between two congressional districts.
7sclara_20110705_4	7052011	Glen Schaller	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Please keep Santa Cruz as a whole unit within the Monterey congressional district.
7sclara_20110705_5	7052011	Leslie Auerbach	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz during the redistricting process as it is an urban city with urban issues.
7sclara_20110705_6	7052011	Meredith Vivian	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two congressional districts. This will case it to compete for federal funds.
7sclara_20110705_7	7052011	Jeremy Neuner	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two congressional districts.
7sclara_20110705_8	7052011	Darren Odden	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz. This will ensure it will have adequate representation for its unique concerns.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110705_2	Santa Cruz, San Benito	Santa Cruz, Monterey Bay		no	yes	The eastern and western parts of Santa Cruz are linked in every possible way, including the selection of city council members.	
7sclara_20110705_3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	The eastern and western parts of the city share similar characteristics and an economic base.	
7sclara_20110705_4	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110705_5	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110705_6	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110705_7	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Santa Cruz should be kept whole because of the issues regarding tourism, higher education, the growing high tech sector, and a commitment to environmental sustainability. It needs one voice to secure federal resources.	
7sclara_20110705_8	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110705_2			no				
7sclara_20110705_3			no				
7sclara_20110705_4			no				
7sclara_20110705_5			no				
7sclara_20110705_6			no				
7sclara_20110705_7			no				
7sclara_20110705_8			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110705_9	7052011	Jennifer Karno	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two congressional districts. It is necessary that the city has unity and shared investment in its unique interests.
7sclara_20110705_10	7062011	Denise Oconnor	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz and its district.
7sclara_20110705_11	7062011	Ryan Coonerty	yes	City of Santa Cruz, Mayor	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two congressional districts, as this will make its voice hard to hear in Washington (with respect to federal funding and river levee, metro system, UCSC, and coastal trail issues).
7sclara_20110705_12	7062011	Robert Williamson	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Santa Cruz should remain whole as to split it would disenfranchise Santa Cruz County (there are only 4 incorporated cities in the county), not the least because of its small size.
7sclara_20110705_13	7062011	John Wilson	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not divide Santa Cruz and its district.
7sclara_20110705_14	7062011	Brenda Lawrence	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz into two congressional districts. This would ultimately hurt the city.
7sclara_20110705_15	7062011	Forrest Williams	yes	San Jose Redistricting Commissioner		Santa Clara	yes	If San Jose is split in half, it will lose its influence in Sacramento. The redistricting of Assembly District 23 dilutes the power of the existing ethnic group and prevents them from selecing representative leadership. Change the northern boundaries.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110705_9	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110705_10	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110705_11	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	As a small community of 58,000 people, Santa Cruz is a cohesive with respect to matters of politics, society, business, and environment.	
7sclara_20110705_12	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes	The eastern and western portions of Santa Cruz share media, local economies of tourism and visitor services, higher education, and high tech.	
7sclara_20110705_13	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110705_14	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110705_15	San Jose	San Jose		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110705_9			no				
7sclara_20110705_10			no				
7sclara_20110705_11			no				
7sclara_20110705_12			no				
7sclara_20110705_13			no				
7sclara_20110705_14			no				
7sclara_20110705_15			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7scruz_20110705_1	7062011	Sheila Coonerty	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split the city of Santa Cruz as it has large city problems in a small town atmosphere - and it handles them quite well. Redistricting Santa Cruz will harm this unification.
8alameda_20110705_1	7052011	Yogi Chugh	no			Alameda	yes	Supports the new maps for the HaywardFremont.NewarkUnion CityMilpitas congressional seat. This gives a significant voice to the AsianSouth Asian community.
8alameda_20110705_2	7052011	Sergio Santos	yes	UAW Local 2244 President		Alameda	yes	Supports the new visualizations of the congressional map for the Tri-Cities area. Heartened by the proposed HaywardFremontNewarkUnion CityMilpitas congressional seat.
8ccosta_20110705_1	7062011	Edi Birsan	no			Contra Costa	yes	It is unclear whether it makes sense to divide cities of large population size during the redistricting process.
8marin_20110705_1	7052011	Hope Timberlake	no		Mill Valley	Marin	yes	Please keep San Francisco and Marin as separate districts.
8marin_20110705_2	7052011	Amy Belser	no			Marin	no	Keep Marin and Sonoma counties together if at all possible. They have a common interest and should not be disconnected.
8smateo_20110705_1	7052011	Norman Grimsby	no			San Mateo	yes	It is unfair to split Redwood City into two congressional districts.
9shasta_20110705_1	7052011	Roy Parker	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	It would be a mistake to redistrict the counties of Tehama, Shasta, and Modoc together with the counties bordering the Pacific Coast.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7scruz_20110705_1	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
8alameda_20110705_1	Hayward, Fremont, Newark, Union City, Milpitas	Alameda		no	no		
8alameda_20110705_2	Hayward, Fremont, Newark, Union City, Milpitas	Alameda		no	no		
8ccosta_20110705_1				no	no		
8marin_20110705_1	Marin, San Francisco			no	no		
8marin_20110705_2	Marin, Sonoma			no	no		
8smateo_20110705_1	San Mateo	Redwood City		no	no		
9shasta_20110705_1	Tehama, Shasta, Modoc			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7scruz_20110705_1			no				
8alameda_20110705_1			no				New maps validate the belief in the CRC and democratic process.
8alameda_20110705_2			no				New maps validate the belief in the CRC and democratic process.
8ccosta_20110705_1			no				
8marin_20110705_1			no				
8marin_20110705_2			no				
8smateo_20110705_1			no				A Voter Fraud task force should be established immediately, and the Electoral College should be abolished.
9shasta_20110705_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110705_2	7052011	Eleanor and Scott Vermilyea	no		Big Bend	Shasta	yes	Do not place Shasta county with the coastal counties - the growth patterns and habitat between north-central and coastal counties are quite different.
9shasta_20110705_3	7052011	Sally Rapoza	no			Shasta	yes	Redding and Shasta county should not be placed with the coastal areas. They do not have anything in common with the communities of Eureka, Crescent City, Fortuna, etc.
9shasta_20110705_4	7052011	Lorretta Woodard	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta county should not be included with coastal districts.
9shasta_20110705_5	7052011	Molly Frame	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta county is on the I-5 corridor and should therefore be in a district with similar counties, not the coastal counties.
9shasta_20110705_6	7052011	Dexter Rogers	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is not part of the coast, and should be included in the central valley.
9shasta_20110705_7	7052011	Phillip Barker	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta county should be in district with Trinity, Siskiyou, Lassen, Modoc, Tehama, and Plumas counties. It should do not placed with coastal communities, as this will dilute the political voice of Shasta.
9shasta_20110705_8	7052011	Merilee Hudson	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta has nothing in common with the coastal counties, and it should be placed with communities that are also along the I-5 corridor.
9shasta_20110705_9	7052011	Donna Ayers	no			Shasta	yes	The draft maps for Shasta do not look reasonable, when one considers population, living situations, work, etc.
9shasta_20110705_10	7052011	A.J. Ayers	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is a vital part of the I-5 corridor and has no common link with the coastal communities. Redding and Shasta should be part of the I-5 corridor.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110705_2	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_3	Shasta	Redding, Eureka, Crescent City, Fortuna		no	no		
9shasta_20110705_4	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_5	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_6	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_7	Shasta, Trinity, Siskiyou, Lassen, Modoc, Tehama, Plumas			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_8	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_9	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_10	Shasta	Redding	I-5	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110705_2			no				
9shasta_20110705_3			no				
9shasta_20110705_4			no				
9shasta_20110705_5			no				
9shasta_20110705_6			no				
9shasta_20110705_7			no				
9shasta_20110705_8			no				
9shasta_20110705_9			no				Would like to know what criteria were used in redistricting.
9shasta_20110705_10			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110705_11	7052011	John Wendele	no			Shasta	yes	Strongly disagrees with the proposal to include Shasta in a district with Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, Lake, and Sonoma counties. It is part of the I-5 corridor, not the north coast.
9shasta_20110705_12	7052011	Lynn Shaw	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta should not be included in the coastal county districts. Instead, adjustments for population should be made along the southern borders of the three existing districts rather than lumping counties together across the divide of a mountain range.
9shasta_20110705_13	7052011	duplicate of 73	no				no	
9shasta_20110705_14	7052011	Gerald Flowers	no			Shasta	yes	Do not place Shasta County with the coastal communities. It must remain with the I-5 corridor, as it has little in common with the business and people in coastal areas.
9shasta_20110705_15	7052011	Mary Stephens	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta county should not be placed with the coastal communities. It should remain with the I-5 corridor, as its political voice will be diminished if it is placed with coastal districts.
9shasta_20110705_16	7052011	Mary Lou Cota	no			Shasta	yes	Do not place Shasta with the coast. Its position within the middle of the state give Shasta unique needs and concerns.
9shasta_20110705_17	7052011	Charles Knight	no			Shasta	yes	Against the current maps. San Francisco and Crescent City have more in common than Crescent City and Redding.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110705_11	Shasta, Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, Lake, Sonoma		I-	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_12	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_13				no	no		
9shasta_20110705_14	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_15	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_16	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_17	Shasta	San Francisco, Crescent City, Redding		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110705_11			no				
9shasta_20110705_12			no				Believes the current lines look contrived by politics, designed to diminish the voice of Shasta county.
9shasta_20110705_13			no				
9shasta_20110705_14			no				
9shasta_20110705_15			no				
9shasta_20110705_16			no				
9shasta_20110705_17			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110705_18	7062011	Jack Ratledge	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta should not be placed in a coastal district. It is in the northern region of the Sacramento Valley (I-5 corridor) and has little to do with the the socio-economic and political issues of the coast.
9shasta_20110705_19	7062011	Don Christian	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta has little in common with the coastal areas. The Trinity Alps are a natural barrier between the two areas.
9shasta_20110705_20	7062011	Angela Wendele	no			Shasta	yes	The coastal counties have nothing in common with the I-5 corridor communities. Placing Shasta with the coastal communities will cause an imbalance of power and income in favor of the coastal communities. Humboldt, Mendocino and Lake should be in region 8.
9shasta_20110705_21	7062011	L Sue Richards	no			Shasta	yes	Strongly disagrees with the proposal to include Shasta with Eureka and other southern coastal communities. This move demonstrates how politicians do not care about rural areas.
9shasta_20110705_22	7062011	Evert Dale	no			Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta county separate from the coastal region. Do not split Siskiyou county in the congressional district.
9shasta_20110705_23	7062011	David Bedwell	no			Shasta	yes	Opposed to placing Shasta with the coastal communities. It should be in the same district as other I-5 communities, as these communities share agricultural interests.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110705_18	Shasta		I-5, Sacramento Valley	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_19	Shasta		Trinity Alps	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_20	Shasta, Humboldt, Mendocion, Lake		I-5	no	yes	Shasta and the coastal communities have no opinions, values, ways of life, or priorities in common.	
9shasta_20110705_21	Shasta	Eureka		no	no		
9shasta_20110705_22	Shasta, Siskiyou			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_23	Shasta		I-5	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110705_18			no				
9shasta_20110705_19			no				
9shasta_20110705_20			no				
9shasta_20110705_21			no				
9shasta_20110705_22			no				
9shasta_20110705_23			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110705_24	7062011	Janet Chandler	no			Shasta	yes	Do not place part of the Shasta County with the coastal area of Humboldt county. The Northeastern portion of California should not be placed with the coastal areas - this move will cause political representation for Shasta to suffer.
9shasta_20110705_25	7062011	Susan Markham	no			Shasta	yes	Strongly opposes the redistricting of Shasta with the coastal communities. It should remain with the I-5 corridor communities.
9shasta_20110705_26	7062011	William Spainhower	no			Shasta	yes	Do not include the coastal communities with Shasta. It is part of the I-5 corridor and should remain so.
9shasta_20110705_27	7052011	Katie Bohne	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Do not redistrict Redding with the coastal communities. It is an I-5 community and should remain so, particularly given that its problems have little in common with the coast.
9shasta_20110705_28	7052011	Name redacted	no			Shasta	yes	It is a bad idea to place Shasta county with the coast, as this will limit the representation of Shasta.
9siskiyou_20110705_1	7052011	Rick Bosetti	yes	Redding City Council and Simpson University, Head Coach of Red Hawks Basketball	Redding	Shasta	yes	It does not make sense to lump Siskiyou, Shasta, and Tehama counties with Humboldt county.
9siskiyou_20110705_2	7052011	Bernita and Thomas Tickner	no			Siskiyou	yes	It does not make sense to redistrict Siskiyou, Scott Valley, and Shasta Valley lines.
9siskiyou_20110705_3	7052011	John Cece Reuter	no			Siskiyou	yes	Do not split Siskiyou county and do not place any mountain county with coastal regions.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110705_24	Shasta, Humboldt			no	no		
9shasta_20110705_25	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_26	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_27	Shasta	Redding	I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110705_28	Shasta			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110705_1	Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Humboldt			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110705_2	Siskiyou, Shasta	Scott Valley		no	no		
9siskiyou_20110705_3	Siskiyou			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110705_24			no				
9shasta_20110705_25			no				
9shasta_20110705_26			no				
9shasta_20110705_27			no				
9shasta_20110705_28			no				
9siskiyou_20110705_1			no				
9siskiyou_20110705_2			no				
9siskiyou_20110705_3			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110705_1	7052011	Alice A Huffman	yes	California State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, President	Sacramento	Sacramento	no	
general_20110705_2	7052011	Name redacted	no				no	
general_20110705_3	7052011	Larry Livesay	no		Grenada	Siskiyou	yes	Redistricting lines should run north and south, not east and west. Do not cross mountains or valleys with the coasts.
general_20110705_4	7052011	Norman Grimsby	no				yes	The maps are unclear and they do not give specific details regarding the dividing lines between districts. This is particularly a problem for Redwood City.
9edorado_20110714_1d	7142011	Gerald Schure	no		Cameron Park	El Dorado	yes	Do not put Cameron park in district that includes Citrus Heights and Roseville. Ignores American River seperation which alignes Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova and Elk Gove, which share interests and goals. Highway 50 corridor is important.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110705_1				no	no		
general_20110705_2				no	no		
general_20110705_3				no	no		
general_20110705_4	San Mateo	Redwood City		no	no		
9edorado_20110714_1d		Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, Citrus Heights, RoseVille, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove	American River, Highway 50	no	yes		development

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110705_1			no				The method used by the CRC to moderate comments is flawed, as it does not differentiate among the relative needs of the persons speaking. It does not allow for those who represent larger and wide-spread populations to have more time to voice their concern
general_20110705_2			no				Would like hisher name added to any action taken on behalf of black voters to rectify the redistricting efforts of Ms Malloy.
general_20110705_3			no				
general_20110705_4			no				
9edorado_20110714_1d	common interests and ggoals,		no			American River seperates Citrus Heights from Cameron Park	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9edorado_20110714_2d	7142011	Cory C. Anttila	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park should be in same district with Rancho Cordova. American river is dividing line between Placer. El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Rancho Cordova and elk Grove are on same side of river and HWY 50, combine in SD and AD
9edorado_20110714_3d	7142011	Pat Schure	no		Cameron Park	El Dorado	yes	Do not place Cameron park with western Placer County cities with no natural boundary with El Dorado Hills. Rancho Cordova, Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills are share American River and Highway 50. Cities in Tahoe area have much in common should be together
9edorado_20110714_4d	7142011	Phillip Weichel	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Disagree with replacement of Citrus Heights and I80 communities for El Dorado Hills and Cameron park. Share Economic, communal, geographic interests with communities south of American River,, Highway 50. Employment, entertainment. Citrus heights Roseville
9edorado_20110714_5d	7142011	Mary Yurkutat Weatherwax	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Happy with first draft maps. Keep El Dorado Hills separate from W Placer cities. El Dorado Hills should be in same SD as Rancho Cordova and Elk Grove. Two county lines away and across American River. Highway 50 connects us, 80 the others.
9humboldt_20110714_1d	7142011	Brian Hodgson	no			Humboldt	yes	Marin and Humboldt have different interests and should have separate representation. Is it true commission has not visitied Eureka?

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9edorado_20110714_2d	Placer	El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove	American River, Highway 50	no	yes		
9edorado_20110714_3d	Tahoe	El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove		no	yes		
9edorado_20110714_4d		El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Roseville, Citrus Heights	American River, Highway 50	no	yes		services, employment
9edorado_20110714_5d	Placer	El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove	American River, Highway 50, 80	no	yes		
9humboldt_20110714_1d	Marin, Humboldt	Eureka		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9edorado_20110714_2d	River, Highway		no			dividing line	
9edorado_20110714_3d	much in common, River, Highway 50		no			no natural boundary	
9edorado_20110714_4d	entertainment, geographic interest		no				keep first draft
9edorado_20110714_5d	Location, Highway, river		no			EDH does not belong with Placer	
9humboldt_20110714_1d			no			different interests	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9shasta_20110714_1d	7142011	Marcia	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta is part of inland N CA, should remain with geographic neighbors in any new district lines
9siskiyou_20110714_1d	7142011	Maria Mesing	no		Yreka	Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou with costal towns which are completely different. Takes away rights, voices, freedom of choice.
9siskiyou_20110714_2d	7142011	MHA	no				yes	Put visualizations in jpg or pdf so ordinary citizens can see them. Computer cannot recognize formats
9sjoaquin_20110714_1d	7142011	Andrea Torres	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Thank you for moving Lodi from Bay Area to central valley with Galt and Elk Grove. Along cities on HWY 99. Do not go further than Elk Grove, keep SACEG Assembly map how it is now.
9sjoaquin_20110714_2d	7142011	Jason Behrmann, City Manager	yes	City of Galt	Galt	San Joaquin	yes	AD extend boundary to the east to Clay Station Road to align with school districts. SD AD should nest inside SD, do not exclude high school E of Marengo Road. CD use prior boundaries, leave Galt with Sacramento
9sjoaquin_20110714_3d	7142011	Katia and Rhodesia Ransom	no		Tracy	San Joaquin	yes	Thank you for keeping Stockton and Tracy together in one AD. Continue to do this and make AD map STKTN the final one
general_20110714_1d	7142011	Emy Estrada	no				yes	Please stop this, it will be big mistake
general_20110714_2d	7142011	Eugene Lee, Voting Rights Project Director,	yes	APALC	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Interpretation of 14 day posting requirement is incorrect, will be sending comments later
general_20110714_3d	7142011	Christina Henry	no				yes	You are not posting accurate agendas. Please post videos ASAP, you are preventing me from right to learn and react quickly

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9shasta_20110714_1d	Shasta			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110714_1d	Siskiyou			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110714_2d				no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110714_1d		Lodi, Galt, Elk Grove,		no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110714_2d	Sacramento	Galt	Clay Station Road, Marengo Road	no	yes		
9sjoaquin_20110714_3d		Stockton, Tracy		no	no		
general_20110714_1d				no	no		
general_20110714_2d				no	no		
general_20110714_3d				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9shasta_20110714_1d			no				
9siskiyou_20110714_1d			no			takes awawy rights, fair representation, voices,	
9siskiyou_20110714_2d			no				
9sjoaquin_20110714_1d	central valley, schools		no				
9sjoaquin_20110714_2d	high school district, development,		no				
9sjoaquin_20110714_3d			no				
general_20110714_1d			no				
general_20110714_2d			no				
general_20110714_3d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110714_4d	7142011	Raul Cabral	no				yes	Redistricting procedure should have been more open and transparent. Recognize LGBT, Communities of Color. Redistricting should be more transparent.
general_20110714_5d	7142011	Ellen Swensen	no				yes	You are late in posting Videos and agendas are innacurate and late. Violates Bagley-Keene public meeting laws and invalidates process. How can I comment when you do not post in time
general_20110714_6d	7142011	Charles	no				yes	There should be no loss whatsoever of Northstate representation. Maintain current level of representation, 3 Ads, 3SDs, 3 CDs. Make improvements to boundaries of districts in Bay area in July 11 visualizations. Make improvements to boundaries of LA Socal
general_20110714_7d	7142011	Migues Lopez	yes	Palm Realty	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	No to redistricting. Block of people here will vote against you.
general_20110714_8d	7142011	David Salder	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	The maps published are a joke, there is no way to distinguish where lines fall. Worst gerrymandering I have ever seen. Voters will not sit idly by.
supporters_antelope_20110714_1d	7142011	T Alamillo	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_2d	7142011	Mike Partkowiak	yes	Century 21 Desert Springs	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110714_4d				no	no		
general_20110714_5d				no	no		
general_20110714_6d	Los Angeles			no	no		
general_20110714_7d				no	no		
general_20110714_8d				no	no		
supporters_antelope_20110714_1d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_2d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110714_4d			no				
general_20110714_5d			no				
general_20110714_6d			no				
general_20110714_7d			no				
general_20110714_8d			no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_1d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_2d	High Desert		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_antelope_20110714_3d	7142011	Ricardo Arosemena, Sr Loan Officer	yes	Platinum Home Mortgage			yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_4d	7142011	April Bartlett	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_5d	7142011	Robert Kacik, GRI	yes	Century 21 Yarrow	Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_6d	7142011	Susan E Marmon	yes	Suburban Realty	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_7d	7142011	Alycia Harrison	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_8d	7142011	Richard Smith	yes	Golden Valley Real Estate			yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_antelope_20110714_3d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_4d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_5d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_6d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_7d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_8d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_antelope_20110714_3d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_4d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_5d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_6d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_7d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_8d	High Desert		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_antelope_20110714_9d	7142011	Donna Sweikow	yes	Keller Williams Realty AV	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_10d	7142011	Debi Breul	yes	Keller Williams Realty AV	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_11d	7142011	Grace Dan	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_12d	7142011	Lisa Schulze	yes	Keller Williams Realty	Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_13d	7142011	Barb Simmons	yes	Essence Real Estate Consultants			yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_14d	7142011	Kevin Scott	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_antelope_20110714_9d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_10d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_11d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_12d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_13d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_14d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_antelope_20110714_9d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_10d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_11d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_12d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_13d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_14d	High Desert		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_antelope_20110714_15d	7142011	Susan Gately	yes	Antelope Property			yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_16d	7142011	Joy Colovin, Realtoe	yes	REO Management Specialist			yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_17d	7142011	Linda Mastin	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_18d	7142011	Lucy Kajrys-Dietz, Realtor	yes	Suburban Realty			yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_19d	7142011	Carol Lynn Hutchinson	no		California City	Los Angeles	yes	Be mindful of needs of people in Antelope Valley. United by living working, shopping, Environment. Keep Lancaster and Palmdale together in SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_20d	7142011	Debi Seitz	yes	Century 21	Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_antelope_20110714_21d	7142011	Yvonne Hayes-Realtor	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_antelope_20110714_15d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_16d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_17d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_18d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_19d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_20d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110714_21d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_antelope_20110714_15d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_16d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_17d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_18d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_19d	High Desert		no			needs are different from folks on other side of the mountains	
supporters_antelope_20110714_20d	High Desert		no				
supporters_antelope_20110714_21d	High Desert		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_antelope_20110714_22d	7142011	Steve Rice, Realtor	yes	Coldwell Banker	Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together. High Desert communities like N LA couty East Kern, Victor Valley in San Bernardino should be kept in same SD. Keep first draft SD
supporters_gwnc_20110714_1d	7142011	Anita Newman, MD	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_2d	7142011	D. Stienfeld, Block Captain	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_3d	7142011	Fred Pickel	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_4d	7142011	Suzanne Henry Chase	no		Windsor Square	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_antelope_20110714_22d	Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_1d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_2d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_3d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_4d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_antelope_20110714_22d	High Desert		no				
supporters_gwnc_20110714_1d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_2d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_3d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_4d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110714_5d	7142011	Jack Humphreville	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_6d	7142011		no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_7d	7142011	Donald R and Joan C Shewfelt	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_8d	7142011	Caroline	no				yes	Moves votes into non COI neighborhoods to West.Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_9d	7142011	John H Welbourne, VP for Planning and Land Use	yes	Windsor Square Association	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Draw line at Western, not PlymouthDo not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_10d	7142011	Harold Cooke, Elaine Murata Sunoo	no				yes	Wilshire should be in tact from Western to La Brea. Follow back property lines.Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110714_5d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_6d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_7d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_8d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_9d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_10d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110714_5d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_6d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_7d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_8d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_9d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_10d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110714_11d	7142011	Mariko VanKampen	no				yes	Conform to Western ave boundary.Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_12d	7142011	Jane Ellison Usher, Board Member	yes	Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council	Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Conform to Western ave boundary.Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_13d	7142011	Jack Humphreville	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_14d	7142011	Caroline Moser	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_15d	7142011	Paulette Light	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_16d	7142011	Angela Wilson Gyetvan, Founder and President	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110714_11d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_12d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_13d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_14d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_15d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_16d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110714_11d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_12d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_13d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_14d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_15d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_16d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110714_17d	7142011	Wendy Savage	no				yes	Fix our boundaries.Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_18d	7142011	Suz Landay,	no		Winsor Square	Los Angeles	yes	do not weaken neighborhoods. Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_19d	7142011	Charles Ward and Michael Lombardo	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_20d	7142011	Robert Eisele	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_21d	7142011	Phil Braen	no		La Brea-Hancock	Los Angeles	yes	Preserve our neighborhoods. Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_22d	7142011	Diana Eisele	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110714_17d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_18d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_19d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_20d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_21d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_22d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110714_17d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_18d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_19d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_20d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_21d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_22d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110714_23d	7142011	Donna and Josh Kishibay	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_24d	7142011	Juanita Kempe	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_25d	7142011	Glen Brunman	no				yes	Drawing district lines like this is a form of gerrymandering Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_26d	7142011	Susan Humphreville	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_27d	7142011	Frederick H. Pickel, Ph.D	yes	Wilshire Energy Consulting Group, Inc	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110714_23d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_24d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_25d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_26d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_27d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110714_23d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_24d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_25d	century old neighborhoodscentury old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_26d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_27d	century old neighborhoodscentury old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110714_28d	7142011	Hilary Liftin	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_29d	7142011	Ron Greeno, MD	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_30d	7142011	Jack Humphreville	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110714_31d	7142011	Debra Knowles	no				yes	Do not cut Plymouth Blvd down the middle. Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_32d	7142011	Ian Jack	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110714_28d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_29d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_30d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_31d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_32d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110714_28d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_29d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_30d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_31d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_32d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110714_33d	7142011	Schuyler Kent and Keith Feldman	no				yes	No good reason for splitting district. Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood.
supporters_gwnc_20110714_34d	7142011	Ron Greeno, PHD	no				yes	Do not split Hancock Park Windsor Square Neighborhood. Keep century old neighborhood intact. Return to LA for State board of equalization. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for CD. Do not divide in half at Plymouth for AD. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_lhabra_20110714_1d	7142011	Annette Mestaz-Carroll	no				yes	Do not put La Habra in L.A. County district. Place with other North Orange County cities.
supporters_lhabra_20110714_2d	7142011	Robert and Lucy LaFreniere	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in L.A. County district. Place with other North Orange County cities.
supporters_lhabra_20110714_3d	7142011	David Guerrero	no				yes	Do not put La Habra in L.A. County district. Place with other North Orange County cities.
supporters_lhabra_20110714_4d	7142011	Randall J Rivera	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Do not put La Habra in L.A. County district. Place with other North Orange County cities.
supporters_lhabra_20110714_5d	7142011	Kim Hickin	no				no	Do not put La Habra in L.A. County district. Place with other North Orange County cities.
supporters_lhabra_20110714_6d	7142011	Kim Van Buskirk	no				no	Do not put La Habra in L.A. County district. Place with other North Orange County cities.
supporters_lhabra_20110714_7d	7142011	Jeannette Lee	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Do not put La Habra in L.A. County district. Place with other North Orange County cities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110714_33d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110714_34d	Los Angeles	Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire	Plymouth Blvd, Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes		
supporters_lhabra_20110714_1d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110714_2d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110714_3d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110714_4d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110714_5d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110714_6d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110714_7d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110714_33d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_gwnc_20110714_34d	century old neighborhoods		no			no COI with East district	
supporters_lhabra_20110714_1d			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110714_2d			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110714_3d			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110714_4d			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110714_5d			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110714_6d			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110714_7d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_1d	7142011	Michelle M. Morales	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_2d	7142011	Bill Tezak	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_3d	7142011	Dolores O Sullivan	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_4d	7142011	Catherine Ford	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_1d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_2d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_3d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_4d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_1d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_2d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_3d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_4d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_5d	7142011	Will Gotay	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_6d	7142011	Angela Jenkins	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_7d	7142011	Eric Jenkins	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_8d	7142011	Linda Apocada	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_5d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_6d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_7d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_8d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_5d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_6d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_7d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_8d	education, tranportation, water districts, representationeducation, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_9d	7142011	Todd Thomas	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_10d	7142011	Bill Tezak	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_11d	7142011	Terri Raines	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_12d	7142011	Mauricio Nunez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_9d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_10d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_11d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_12d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_9d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_10d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_11d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_12d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_13d	7142011	Mauricio Nunez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in SD and AD with Los Angeles Cities, does not share community identity, history, relationships. More Aligned with North Orange for education, transport, water. La Habra should be in DBYL SD and DBRYL or ANAFULL AD
supporters_smonica_20110714_1d	7142011	Ruth L. Seroussi	no				yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality
supporters_smonica_20110714_2d	7142011	Mark A. Winter	no				yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey) in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality
supporters_smonica_20110714_3d	7142011	James Murez	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey) in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality
supporters_smonica_20110714_4d	7142011	Captain Jim Cash	no		Marina Del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_13d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_smonica_20110714_1d		Santa Monica Bay		no	yes		
supporters_smonica_20110714_2d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		
supporters_smonica_20110714_3d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		
supporters_smonica_20110714_4d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110714_13d	education, tranportation, water districts, representation		no			no COI with LA county cities	
supporters_smonica_20110714_1d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no				
supporters_smonica_20110714_2d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no				
supporters_smonica_20110714_3d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no				
supporters_smonica_20110714_4d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_smonica_20110714_5d	7142011	Mark Winter	yes	MPNA, director			yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey) in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality
supporters_smonica_20110714_6d	7142011	Alice D. Leahey	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey) in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality.
supporters_smonica_20110714_7d	7142011	Marcia Sherwin	yes	ReMax Beach Cities Realty	Marina del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey) in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality.
supporters_smonica_20110714_8d	7142011	Ivonne Guzman, Member	yes	Venice Neighborhood Council	Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey) in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_smonica_20110714_5d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		
supporters_smonica_20110714_6d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		
supporters_smonica_20110714_7d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		
supporters_smonica_20110714_8d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_smonica_20110714_5d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no				
supporters_smonica_20110714_6d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no			Inglewood has different issues and interests	
supporters_smonica_20110714_7d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no				
supporters_smonica_20110714_8d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_smonica_20110714_9d	7142011	Renae Paonessa	yes	P Arcuri			yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey) in AD into 3 separate districts, will weaken. Shares coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality.
1imperial_20110714_1d	7142011	Christina Henry	no				yes	Imperial County is agricultural Coachella Valley is tourism and they should not be combined. Statistics included
2riverside_20110714_1d	7142011	David Salaverry	yes	CCAG			yes	Coachella Valley Economy is based in Tourism, not agriculture, should not be combined with Imperial Countys agricultural COI in any map. CVEP reports show.
2sbernardino_20110714_1d	7142011	Scott Murphy	no				yes	Want to see what is being looks at re San Bernardino, relationship to High Desert region of Hesperia, Victorville, Barstow. Changes should reflect demographic shifts occuring in last 10 years
6kern_20110714_1d	7142011	Alex Topar	no				yes	Pick option 1, it is the least change
7scruz_20110714_1d	7142011	Ryan Globus	no			Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Santa Cruz county whole, small county with strong sense of community and unity. Splitting down middle of town is arbitrary and no reflection of community
8alameda_20110714_1d	7142011	Alan L. Nagy, Councilmember	yes	City of Newark	Newark	Alameda	yes	Supports CD map for Hayward, Fremont, Newark, Union City, Milpitas. Pleased Fremont is rooted in Alameda county district ,history and institutions. Hope this will be final map

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_smonica_20110714_9d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey		no	yes		
1imperial_20110714_1d	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110714_1d	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110714_1d	San Bernardino	Hesperia, Victorville, Barstow		no	yes		
6kern_20110714_1d				no	no		
7scruz_20110714_1d	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
8alameda_20110714_1d	Alameda	Hayward, Fremont, Newark, Union City, Milpitas		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_smonica_20110714_9d	coastal dependent tourism, coastal recreation, urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality		no			Do not group with Inglewood, inland vs. coastal	
1imperial_20110714_1d			no			agriculture vs. tourism industries	
2riverside_20110714_1d			no			agriculture vs. tourism	
2sbernardino_20110714_1d	demographic shifts in High Desert		no				
6kern_20110714_1d			no				
7scruz_20110714_1d	strong sense of community and unity		no				
8alameda_20110714_1d	history and institutions		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110714_1d	7142011	Peter Van Meter	no		Sausalito	Marin	yes	Keep Marin whole, combined with Sonoma, do not go East or link with SF. AD trade pop north of Hwy 12 in Santa Rosa to include Rohnert Park in Marin. SD nest AD s, include Petaluma. CD 6th best serves areas COI
8napa_20110714_1d	7142011	Mark Gasster	no				yes	Thanks for efforts to further destroy California. Attached editorial by Tony Quinn about proposition 20 and the 54th democratic seat
8napa_20110714_2d	7142011	Roger Peters	no				yes	No COI between Benicia and Lake County. Pop base of Fairfield, Benicia and Vallejo will dominate. Combine area north of Hwy 37 with Sonoma and Napa Valleys and areas north into common district. Berryessa and Clearlake would fit North or east with Woodland
4langeles_20110702_9	722011	Mary Galpin	no				yes	Use plan proposed by VICA and keep the Valley together
4langeles_20110702_10	722011	Cyndi Hench	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester, Playa Del Rey and Playa Vista and LAX with South Bay Cities. More in Common with South Bay than cities to East. Transport, LAX, coastal issues
4langeles_20110702_11	722011	Hattie Herring	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Carson, Compton, and Central and West Long Beach running down to Port of Long beach, together for COI reasons; truck traffic, rail traffic, related pollutants. Redraw COMP and PVEBC maps.
5sbarbara_20110702_1	722011	Brian N Kopeikin, MD	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Santa Barbara is far different from Ventura and Oxnard demographically, politically, economically. Accept solution endorsed by Pedro Nava and Brooks Firestone to give competitive district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110714_1d	Marin, Sonoma	SF, Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Petaluma	Hwy 12	no	yes		
8napa_20110714_1d				no	no		
8napa_20110714_2d	Lake, napa, Sonoma	Benecia, Fairfield, Vallejo, Berryessa, Clearlake, Woodland	37 hwy	no	no		
4langeles_20110702_9				no	no		
4langeles_20110702_10	Los Angeles	Westchester, Playa Del Rey, Playa Vista, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110702_11		Carson, Compton, Long Beach, Port of Long Beach, Palos Verdes		no	yes		
5sbarbara_20110702_1	Santa Barbara, Ventura, Oxnard			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110714_1d			no				
8napa_20110714_1d			no				
8napa_20110714_2d			no			no COI of Benicia and Lake County	
4langeles_20110702_9			no				
4langeles_20110702_10	coastal issues, LAX, transportation issues		no				
4langeles_20110702_11	truck traffic, rail traffic, pollutants		no				
5sbarbara_20110702_1			no			different demographics, politics, economics	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110702_1	722011	Frances Soule	no				yes	Do not link the northern segment of San Lorenzo Valley and Scotts Valley with any part of Silicon Valley.
7sclara_20110702_2	722011	Lilian Alecia Morgan	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Santa Cruz mountains have different concerns from Santa Clara Valley area, and are seperated by mountains. Include San Lorenzo Valley with Santa Cruz area instead of Santa Clara Valley. Different geography and environment
8alameda_20110702_1	722011	Anthony Franks	no			Alameda	yes	Thanks for keeping Livermore, Dublin, Pleasanton, San Jose together. Opposed to being linked with Hayward, Tri-Cities, do not want to cross the mountains. Livermore Labs and Silicon Valley have a lot in common.
8ccosta_20110702_1	722011	Dolores Neese	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not destroy Richmond, unite it.
8ccosta_20110702_2	722011	Susan Druding	yes	Straw Into Gold, Inc	Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond between two different districts. Not the way to bring community and city unity
8ccosta_20110702_3	722011	Susan Meeter	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond between two districts. Violates principle of maintaining integrity of cities and undermines attempts to unify diverse neighborhoods
8ccosta_20110702_4	722011	Rev, Deborah J. Butler	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond between two representatives. Would be devestating, with pressing issues of poverty, violence, health and community development. One portion would receive less attention from Congresswoman Lee, who sees over Oakland as well.
8ccosta_20110702_5	722011	Dolores Neese	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond. Citizens want a united Richmond

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110702_1		San Lorenzo, Scotts Valley, Silicon Valley		no	no		
7sclara_20110702_2		Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Lorenzo	Mountains	no	no		
8alameda_20110702_1		Livermore, Dublin, Pleasanton, Hayward, San Jose	mountains	no	yes		Livermore Labs, Silicon Valley, innovation
8ccosta_20110702_1		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110702_2		Richmond		no	no		
8ccosta_20110702_3		Richmond		no	yes	diverse neighborhoods	
8ccosta_20110702_4		Richmond, Oakland		no	yes		poverty, community development
8ccosta_20110702_5		Richmond		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110702_1			no			beyond ridiculou	
7sclara_20110702_2			no			different environment, concerns, political views, geography	
8alameda_20110702_1			no			do not want to cross mountains	
8ccosta_20110702_1			no				
8ccosta_20110702_2			no				resident and business owner
8ccosta_20110702_3	city integrity,		no				
8ccosta_20110702_4	violence, health, Millers representation		no			would be devestating not to have one person connected with area	
8ccosta_20110702_5	citizens want united		no				no no no

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110702_1	722011	Carol Nelson	no		San Rafael	Marin	yes	Include parts of San Francisco in Marin County. Have most in common with Sonoma County residents and SF county residents. Less in common with Napa and Lake and the north coast.
8marin_20110702_2	722011	Barbara McEntyre	no				yes	Keep MarinSonomaNorthcoast separate from San Francisco. Former are suburban rural and do not have COI with SF. MarinSonoma will be overshadowed by SF in Senate. Put Marin and all of Sonoma together including Santa Rosa, do not split Sonoma.
8marin_20110702_3	722011	Maurice Groat	no			Marin	yes	Do not change current district boundaries. Little in common with counties to the North, besides the coastline. Existing district has served well.
8marin_20110702_4	722011	Sue Severin	no		San Anselmo	Marin	yes	Do not include San Francisco in Marin County district. Keep it Marin and Sonoma County.
8marin_20110702_5	722011	Lynn Arias Bornstein	no			Marin	yes	First district map was perfect. Keep Marin north of Golden Gate bridge. Do not include San Francisco. Interests do not reflect those of urban area.
8marin_20110702_6	722011	Margery Jacobs Schnitzer	no			Marin	yes	Do not include any part of SF in Marin. Marin has different needs than urban areas
9edorado_20110702_1	732011	Roberta Long	no				yes	Keep El Dorado County and Folsom together on all maps. They are like twin Cities , independent. Suburban and rural areas are not different communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110702_1	San Francisco, Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Lake			no	yes		
8marin_20110702_2	Marin, Sonoma	San Francisco, Santa Rosa		no	no		
8marin_20110702_3	Marin			no	yes		
8marin_20110702_4	Marin, Sonoma	San Francisco, Santa Rosa		no	no		
8marin_20110702_5	Marin, San Francisco	San Francisco	Golden Gate Bridge	no	no		
8marin_20110702_6	Marin, San Francisco	San Francisco		no	no		
9edorado_20110702_1	El Dorado	El Dorado, Folsom		no	yes	twin cities, independent	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110702_1	most in common		no			less in comon with Napa and Lake	
8marin_20110702_2			no			no COI with SF, representation	
8marin_20110702_3	Legislator had close and regular contact with constituents		no			little in common with North Counties	
8marin_20110702_4			no				
8marin_20110702_5			no			interests are not those of urban area	
8marin_20110702_6			no			different needs than urban areas	
9edorado_20110702_1	suburban and rural		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110702_1	732011	Stephen Edel	yes	Marble Peaks Ranch	Etna	Siskiyou	yes	Do not put Etna and Fort Jones with North Coastal communities. Interests are tied to Siskiyou county. Etna and Eureka are geographically, culturally, and politically orthogonal.
9sjoaquin_20110702_1	722011	Donna DeMartino	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	San Joaquin County should be CD on its own, should have one SD, entire AD, not more than 2 AD s in county. Would preserve county boundaries and give residents political voice. Do not put in CD that goes to Merced or Fresno. Do not tear apart Stockton
20110702_1	722011	Eugene Lee, Voting Rights Project Director	yes	Asian Pacific American Legal Center			yes	Information clarifying Commissions understanding of population Equality standard applicable to redrawing of California legislative districts. There is inconsistency between Commissions deviation limit and the population equality standard established.
20110702_2	722011	Robert Roenicke	no				yes	Inland Valley, mountainous, and desert counties should be separate, together from Coastal Counties. Use North South lines with major hwy corridors.
1sdiego_20110703_1	732011	Lydia Ruggero	no		Clairmont	San Diego	yes	Keep Clairmont intact with one Assembly member and Senator, strong community should not be divided.
1sdiego_20110703_2	732011	Al Verna	no		Clairmont	San Diego	yes	Keep Clairemont district intact, do not divide. Remain fair and unbiased
1sdiego_20110703_3	732011	David S. De Fields, Representative	yes	Citizens of Spring Valley	Spring Valley	San Diego	yes	91977-3545 section of Spring Valley should remain in Duncan Hunters CD. Politically aligned with La Mesa-El Cajon-Alpine. Voice would be lost otherwise.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110702_1	Siskiyou	Etna, Fort Jones, Eureka		no	yes		ranching, rural, inland
9sjoaquin_20110702_1	San Joaquin, Merced, Fresno	Stockton		no	yes	similar interests and concerns, county boundaries	
20110702_1				no	no		
20110702_2			I-5, 99, 395	no	no		
1sdiego_20110703_1		Clairmont		no	yes	strong community should not be divided	
1sdiego_20110703_2		Clairemont		no	no		
1sdiego_20110703_3		La Mesa, El Cajon, Alpine		no	yes	politically aligned and in-tune with Duncan Hunter	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110702_1	farming and ranching, sheep, agricultural environment		no			not a coastal community	
9sjoaquin_20110702_1	effective representation		no			do not divide, or pput with people in Bay Area	
20110702_1			no				Commissions deviated limit vs. pop equality standard established in California supreme count decisions
20110702_2			no				
1sdiego_20110703_1			no				
1sdiego_20110703_2			no				
1sdiego_20110703_3			no			voices would be lost if re-districted	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110703_1	732011	Iku Kiriyama	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	West Torrance is connected to beach communities in Southern Beach section. North, Central, and East Torrance is better aligned as in Assembly and tate proposal for historic and cultural Japanese American COI.
4langeles_20110703_2	732011	Joan Levine	no		Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Silver Lake from Los Feliz, they are inextricably linked in every way.
5ventura_20110703_1	732011	Marcella F. Sharp	no		Thousand Oaks	Ventura	yes	Do not take parts of Thousand Oaks and Simi Valley and include them in LA precinct of SFV. Residents would have to drive long distances. Tax money should go to schools. Would make voting, paying taxes, school issues, difficult
8ccosta_20110703_1	732011	Robert Blankenship	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not take poorer, blacker parts of Richmond and add them to Oaklands district. Dividing citizens political energy and focus by putting them in 2 districts will harm the city.
8ccosta_20110703_2	732011	Patricia Kelly	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond. Need to stay with George Miller to not get lost in Barbara Lees district
8ccosta_20110703_3	732011	Janet S Johnson	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Redraw lines so that Richmond can remain unified and ties to Congressman Millers office can be maintained. Not in best interests of beleaguered city to be divided into two CDs. Richmonds needs would be eclipsed by Oaklsnds greater difficulties.
8smateo_20110703_1	732011	Meredith stapp- Ozbil	no		Menlo Park	San Mateo	yes	Do not divide Menlo Park. Menlo Park and Atherton need to be represented by same people, communities are tied to each other

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110703_1		Torrance		no	yes	historic and cultural Japanese American community	
4langeles_20110703_2		Silver Lake, Los Feliz		no	yes	linked in every way	
5ventura_20110703_1	Los Angeles	Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110703_1		Richmond, Oakland		no	yes	city in own right with mix of black, white, poor, rich	
8ccosta_20110703_2		Richmond		no	yes	need all togetherness can muster	
8ccosta_20110703_3	Contra Costa	Richmond, Oakland		no	yes		low-income communities, high crime, unemployment, poor schools,
8smateo_20110703_1		Menlo Park, Atherton		no	yes	tied to each other	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110703_1			no				
4langeles_20110703_2			no				
5ventura_20110703_1			no			long distance, voting, paying taxes, school issues, street repair	
8ccosta_20110703_1	beginning to get act together		no			smells of racial and economic segregation, dividing will harm city	
8ccosta_20110703_2	stay with George miller		no			do not want to get lost in Lees district	
8ccosta_20110703_3	citizens united for a more livable city		no			Need George Millers advocacy	
8smateo_20110703_1			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sonoma_20110703_1	732011	Kathleen Harms	no		Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Do not put Santa Rosa and Sonoma in CD with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or yolo, would disenfranchise Santa Rosa. Are part of North bay, concerns are with Russian River, coast, SF Bay, wine, and organic gardening.
8sonoma_20110703_2	732011	Mary Harms	no				yes	Do not put Santa Rosa and Sonoma in CD with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or yolo, would disenfranchise Santa Rosa. Are part of North bay, concerns are with Russian River, coast, SF Bay, wine, and organic gardening.
8sonoma_20110703_3	732011	Jean O Donnell	no				yes	Do not put Santa Rosa and Sonoma in CD with Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, or yolo, would disenfranchise Santa Rosa. Are part of North bay, concerns are with Russian River, coast, SF Bay, wine, and organic gardening.
9calveras_20110703_1	732011	Robert Pebley	no				yes	Congressional foothill district is good idea. Do not Madera with Amador, El Dorado, Calaveras. S foohills have little in common with Mother Lode counties. Galt should be with Sacramento, not calistoga. Lodi belongs with stockton.
9calveras_20110703_2	732011	Michael J. Spadoni	no		Rail Road Flat	Calaveras	yes	Calaveras County district is controlled by flatland Counties. Mother Lode Counties have needs not relevant to flatlands, and should have own representation not overshadowed by more influential counties.
9shasta_20110703_1	732011	Sam Smith	no				yes	Do not lump Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc and Lassen counties with the coast. Nothing in common

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sonoma_20110703_1	Sonoma, Glen, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
8sonoma_20110703_2	Sonoma, Glen, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
8sonoma_20110703_3	Sonoma, Glen, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
9calveras_20110703_1	Madera, Amador, El Dorado, Calaveras	Galt, Lodi, Stockton		no	yes		
9calveras_20110703_2	Calaveras.			no	yes	have own needs	
9shasta_20110703_1	Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sonoma_20110703_1	Russian River, coastal preservation, SF Bay, wine, organic gardening		no			little in common	
8sonoma_20110703_2	Russian River, coastal preservation, SF Bay, wine, organic gardening		no			little in common	
8sonoma_20110703_3	Russian River, coastal preservation, SF Bay, wine, organic gardening		no			little in common	
9calveras_20110703_1	joined at hips, representation		no			S foothills little in common with Mother Lode. Little in common with Fresno.	
9calveras_20110703_2			no			other counties overshadow needs	
9shasta_20110703_1			no			nothing in common at all	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9siskiyou_20110703_1	732011	Chris E. Sorensen	no				yes	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama together
general_20110703_1	732011		no				yes	No to newly drawn redistricting maps.
general_20110703_2	732011	Peddy da Silva	no				yes	Hope you will draw districts that are communities and neighborhoods. Should be grouped in neighborhoods, to elect representatives who will know their communities
general_20110703_3	732011	Jeffrey Hunt	no				yes	Supports California secession to South California. Worried about people immigrating from California to Utah.
1sdiego_20110704_1	742011	Mark Adrian	no		Clairemont	San Diego	yes	Supports Lori Sandenas posture on Clairemont. Leave existing Assembly, Senate and CD boundaries as they are now. Leave the traditional boundaries intact. Opposed to all redistricting.
1sdiego_20110704_2	742011	Donald Scott	no		Clairemont	San Diego	yes	Have lived in N part of Clairemont in San Diego since 1970 and does not appreciate proposed dividing of Community
4langeles_20110704_1	742011	Linda and Gary Starr	no		Chatsworth	Los Angeles	yes	Add Agoura and Calabasas to West Valley AD and CD. Correctly removed Thousand Oaks. Beverly Hills has nothing in common with Calabbasas and Agoura and should not be in same district. Keep those districts west of 405
4langeles_20110704_2	742011	James Wu	no				yes	Silverlake and Los Feliz belong together in whatever district is drawn. Two neighborhoods are dependent on each other and indistinguishable

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9siskiyou_20110703_1	Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama			no	no		
general_20110703_1				no	no		
general_20110703_2				no	no		
general_20110703_3				no	no		
1sdiego_20110704_1	San Diego	San Diego		no	yes	traditional boundaries have existed for decades	
1sdiego_20110704_2	San Diego	Clairemon		no	no		
4langeles_20110704_1	Los Angeles	Agoura, Calabasas, Thousand Oaks, Beverly Hills	405	no	no		
4langeles_20110704_2	Los Angeles	Silverlake, Los Feliz		no	no	dependent on each other	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9siskiyou_20110703_1			no				
general_20110703_1			no				
general_20110703_2			no			questions how we group people in 21st century CA	
general_20110703_3			no			capricious crime, deviant drivers	calls california a sink hole
1sdiego_20110704_1			no				
1sdiego_20110704_2			no				
4langeles_20110704_1			no			Nothing at all in common	
4langeles_20110704_2	indistinguishable at many points		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110704_3	742011	Joseph Luis Pinon, Chairman	yes	Environmental Commission	Carson	Los Angeles	yes	Carson has more common interests with Torrance, Gardena or Wilmington than Beach Cities or Florence-Firestone. Keep Carson intact, should not be split like a big city. Is diverse city, civic minded, and should not be gerrymandered
4langeles_20110704_4	742011	Marilyn Judson	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Monica Mountains SD 23 with Santa Monica, Malibu, Beverly Hills, Agoura Hills and Thousand Oaks. Lines as they are now are a poor start
4langeles_20110704_5	742011	Susan J. Abato	no		San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Put Calabasas and Agoura with West San Fernando Valley AD and CD. Stop at Mulholland Ridge, not Mulholland Drive. Nothing in common with Beverly Hills or Westside. Put Sherman Oaks with East SFV, west of 405
5ventura_20110704_1	742011	Kelly Spencer	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley out of LA county, happy with Ventura. School districts would suffer worse if became a part of LAUSDs cuts
5ventura_20110704_2	742011	Cherie Whitaker	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley part of Ventura. City council balances budget, citizens work hard, unlike LA County. Left LA county to escape corrupt, overdrawn county, air, crime, rules.
5ventura_20110704_3	742011	Dawn Moffett	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley whole, and with Ventura County. More in common with Ventura than Santa Clarita and Antelope valley. Will limit voice in local issues and throw with non local areas.
5ventura_20110704_4	742011	Nancy McConnell	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Simi Valley part of Ventura county in all ways, shapes, and districts. Do not hand over to L.A. County for any reason

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110704_3		Carson, Torrance, Gardena, Wilmington, Florence-Firestone		no	yes	ehnicity, religion	income levels,
4langeles_20110704_4	.	Santa Monica, Malibu, Beverly Hills, Agoura Hills, Thousand Oaks, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110704_5		Calabasas, Agoura, SFV, Beverly Hills, Westside	Mulholland, 405	no	yes	history	
5ventura_20110704_1	Los Angeles, Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110704_2	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley		no	yes		
5ventura_20110704_3	Ventura	Simi Valley, Santa Clarita, Antelope Valley		no	yes		
5ventura_20110704_4	Ventura, Los Angeles	Simi Valley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110704_3	diversity, one city, schools, parks, city events.		no			would betray fair representation motto	
4langeles_20110704_4	Santa Monica Mountains primarily defended and used by people in close proxility thereto		no			might as well combine with Lincoln	
4langeles_20110704_5			no			nothing in common with Beverly Hills	
5ventura_20110704_1			no			school districts would suffer	
5ventura_20110704_2	city council, budget, committee, citizens work hard		no			LA is corrupt and overdrawn with rules and crime	
5ventura_20110704_3	more in common		no			do not throw with areas not geographically local	
5ventura_20110704_4			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8sfrancisco_20110704_1	742011	Michael Francis McCarthy	no				yes	Do not group districts from West to East, from coast over the hills into the central valley, as it disenfranchises Republicans, Hispanics. Re-do the plan.
9sacramento_20110704_1	742011	Charles Stone	no				yes	Agrees with majority of efforts except Citrus Heights should be united under one representative
2riverside_20110702_1	722011	Cindy Nance, Ph. D	yes	Desert Edge	Desert Hot Spring	Riverside	yes	Do not combine desert communities of Coachella Valley with urbanized Inland Empire of Western Riverside. Do not separate Menifee. Communities are defined by Desert, Mountains, Beaches. Keep together In SD, AD CD.
4langeles_20110702_1	722011	Debbi Vanatta	no		Newhall	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Newhall in own Valley. Stop playing around with rights.
4langeles_20110702_2	722011	Denny Schneider	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep coastal district in LA county. Do not segregate portions of westchester, Playa Del Rey and Playa Vista, do not move LAX from community. Connect with points south like South Bay into SFV. Restore consistency for Westchester-Playa.
4langeles_20110702_3	722011	Margaret Day Maier	no		Brentwood Glen	Los Angeles	yes	Do not join Brentwood glen to Westwood CD. Identity is with Brentwood, not Westwood. 405 freeway is divider. Issues are different, like UCLA
4langeles_20110702_4	722011	Cyndi Hench	no			Los Angeles	yes	Thank you for including, Westchester, Playa Del Rey and Playa Vista with South BayBeach Cities. More in common, coastal issues, LAX, transport, than with cities to East.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8sfrancisco_20110704_1				no	no		
9sacramento_20110704_1		Citrus Heights		no	no		
2riverside_20110702_1	Riverside	Menifee, Coachella Valley	Mt San Jacinto Mountain Range	no	yes		agriculture, amenitieis, limited acceess and economic challenges, seasonal work
4langeles_20110702_1		Newhall		no	no		
4langeles_20110702_2	Los Angeles	Westchester, Playa Del Rey, Playa Vista		no	yes		development and economic issues
4langeles_20110702_3		Brentwood, Brentwood Glen, Westwood	405 fwy	no	yes		UCLA
4langeles_20110702_4	Los Angeles	Westchester, Playa Del Rey, Playa Vista, South Bay		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8sfrancisco_20110704_1			no			urban coastal vs. inland counties, different voting patterns, taxes, regulations, water rights	
9sacramento_20110704_1			no				
2riverside_20110702_1	climate, elevation, ecosystems,		no			cannot be represented if forced to compete for needs with urban area	
4langeles_20110702_1			no			stop playing with rights	
4langeles_20110702_2	excessive traffic flow, environmental issues		no				supports initial map
4langeles_20110702_3	different issues		no				
4langeles_20110702_4	coastal issues, LAX, transportation issues		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110702_5	722011	Phil Hench	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester, Playa Del Rey and Playa Vista and LAX with South Bay Cities. More in Common with South Bay than cities to East. Transport, LAX, coastal issues
4langeles_20110702_6	722011	Janet Shigekawa	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Santa Clarita in two for CD.
4langeles_20110702_7	722011	Bill Fagerbakke	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Topanga with Santa Clarita. More involved in Santa Monica, Palisades, Calabasas, and Woodland Hills for schools, shopping, work.
4langeles_20110702_8	722011	Denny Schnieder	no		Westchester-Playa	Los Angeles	yes	Westchester, Playa Del Rey is one community of interest. Do not divide from within neighborhood council. Do not take LAX out of Westchester
2riverside_20110713_1c	7132011	Esther M. Rice	no		Blythe	Riverside	yes	Do not use 61011 maps for 80th AD; put Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley togetherImperial county
2riverside_20110713_2c	7132011	Nettie H. and Willie Washington	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio in the 80th AD; do not use current proposal
2riverside_20110713_3c	7132011	Alma Flores	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Do not use 61011 maps for 80th AD; put Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley togetherImperial county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110702_5	Los Angeles	Westchester, Playa Del Rey, Playa Vista, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110702_6		Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110702_7		Topanga, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica, Palisades, Calabasas, Woodland Hills		no	yes	schools, shopping	work
4langeles_20110702_8		Westchester, Playa Del Rey		no	yes		LAX is major impacter
2riverside_20110713_1c	Imperial			no	yes	Both valleys share history, water and utility districts, growing problems at the Salton Sea	Both Valleys share same industries tourism, agriculture, and green energy
2riverside_20110713_2c		Indio		no	no		
2riverside_20110713_3c	Imperial			no	yes	Both valleys share history, water and utility districts, growing problems at the Salton Sea	Both Valleys share same industries tourism, agriculture, and green energy

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110702_5	coastal issues, LAX, transportation issues		no				
4langeles_20110702_6			no			do not believe it is correct	
4langeles_20110702_7			no				What is the rationale
4langeles_20110702_8			no				
2riverside_20110713_1c			no				
2riverside_20110713_2c			no				
2riverside_20110713_3c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110713_4c	7132011	Dan Martinez	yes	City of Indio, City Manager	Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio wCoachella Valley and surrounding Riverside county communities
2riverside_20110713_5c	7132011	John Kopp	no		Eastvale	Riverside	yes	Riverside SD and AD look fine; Do not use proposed CD for ONTPM, SBRIA, RVMVN; do not split Eastvale, do not put Eastvale wSan Bernardino and LA counties; keep it wJurupa Valley; do not split Jurupa Valley; do not put wSan BernardioLA co.
2riverside_20110713_6c	7132011	Joe Ludwig	no				yes	In the RTLFO CD, include all of the city of Jurupa Valley, including the Pedley area which is currently left out; switch it wCity of Grand Terrace, which could be put in dist wRiverside
2riverside_20110713_7c	7132011	P.M. Chapman	no		La Quinta	Riverside	yes	Do not use 61011 maps for 80th AD; put Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley togetherImperial county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110713_4c	Riverside	Indio		no	yes	Indio is second county seat for Riverside, has experienced exponential economic growth in past years brining it to partiy wCoachella Valley; county svcs operate out of Indio, do not separate from surrounding closely-related communities	Mostly tourism and business, like Coachella Valley; very low and decreasing percentage agriculture (3.9)
2riverside_20110713_5c	Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Eastvale, Jurupa Valley		no	yes	Both Eastvale and Jurupa Valley are newly incorporated cities, have asserted identity as COIs; splitting them will undermine early development, divert DMV licencing fee revenue meant for new cities; COI shares low socioeconomic level, Latino community	
2riverside_20110713_6c	Riverside	Riverside, Jurupa Valley, Grand Terrace		no	no		
2riverside_20110713_7c	Imperial			no	yes	Both valleys share history, water and utility districts, growing problems at the Salton Sea	Both Valleys share same industries tourism, agriculture, and green energy

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110713_4c			no				
2riverside_20110713_5c		Latino community in Jurupa Valley is a COI	no				
2riverside_20110713_6c			no				
2riverside_20110713_7c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110713_8c	7132011	Mary Lisi	no				yes	Do not use 61011 maps for 80th AD; put Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley togetherImperial county
2riverside_20110713_9c	7132011	Michael Wilson	yes	City of Indio, Councilmember	Indio	Riverside	yes	Use original plan for Coachella Valley; do not split Coachella valley and put part of it with Imperial Valley; keep Indio, Coachella, county of Riverside with the other 7 incorporated cities in Coachella Valley; keep current relationship wSan Diego co.
2riverside_20110713_10c	7132011	Sharon Deuber	yes	Hemet Planning Commission, Vice Chair		Riverside	yes	Keep Hemet, San Jacinto Valley in 45th CD, in Riverside Co.
2riverside_20110713_11c	7132011	John W. Kopp, duplicate	no				no	
3orange_20110713_1c	7132011	Jon	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra wLA county
3orange_20110713_2c	7132011	Joaquin Herrera	no				no	
3orange_20110713_3c	7132011	Don Reeves	no				yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county
3orange_20110713_4c	7132011	Nancy Beamish	no				yes	Keep La Habra with Orange county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110713_8c	Imperial			no	yes	Both valleys share history, water and utility districts, growing problems at the Salton Sea	Both Valleys share same industries tourism, agriculture, and green energy
2riverside_20110713_9c	Riverside, Imperial, San Diego	Riverside, Coachella, Indio		no	yes	Coachella Valley is a COI, linked through Association of Governments and other regional bodies; do not use racesocioeconomic class to draw lines, do not carve out district for Latino community	
2riverside_20110713_10c	Riverside	Hemet		no	yes	San Jacinto Valley is a desert community, similar to Coachella Valley, many residents are retirement age, shares tourism, artscultureentertainment, benefit greatly from being wCoachella Valley which has simiar interests	San Jacinto Valley shares tourism, manufacturing industries wCoachella valley
2riverside_20110713_11c				no	no		
3orange_20110713_1c	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_2c				no	no		
3orange_20110713_3c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_4c	Orange	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra residents pay taxes to Orange county	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110713_8c			no				
2riverside_20110713_9c			no				
2riverside_20110713_10c			no				
2riverside_20110713_11c			no				
3orange_20110713_1c			no				
3orange_20110713_2c			no				no comment in file
3orange_20110713_3c			no				
3orange_20110713_4c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110713_5c	7132011	Kathleen Maassen	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county cities
3orange_20110713_6c	7132011	Frank Shaia	no				yes	Do not put La Habra wLA county
3orange_20110713_7c	7132011	Randy Roberts	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange county; Do not put La Habra wLA county
3orange_20110713_8c	7132011	Brent Goode	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange county
3orange_20110713_9c	7132011	Sandra Garcia	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange county
3orange_20110713_10c	7132011	Marilyn Huff	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra where it is.
3orange_20110713_11c	7132011	KNG	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_12c	7132011	Barbara Kerr	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange county
3orange_20110713_13c	7132011	John Sudduth	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_14c	7132011	James O. Ayers	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_15c	7132011	Marie Gallardo	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_16c	7132011	Jonathan Horowitz	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra where it is.
3orange_20110713_17c	7132011	Sal NVM Loans	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_18c	7132011	Joe Garcia	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_19c	7132011	Richard Van Camp	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra with LA county
3orange_20110713_20c	7132011	Julie Wei	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it in SDAD wLA county
3orange_20110713_21c	7132011	Irene Reynoso	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it in SDAD wLA county
3orange_20110713_22c	7132011	Jennifer Lewis	no				yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110713_5c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_6c	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_7c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_8c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_9c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_10c		La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_11c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_12c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_13c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_14c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_15c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_16c		La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_17c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_18c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_19c	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_20c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_21c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_22c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110713_5c			no				
3orange_20110713_6c			no				
3orange_20110713_7c			no				
3orange_20110713_8c			no				
3orange_20110713_9c			no				
3orange_20110713_10c			no				
3orange_20110713_11c			no				
3orange_20110713_12c			no				
3orange_20110713_13c			no				
3orange_20110713_14c			no				
3orange_20110713_15c			no				
3orange_20110713_16c			no				
3orange_20110713_17c			no				
3orange_20110713_18c			no				
3orange_20110713_19c			no				Opposes La Habras highest tax rate in Orange county
3orange_20110713_20c			no				
3orange_20110713_21c			no				
3orange_20110713_22c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110713_23c	7132011	Patricia Abel	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it in SDAD wLA county; La Mirada, Buena Park and Whittier have not been disturbed by redistricting
3orange_20110713_24c	7132011	Christian Bakken	no				yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county
3orange_20110713_25c	7132011	Hugo Silva	no		Fullerton	Orange	yes	Keep Fullerton whole, do not divide along Commonwealth or Orangethrope; do not link Fullerton wAnaheim, Santa Ana;
3orange_20110713_26c	7132011	Quynh Nguyen	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county
3orange_20110713_27c	7132011	Hank	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_28c	7132011	Christeen Amloian	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_29c	7132011	Jack Amloian	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_30c	7132011	Sherry Draxler	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_31c	7132011	Guillermo Rojas	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110713_23c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra, La Mirada, Buena Park, Whittier		no	no		
3orange_20110713_24c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_25c		Fullerton, Santa Ana, Anaheim	Commonwealth, Orangethrope	no	yes	Fullerton school district is not related to Santa Ana or Anaheim school districts; Fullerton has city health and education services; splitting Fullerton would harm Latino community	
3orange_20110713_26c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_27c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_28c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares issues on community, education, business and structure wOrange county	
3orange_20110713_29c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares issues on community, education, business and structure wOrange county	
3orange_20110713_30c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_31c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110713_23c			no				
3orange_20110713_24c			no				
3orange_20110713_25c		Splitting Fullerton would hurt the citys Latino community	no				
3orange_20110713_26c			no				
3orange_20110713_27c			no				
3orange_20110713_28c			no				
3orange_20110713_29c			no				
3orange_20110713_30c			no				
3orange_20110713_31c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110713_32c	7132011	Ysabel Sims	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_33c	7132011	Bob Russell	no			Orange	yes	Do not change Orange county districts
3orange_20110713_34c	7132011	Joanne Yurcho	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_35c	7132011	Tony Bernabe	no				yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county cities
3orange_20110713_36c	7132011	Anonymous	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_37c	7132011	Tony and Paulina Padilla	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county; put La Habra in the DB-YL SD, and either the DBRYL or ANAFULL AD; do not put it in the Los AngelesCovina SD, and the WhittierNorwalk AD
3orange_20110713_38c	7132011	Deanne Zamora	no				yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_39c	7132011	Kathy Gibbs	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_40c	7132011	Angela Tapia	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110713_32c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_33c	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110713_34c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares media with Orange County, not LA	
3orange_20110713_35c	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_36c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra students go to Orange county schools	
3orange_20110713_37c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra, Norwalk, Covina		no	yes	La Habra shares education, transportation authority, municipal water district, and many other organizations with Orange county	
3orange_20110713_38c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_39c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_40c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares resources for special needs children with Orange county, splitting them would have a negative impact on tax, location, housing, status and living	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110713_32c			no				
3orange_20110713_33c			no			Draw district lines considering tax variation, utility control, and childrens educational future	
3orange_20110713_34c			no				
3orange_20110713_35c			no				
3orange_20110713_36c			no				
3orange_20110713_37c			no				
3orange_20110713_38c			no				
3orange_20110713_39c			no				
3orange_20110713_40c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110713_41c	7132011	Damon Wong	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_42c	7132011	Lydia Kim	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_43c	7132011	Deborah West	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_44c	7132011	William E. McAuliffe	no				yes	Do not put La Habra with Los Angeles County
3orange_20110713_45c	7132011	Doris Francia	no				yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_46c	7132011	Mary Luby	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_47c	7132011	Tim Dell	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_48c	7142011	David Ling	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county; put La Habra in the DB-YL SD, and either the DBRYL or ANAFULL AD; do not put it in the Los AngelesCovina SD, and the WhittierNorwalk AD
3orange_20110713_49c	7132011	Jake Mendrin	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_50c	7132011	David Axelson	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110713_41c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	LA county already has money problems, where Orange county has dealt better with education, public safety, transportation, land use, and other legislative issues	
3orange_20110713_42c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_43c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_44c	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_45c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_46c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_47c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_48c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra, Norwalk, Covina		no	yes	La Habra shares education, transportation authority, municipal water district, and many other organizations with Orange county	
3orange_20110713_49c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares education, public safety, transportation, land use, and other legislative issues with Orange county	
3orange_20110713_50c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110713_41c			no				
3orange_20110713_42c			no				
3orange_20110713_43c			no				
3orange_20110713_44c			no				
3orange_20110713_45c			no				
3orange_20110713_46c			no				
3orange_20110713_47c			no				
3orange_20110713_48c			no				
3orange_20110713_49c			no				
3orange_20110713_50c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110713_51c	7132011	Marsha Rodriguez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra with LA county
3orange_20110713_52c	7132011	Marilyn Castillo	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_53c	7132011	Frenando Castillo	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_54c	7132011	Sharon Woods	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_55c	7132011	Julie Kim	no				yes	Do not put City of La Palma with Long Beach Port CD, LA county cities; put it with Cypress, Buena Park, and Fullerton; put La Palma in a CD dested with Orange county
3orange_20110713_56c	7132011	Don Bankhead	no				yes	Do not use current proposal for Fullerton, leave it as it is
3orange_20110713_57c	7132011	Patrick McKinley	yes	City of Fullerton, Councilmember	Fullerton	Orange	yes	Keep Fullerton whole; put Fullerton with other northern Orange county Brea, Placentia, Yorba Linda

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110713_51c	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_52c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_53c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares education, public safety, transportation, land use, and other legislative issues with Orange county	
3orange_20110713_54c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra is a calm, retirement city; is unlike LA county, does not want to be connected to LA problems or LAUSD school district	
3orange_20110713_55c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Palma, Cypress, Buena Park, Fullerton		no	yes	La Palma shares COI wBuena Park and Fullerton; common school districts, small town community	
3orange_20110713_56c		Fullerton		no	no		
3orange_20110713_57c	Orange	Fullerton, Brea, Placentia, Yorba Linda		no	yes	Fullerton has programs and activities that coordinate with state and federal representatives; Fullerton activities would combine well wother northern Orange county cities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110713_51c			no				
3orange_20110713_52c			no				
3orange_20110713_53c			no				
3orange_20110713_54c			no				
3orange_20110713_55c			no				
3orange_20110713_56c			no				
3orange_20110713_57c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110713_58c	7132011	F. Richard Jones	no		Fullerton	Orange	yes	Do not divide Fullerton
3orange_20110713_59c	7132011	Ryan	no			Orange	yes	Use first draft maps for Orange county, apply VRA adjustments, and make them official
3orange_20110713_60c	7132011	Dorothy Kanger	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_61c	7132011	Charles Cartwright	no				yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_62c	7132011	Richard Kanger	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_63c	7132011	Lisa Quintero	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_64c	7132011	Debbie Pressley	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county
3orange_20110713_65c	7132011	Analy Rodriguez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with northern Orange county, do not put it with LA county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110713_58c		Fullerton		no	yes	Fullerton has pop of 135k, is fiscally conservative, sound and has reserve of money; shares transportation center, is an education community with 5 (will soon have 6) universitiescolleges; affordable housing, economically diverse; keep city unified	
3orange_20110713_59c	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110713_60c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_61c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_62c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110713_63c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra is in the Fullerton school district in Orange county, not the LA school district	
3orange_20110713_64c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares education, public safety, transportation, land use, and other legislative issues with Orange county	
3orange_20110713_65c	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110713_58c			no				
3orange_20110713_59c			no				
3orange_20110713_60c			no				
3orange_20110713_61c			no				
3orange_20110713_62c			no				
3orange_20110713_63c			no				
3orange_20110713_64c			no				
3orange_20110713_65c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_1c	7132011	Danny Rojany	no				yes	Do not move Marina Del Rey and Venice out of current coastal AD; do not put them with Inglewood; keep them with the bay communities
4langeles_20110713_2c	7132011	George Adler	no			Los Angeles	yes	Leave Marina Del Rey in its present district, do not move it away from the coastal community
4langeles_20110713_3c	7132011	Dr. and Mrs. Matthew Burton	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey in the Coastal AD and SD
4langeles_20110713_4c	7132011	Ellen and Al Hains	no				yes	Do not move Marina Del Rey out of Coastal ADSD; do not put it with Inglewood; keep it wSanta Monica and Venice
4langeles_20110713_5c	7132011	Joe Lyou	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not break up beach communities into three districts; do not use proposed plan for Torrance, Inglewod, Marina Del Rey
4langeles_20110713_6c	7132011	Reta Moser	no				yes	Do not separate Marina Del Rey and Venice from the coastal ADSDs; keep Santa Monica, Venice and Marina Del Rey together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_1c		Inglewood		no	yes	Marina Del Rey and Venice share coastal recreation, impacts of urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality, with bay cities	Shares coastal tourism industry with bay cities, not inland city of Inglewood
4langeles_20110713_2c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_3c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_4c		Santa Monica, Inglewood		no	yes	Marina Del Rey shares coastal recreation, impacts of urban run-off, fragile ecosystem, impaired water quality, with bay cities Venice and Santa Monica	
4langeles_20110713_5c		Torrance, Inglewood		no	yes	Santa Monica Bay communities share interests regarding tourism, coastal recreation, shared bicycle path, environmental problems (ie. Urban runoff), water quality, and coastal protection	
4langeles_20110713_6c		Santa Monica		no	yes	Santa Monica, Venice and Marina Del Rey share coastal issues	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_1c			no				
4langeles_20110713_2c			no				
4langeles_20110713_3c			no				
4langeles_20110713_4c			no				
4langeles_20110713_5c			no				
4langeles_20110713_6c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_7c	7132011	Sue Kaplan	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Marina Del Rey and Venice from the coastal ADSDs, do not put them in an inland district
4langeles_20110713_8c	7132011	Linda Lucks	yes	Venice Neighborhood Council, President		Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Marina Del Rey and Venice from the coastal ADSDs, do not put them in an inland district
4langeles_20110713_9c	7132011	Linda Lucks, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110713_10c	7132011	Linda Lucks, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110713_11c	7132011	Tom Paris, Lauren Smith	no				yes	Do not separate Marina Del Rey and Venice from the coastal ADSDs, do not put them in an inland district
4langeles_20110713_12c	7132011	Beth Ann Chatfield	no				yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Veince together, do not put them with El Segundo
4langeles_20110713_13c	7132011	Beth Ann Chatfield, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110713_14c	7132011	Daniel Gottleib	no				yes	Do not divide Marina Del Rey, Venice and Santa Monica, as is proposed in 2nd draft maps

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_7c				no	yes	These cities share coastal issues, require jurisdiction by the state of CA Coastal Commission	
4langeles_20110713_8c				no	yes	These cities share coastal issues, require jurisdiction by the state of CA Coastal Commission	
4langeles_20110713_9c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_10c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_11c				no	yes	These cities share coastal issues, require jurisdiction by the state of CA Coastal Commission	
4langeles_20110713_12c		El Segundo		no	yes	Marina Del ReyVenice are residential communities, do not put with El Segundo which is occupied by corporations	
4langeles_20110713_13c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_14c		Santa Monica		no	yes	These bay cities share common concerns, such as health of Santa Monica Bay, tourism, beach traffic, and parking	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_7c			no				
4langeles_20110713_8c			no				
4langeles_20110713_9c			no				
4langeles_20110713_10c			no				
4langeles_20110713_11c			no				
4langeles_20110713_12c			no				
4langeles_20110713_13c			no				
4langeles_20110713_14c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_15c	7132011	Denise Fast	no			Los Angeles	yes	Donot divide Santa Monica Bay COI (Santa Monica, Venice and Marina Del Rey); keep all three in the Coastal AD.
4langeles_20110713_16c	7132011	Diana Soielberger	yes	Marina Peninsula Neighborhood Association, Board Member	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with Santa Monica and the Coastal AD; do not split them into 3 districts
4langeles_20110713_17c	7132011	Richard Myers	no				yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with Santa Monica and the Coastal AD; do not split them into 3 districts
4langeles_20110713_18c	7132011	Nii-Quartelai Quartey	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Larchmond Villiage in 33rd CD; unite Hollywood, Silverlake, Los Feliz, Pico-Robertson, Larchmont Village, MidCity, Thai Town, Little Ethiopia, Little Armenia, Koreatown, Culver City,Leimert Park, Baldwin Hills, Windsor Hills, Ladera, View Park
4langeles_20110713_19c	7132011	John Davis and LeAnne Warren	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with Santa Monica and the Coastal AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_15c		Santa Monica		no	yes	These bay cities share coastal recreation, impacts of urban runoff, fragile ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Share tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_16c		Santa Monica		no	yes	These bay cities share coastal recreation, impacts of urban runoff, fragile ecosystem, and impaired water quality, protection of marine life	share tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_17c		Santa Monica		no	yes	These bay cities share coastal recreation, impacts of urban runoff, fragile ecosystem, and impaired water quality, protection of marine life, coastal access issues	share tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_18c				no	yes	33rd CD as it is unites highly educated, diverse community that shares values	
4langeles_20110713_19c		Santa Monica		no	yes	Coastal communities are a COI, share financial, environmental, and political issuesvalues	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_15c			no				
4langeles_20110713_16c			no				
4langeles_20110713_17c			no				
4langeles_20110713_18c			no				
4langeles_20110713_19c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_20c	7132011	David Barish	yes	We ARE Marina Del Rey, Co-Director		Los Angeles	yes	Do not use 2nd draft map for Marina Del Rey AD and SD; Keep Marina Del Rey with coastal districts, with Venice and Santa Moncia, not with Inglewood
4langeles_20110713_21c	7132011	Robert A. Aronson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Venice and Marina del Rey within the Coastal AD
4langeles_20110713_22c	7132011	Marie Rassman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district where they currently are, do not put them with Inland Empire
4langeles_20110713_23c	7132011	Roslyn E. Walker	no				yes	Do not use 2nd draft map; keep Marina Del Rey and Venice in coastal ADSDs; do not put them with Inglewoodinland communities; do not divide Santa Moncia Bay environmental COI (Santa Monica Bay, Marina Del Rey, Venice) into 3 districts

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_20c		Santa Moncia, Inglewood		no	yes	Coastal communities are a COI, share interests in preservingenhancing land, non motorized boating, bike paths, reducting pollution and stormwater runoff, saving wetlands, bird life, ecosystem, habitat, enviornmental issues.	
4langeles_20110713_21c				no	yes	Coastal area needs coastal rep who is familiar with CA Coastal Commission matters; shared issues including coastal access, ecosystem, tourism and parking, recreation, and stormwater runoff	
4langeles_20110713_22c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_23c		Santa Monica, Inglewood		no	yes	Bay region shares issues relating to coastal recreation, urban runoff, fragile ecosytem and impaired water quality	shares tourism industry

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_20c			no				
4langeles_20110713_21c			no				
4langeles_20110713_22c			no				
4langeles_20110713_23c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_24c	7132011	Andrea Anderson	no				no	
4langeles_20110713_25c	7132011	James R. Beyer	no				yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI into three districts (Santa Monica Bay, Marina Del Rey, and Venice); keep Marina Del Rey and Venice in the coastal AD
4langeles_20110713_26c	7132011	Mary Sinclair	no				yes	Do not remove Burbank from the Pasadena CD; do not divide Pasadena; keep Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank together in one district
4langeles_20110713_27c	7132011	Bethany Gorfine	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Marina Del Rey and Venice, keep them in the Coastal AD; Do not divide Santa Monica Bay environmental COI into three districts (Santa Monica Bay, Marina Del Rey, and Venice)
4langeles_20110713_28c	7132011	Christopher Silva Moore	no				yes	Do not split up Silverlake and Los Feliz
4langeles_20110713_29c	7132011	Laura Maslon	no				yes	Do not separate Marina Del Rey from other coastal districts
4langeles_20110713_30c	7132011	Julie Inouye and Dr. Michael Rubottom	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict; keep Playa Del Rey with Venice and Westchester

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_24c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_25c		Santa Monica		no	yes	These bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	shares tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_26c		Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110713_27c		Santa Monica		no	yes	These bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	shares tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_28c				yes	no	Silverlake and Los Feliz are inextricably tied, do not divide	
4langeles_20110713_29c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_30c				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_24c			no				Make districts 5050 divided between Democrats and Republicans, so voting will be based on issues and candidates, rather than about the parties
4langeles_20110713_25c			no				
4langeles_20110713_26c			no				
4langeles_20110713_27c			no				
4langeles_20110713_28c			no				
4langeles_20110713_29c			no				
4langeles_20110713_30c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_31c	7132011	Nancy Dopp	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district; do not put Marina Del Rey and Venice with Inglewood
4langeles_20110713_32c	7132011	Joyce Stein	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district
4langeles_20110713_33c	7132011	Sarah Dennison	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Venice, Marina Del Rey and Santa Monica into 3 districts; keep these three cities in one coastal district
4langeles_20110713_34c	7132011	Trudy Goldman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey with coastal district
4langeles_20110713_35c	7132011	Felicia Craggs	no				yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district; do not put Marina Del Rey and Venice with Inglewood

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_31c				no	yes	Marina Del Rey and Venice share coastal environmental issues that do not apply to inland areas	
4langeles_20110713_32c				no	yes	Marina Del Rey shares issues wSanta Monica Bay relating to fragile coastal environment, runoff, seasonal tourism, water pollution, tsunami warning zone, and do not share same problems as inland area	
4langeles_20110713_33c		Santa Monica		no	yes	These bay cities share common concerns, such as environmental protection, tourism industry, coastal recreation, impaired water quality, impact of urban storm water runoff, and fragile coastal ecosystem	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_34c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_35c		Inglewood		no	yes	These bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_31c			no				
4langeles_20110713_32c			no				
4langeles_20110713_33c			no				
4langeles_20110713_34c			no				
4langeles_20110713_35c			no				Disappointed that the fireworks were canceled for financial reasons, should be seen as a revenue generator

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_36c	7132011	Nancy Poertner	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Marina Del Rey and Venice from the coast
4langeles_20110713_37c	7132011	Patricia Donaldson	yes	Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne shares COI wBeach Cities south of 105 FWY, and west of 110 FWY; keep Hawthorne in a district with these areas
4langeles_20110713_37c	7132011	Larry M. Guidi, Alex Vargas, Ginny Lambert, Daniel Juarez, Angie Reyes English, Arnold Shadbehr	yes	City of Hawthorne, Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem, Councilmember, Councilmember, Councilmember, and Interim City Manager (respectively)	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Put city of Hawthorne in 36th CD with South BayBeach Cities (south of 105 FWY, and west of 110 FWY, with Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, El Segundo)
4langeles_20110713_38c	7132011	Robert Fraser and Karen Rafalski	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Put Hawthorne wSouth Bay cities (Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, El Segundo, Lawndale), not with south central LA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_36c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_37c		Hawthorne	105 FWY, 110 FWY	no	yes	Hawthorne is COI wBeach Cities; bay cities film industry workers use Hawthorne Airport; shared police helicopter	Hawthorne shares aerospace industry wBeach Cities, residents of both areas emploed at LA Air Force Base and Spacex; shared ties to entertainment industry, major studios in El Segundo and Manhattan Beach, some shoot TV and film footage in Hawthorne
4langeles_20110713_37c		Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, El Segundo	105 FWY, 110 FWY	no	yes	Hawthorne is COI wBeach Cities; bay cities film industry workers use Hawthorne Airport; shared police helicopter; shares fwy access and transportation corridors wbeach cities, serves as gateway to beach cities	Hawthorne shares aerospace industry wBeach Cities, residents of both areas emploed at LA Air Force Base and Spacex; shared ties to entertainment industry, major studios in El Segundo and Manhattan Beach, some shoot TV and film footage in Hawthorne
4langeles_20110713_38c		Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, El Segundo, Lawndale		no	yes	Hawthorne is COI wBeach Cities; share top-ranking school districts, historic aerospaceindustry, property values, historical connection	Hawthorne shares aerospace industry wBay Cities, including Space EX, Aerospace and Northrop Grumman

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_36c			no				
4langeles_20110713_37c			no				
4langeles_20110713_37c			no				
4langeles_20110713_38c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_39c	7132011	Donald Karasevics	no				yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal AD, do not put them in an inland district
4langeles_20110713_40c	7132011	Karen J. Dixon	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal AD and SD, do not put them with Inglewood; Do not separate Venice, Marina Del Rey and Santa Monica into 3 districts
4langeles_20110713_41c	7132011	Nora Nicosia	no				yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district
4langeles_20110713_42c	7132011	Joe Halper	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	7811 visualization for AD looks OK, but change LAEVENT 02 keep Pacific Palisades, Malibu, Topanga, Agoura Hills, Calabasas together with Santa Monica; Remove Simi Valley (pop 10,500) and ad Santa Monica (pop 89,700)
4langeles_20110713_43c	7132011	Janet Wortman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with Santa Monica in the coastal district
4langeles_20110713_44c	7132011	Helen Martinez	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne wBeach Cities (El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, etc)
4langeles_20110713_45c	7132011	Dr. Irving Lebovics	yes	Agudath Israel of California, Chairman, Presidium			yes	(SEE MAPS) Keep Pico-RobertsonBeverlywood, Century City and the Fairfax-Hancock Park-Miracle Mile area united; Jewish COI of 80k here; Pico-Robertson runs from 18th st North to the Beverly Hills Line btwn Beverwl and La Cienega in the Fairfax

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_39c				no	yes	These cities share coastal issues	
4langeles_20110713_40c		Santa Moncia, Inglewood		no	yes	These bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_41c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_42c		Malibu, Topanga, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Santa Monica		no	yes	Listed cities and Santa Monica share commerce, health and hospital, entertainment services, and are the travel gateway to the greater LA area	
4langeles_20110713_43c		Santa Monica		no	yes	Bay cities share environmental and recreational issues	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_44c		Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo		no	yes	Hawthorne shares school districts, closest supermarketpharmacy, and family ties with Beach Cities	
4langeles_20110713_45c				no	yes	Jewish community of 80k should be kept together; shared services, 25 orthodox synogogues, ambulance services, LA Jewish Federation, shopping	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_39c			no				
4langeles_20110713_40c			no				
4langeles_20110713_41c			no				
4langeles_20110713_42c			no				
4langeles_20110713_43c			no				
4langeles_20110713_44c			no				
4langeles_20110713_45c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_46c	7132011	Maureen Hunt	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal AD; Do not separate Venice, Marina Del Rey and Santa Monica into 3 districts
4langeles_20110713_47c	7132011	Karen Wolfe	yes	Venice Neighborhood Council, former board member; VNC Land Use and Planning Committee, Former member			yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal CD
4langeles_20110713_48c	7132011	Karen Wolfe, duplicate	no				no	
4langeles_20110713_49c	7132011	Betsy Goldman	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district, not with inland areas
4langeles_20110713_50c	7132011	Lunda Hutson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district, not with inland areas
4langeles_20110713_51c	7132011	Bob Gutierrez	yes	Latino Policy Forum			yes	Create east-west SD from Culver City to Florence Firestone; create another SD including Inglewood, Hawthorne, Compton, Carson District, some of LA; another SD wEast Ventura, Santa ClaritaPalmdale; SM mtns wWest LA, beverly hills, west hollywood

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_46c		Santa Monica		no	no	Santa Monica Bay environmental COI shares common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_47c				no	no	Bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_48c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_49c				no	yes	Mutual concerns affect coastal area	
4langeles_20110713_50c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_51c	Ventura	Culver City, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Compton, Los Angeles, Santa Clarita, Palmdale		no	no	Unite African-American and Hispanic COIs to preserve representation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_46c			no				
4langeles_20110713_47c			no				
4langeles_20110713_48c			no				
4langeles_20110713_49c			no				
4langeles_20110713_50c			no				
4langeles_20110713_51c		Unite African-American and Hispanic COIs to preserve representation	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_52c	7132011	Sasha L. Robinson	no				no	
4langeles_20110713_53c	7132011	Martin and Gloria Werlie	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district, not with Inglewood
4langeles_20110713_54c	7132011	Francesca Vega	no				yes	Do not change 33rd CD; keep Leimert Park, Baldwin Hills, Ladera, Crenshaw District, together; Include Culver City

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_52c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_53c		Inglewood		no	yes	Bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_54c		Culver City		no	yes	33rd CD shares historical connection, communities of color COI	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_52c			no				Please release all info used for LA districting, including the Racially Polarized Voting Analysis; not releasing info undermines CRCs credibilitytransparency; study should have been done earlier; expert opinions vary; public needs a chance to respond
4langeles_20110713_53c			no				
4langeles_20110713_54c		33rd CD enfranchises people of color, has benefitted from VRA the way it is currently configured	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_55c	7132011	Danna Cope	no				yes	Keep Westchester (90045) Playa del Rey (90293) wEl Segundo, Inglewood, Hawthorne Lawndale area of Los Angeles; extend the 35th CD to include these areas
4langeles_20110713_56c	7132011	Carolyn Fowler	yes	Inglewood Chamber of Commerce, past president; LA County Voting Advisory Committee, member	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Reiteration of testimony at 61611 hearing in Culver City Hawthorne, Westchester, Inglewood, El Segundo, Lawndale, Playa del Rey, Gardena are a COI
4langeles_20110713_57c	7132011	James F. Hart	no				yes	Keep entire city of San Pedro in one CDSDAD
4langeles_20110713_58c	7132011	Omar Navarro	no				yes	Do not take Torrance out of the 36th dist.; keep Torrance intact
4langeles_20110713_59c	7132011	Kathleen Rips	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Do not use first draft of CCRC; do not put South Pasadena in 34th dist wEast LA, Boyle Heights; keep South Pasadena with Pasadena

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_55c		El Segundo, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Los Angeles		no	yes	These areas are a COI around LAX airport; share airport benefits (employment), and negative effects such as traffic, air and noise pollultion; also share Centinela Valley Adobe, and social services	Shared economy around LAX airport
4langeles_20110713_56c		Hawthorne, Inglewood, El Segundo, Gardena		no	yes	These areas are a COI, have collaborated on issues such as LAX noise mitigation, runway expansion, wetlands Playa Vista, water recycling, MTA light rail; shared schoolscommuntiy colleges; job training services, economic development	
4langeles_20110713_57c		San Pedro		no	no		
4langeles_20110713_58c		Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110713_59c		Pasadena, South Pasadena, Los Angeles		no	yes	South Pasadena does not share economic, cultural, ethnic or political perspective wthose cities, is more aligned with Pasadena	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_55c			no				
4langeles_20110713_56c			no				
4langeles_20110713_57c			no				
4langeles_20110713_58c			no				
4langeles_20110713_59c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_60c	7132011	Onofrio V. Bertolini	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not put Westchester in Beach Cities CD; put Westchester wInglewood and LAX airport COI; could be with Playa del Rey, El Segundo
4langeles_20110713_61c	7132011	Anna Malkhasian	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep foothill communities of Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, Lake View Terrace, La Crescenta together
4langeles_20110713_62c	7132011	Sheila Mickelson	yes	Westchester Playa Village, board member		Los Angeles	yes	Reiteration of testimony at 61611 hearing in Culver City keep Westchester in CD 35 wInglewood and surrounding LAX airport communities; do not put Westchester with Beach Cities
4langeles_20110713_63c	7132011	Hank Kratzer	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey with Santa Monica and coastal district, not with Inglewood
4langeles_20110713_64c	7132011	Joni Rountree	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district, not with Inglewood

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_60c		El Segundo, Inglewood		no	yes	Westchester is part of the LAX airport COI, has worked wInglewood around LAX community issues	
4langeles_20110713_61c				no	no		
4langeles_20110713_62c		Inglewood		no	yes	Westchester is the home of LAX, keep it part of the LAX airport COI; community organizing wInglewood around LAX issues	Economy based on LAX airport
4langeles_20110713_63c		Santa Monica, Inglewood		no	yes	Bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_64c		Inglewood		no	yes	Bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_60c			no				
4langeles_20110713_61c			no				
4langeles_20110713_62c			no				
4langeles_20110713_63c			no				
4langeles_20110713_64c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_65c	7132011	Bill Hooper	no				yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district, not with Inglewood
4langeles_20110713_66c	7132011	Eleonore Koury	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal AD, not with Inglewood; Do not separate Venice, Marina Del Rey and Santa Monica into 3 districts
4langeles_20110713_67c	7132011	Vivienne Versace	yes	Marina City Club		Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice in current AD and SD, not with Inglewood
4langeles_20110713_68c	7132011	Robert C. Goold	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice in the coastal district with Santa Monica; keep all three together
4langeles_20110713_69c	7132011	Steven Mittleman	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Marina Del Rey and Venice with coastal district, not with InglewoodCulver City

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_65c		Inglewood		no	yes	Bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_66c		Santa Moncia, Inglewood		no	yes	Bay cities share common concerns, such as coastal recreation, impact of urban runoff, fragile coastal ecosystem, and impaired water quality	Shared tourism industry
4langeles_20110713_67c		Inglewood		no	no		
4langeles_20110713_68c		Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110713_69c				no	yes	Santa Monica Bay communities share demographics, are geographically touching, and have common interests in tourism, beach access, beach and water quality, and traffic	Shared tourism industry

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_65c			no				
4langeles_20110713_66c			no				
4langeles_20110713_67c			no				
4langeles_20110713_68c			no				
4langeles_20110713_69c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110713_70c	7132011	Vendella Barnett	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not change district for Baldwin Hills; maintain 4 ADs, 3 CDs, and 2 SDs; keep African-American COI in South Los Angleles united
6mono_20110713_1c	7132011	Niall Roberts	no				yes	East-West oriented ADSD for Mono and Inyo counties are better than North-South oriented CD; do not put Mono Lake with southern CA; do not put Owens Valley wsouthern CA
6sjoaquin_20110713_1c	7132011	Cindy Harris	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Reiteration of testimony at 71311 hearing in Stockton use current SACEG map for Lodi, connected to So. Sacramento, Elk Grove, and Galt, and HWY 99 corridor; would prefer to see Lodi connected with Stockton; do not put wBay Area or Rancho Cordova
7sclara_20110713_1c	7132011	City of Santa Clara	yes	City of Santa Clara			yes	Do not split city of Santa Clara
7sclara_20110713_2c	7132011	Judy Moss	no				no	
7scruz_20110713_1c	7132011	John Welch	no				yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110713_70c		Los Angeles		no	yes	South Los Angeles is an African American COI, do not divide it; represents years of hard-won African-American voting power and racial unity	
6mono_20110713_1c	Inyo, Mono			no	no		
6sjoaquin_20110713_1c		Lodi, Sacramento, Elk Grove, Galt, Stockton, Rancho Cordova	HWY 99 corridor	no	no		
7sclara_20110713_1c		Santa Clara		no	no		
7sclara_20110713_2c				no	no		
7scruz_20110713_1c		Santa Cruz		no	yes	Santa Cruz is a tightly knit COI	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110713_70c		The lawyers from Gibson, Dunn, and Crutcher do not interpret the VRA with court rulings and experts in the field; preserve representation of African-American community	no				
6mono_20110713_1c			no				CRC should gather more input from residents of the Eastern Sierra region
6sjoaquin_20110713_1c			no				
7sclara_20110713_1c			no				
7sclara_20110713_2c			no				One SD should be composed of two ADs, rather than splitting parts of several ADs (comment appears to say that districts should be nested)
7scruz_20110713_1c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110713_1c	7132011	Allen Payton	yes	Contra Costa Citizens Redistricting Task Force, Chairman			yes	Use RichmondOaklandEast Bay Hills as the dividing line; apply this to Tri Valley (Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore); put west county cities (Hercules, Pinole, Richmond) wVallejo, Berkeley, Oakland along I-80 corridor, not wother Contra Costa cities
8alameda_20110713_2c	7132011	Patricia Smith	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide city of Richmond between two districts, leave it as it is
8alameda_20110713_3c	7132011	Susan Swift	no			Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond; do not align west Contra Costa county with Alameda county cities (OaklandBerkeleyEmeryville); keep Richmond with Contra Costa county
8alameda_20110713_4c	7132011	Ward Belding	no				no	
8ccosta_20110713_1c	7132011	Allen Payton, duplicate	no				no	
8ccosta_20110713_2c	7132011	Patricia Smith, duplicate	no				no	
8ccosta_20110713_3c	7132011	Susan Swift, duplicate	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110713_1c	Contra Costa	Richmond, Oakland, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, Hercules, Pinole	I-80 corridor	no	yes	West county cities share I-80 corridor and 510 area code with BerkeleyOakland; the rest of Contra Costa is 925 area code.	
8alameda_20110713_2c		Richmond		no	no		
8alameda_20110713_3c	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond, Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville		no	yes	Richmond competes with Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville for funding; Richmond is part of Contra Costa diverse COI; has separate school district; happy with current representative	
8alameda_20110713_4c				no	no		
8ccosta_20110713_1c				no	no		
8ccosta_20110713_2c				no	no		
8ccosta_20110713_3c				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110713_1c			no				
8alameda_20110713_2c			no				
8alameda_20110713_3c			no				
8alameda_20110713_4c			no				Base districts on COIs, not on special interest groups including LGBT, Hispanic, etc.
8ccosta_20110713_1c			no				
8ccosta_20110713_2c			no				
8ccosta_20110713_3c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8ccosta_20110713_4c	7132011	Leonard Lloyd	no		Oakley	Contra Costa	yes	Do not separate city of Oakley from neighboring cities; do not put Oakley with Lodi and Stockton; Oakley shares interests wEast Contra Costa county, eastern Alameda County, but not with San Joaquin Valley or Napa
8ccosta_20110713_5c	7132011	Randy Khalil	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Unite west Contra Costa (within 510 area code) into 3 districts; keep Richmond in George Miller dist; if Richmond must be wOakland, Berkeley, also include Kensington, Albany and El Cerrito (do not put them wWalnut Creek, Pittsburgh)
8marin_20110713_1c	7132011	Joan Brownstein	no			Marin	yes	Put Marin with San Francisco, not Mendocino or Sonoma
9calaveras_20110713_1c	7132011	Anonymous	no				yes	Put Calaveras, Tuolumne and Amador counties in the same district
9edorado_20110713_1c	7132011	Charles Hill	no		Placerville	El Dorado	yes	Do not put Placerville in AD wRoseville and Western Placer County; put Placerville with Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, El Dorado Hills, and Cameron Park; unite HWY 50 corridor in El Dorado County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8ccosta_20110713_4c	Contra Costa, Alameda, San Joaquin, Napa	Oakley, Lodi, Stockton		no	no		
8ccosta_20110713_5c	Contra Costa	Richmond, Berkeley, Oakland, Albany, Kensington, El Cerrito, Walnut Creek, Pittsburgh		no	no		
8marin_20110713_1c	Marin, San Francisco, Sonoma	San Francisco		no	yes	Marin is more urban than residents like to recognize; shares interests wSF; Marin has environmental concerns that conflict with lumber and fishing interests in northern counties; Marin residents go to SF for medical care, cultural events, shopping, jobs	
9calaveras_20110713_1c	Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador			no	no		
9edorado_20110713_1c	El Dorado, Placer	Placerville, Roseville, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova	HWY 50	no	yes	Placerville shares economic, historical, and agricultural connection, natural resources, with Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, El Dorado Hills, and Cameron Park	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8ccosta_20110713_4c			no				
8ccosta_20110713_5c			no				
8marin_20110713_1c			no				
9calaveras_20110713_1c			no				
9edorado_20110713_1c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9edorado_20110713_2c	7132011	Daniel Stephenson	no			El Dorado	yes	Keep Shingle Springs, El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park in same AD and SD as towns south of HWY 50 (Rancho Cordova, Vinyard, Elk Grove), not with Placer county suburbs (Citrus Heights, Rocklin); keep Tahoe basin whole including national forests, ski areas
9edorado_20110713_3c	7132011	Don Nicodemus	no			El Dorado	yes	Give El Dorado county separate AD from western Placer suburbs; keep El Dorado Hill area wRancho Cordova; put Citrus Heights with Roseville; use 1st draft map for ELDO; keep Citrus Heights whole by putting some of Fair Oaks wEl Dorado
9nevada_20110713_1c	7142011	Lee Blakemore	yes	Tea Party Patriots			no	
9sacramento_20110713_1c	7132011	May O. Lee	no				yes	Unite Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI) COI in South Sacramento; still not united in 7711 map; include area south of Sutterville Rd, area east of I-5, Greenhave Pocket (west of I-5), area btwn I-5 and HWY 99 wElk Grove
9sacramento_20110713_2c	7132011	Joan Kramer	no				yes	Do not change district for Citrus Heights
9sacramento_20110713_3c	7132011	Steven Noble	no				yes	Do not put Citrus Heights with El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, and Elk Grove

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9edorado_20110713_2c	Placer	Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, Rocklin, Citrus Heights	HWY 50	no	yes	El Dorado towns share COI wRancho Cordova, Elk Grove, not suburbs in Placer county	
9edorado_20110713_3c	El Dorado, Placer	Citrus Heights, Roseville, Rancho Cordova		no	yes		El Dorado towns have competing economic interests with Placer county suburbs
9nevada_20110713_1c				no	no		
9sacramento_20110713_1c		Sacramento, Elk Grove	Sutterville Rd, I-5, HWY 99	no	yes	Keep AAPI community together by including these areas; majority of AAPI COI lives east of I-5.	
9sacramento_20110713_2c		Citrus Heights	I-80	no	yes	Location on I-80 corridor is not sufficient justification for the change in districting	
9sacramento_20110713_3c		Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, Citrus Heights		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9edorado_20110713_2c			no				
9edorado_20110713_3c			no				
9nevada_20110713_1c			no				Redistricting efforts must be fair and balanced, otherwise you will be held accountable.
9sacramento_20110713_1c			no				
9sacramento_20110713_2c			no				
9sacramento_20110713_3c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110713_4c	7132011	Phil Serna	yes	Sacramento Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Phil Serna, District 1	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Put Sacramento airport in same CD as downtown metro area, not wGlenn county; follow objection by Sacramento County board of supervisors
9shasta_20110713_1c	7132011	Ashley Adishian	no			Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta County with the I-5 corridor, not with the coastal district
9shasta_20110713_2c	7132011	Zach Lierly	no		Redding	Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta County with the I-5 corridor, not with the coastal district
9shasta_20110713_3c	7132011	Leslie Williem	no			Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta County with the I-5 corridor, not with the coastal district
9shasta_20110713_4c	7132011	Andre Nippe	no			Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta County with the I-5 corridor, not with the coastal district
general_20110713_1c	7132011	Tony Quinn	no				yes	54th dist is gerrymandered in favor of Democrats, should not cross county line, should not include Pasadena;

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110713_4c	Sacramento, Glenn	Sacramento		no	yes	Majority of those using the airport go to citycounty of Sacramento, not Glenn; Airport is located in Sacramento county, so residents and local gov. there should have voice for federal fundingprograms regarding the airport	Airport supports local economy in Sacramento
9shasta_20110713_1c	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110713_2c	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110713_3c	Shasta		I-5	no	yes		Shasta shares economic COI with I-5 corridor, not coast
9shasta_20110713_4c	Shasta		I-5	no	yes		Shasta shares economic COI with I-5 corridor, not coast
general_20110713_1c				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110713_4c			no				Please replace the letter sent from them a few days ago with this version, the previous version was a draft and was sent inadvertently
9shasta_20110713_1c			no				
9shasta_20110713_2c			no				
9shasta_20110713_3c			no				
9shasta_20110713_4c			no				
general_20110713_1c			no				The comission is drawing lines to benefit Democrats, giving John Perez a 23 majority in the assembly; Republicans will challenge corrupt redistricting plans in court before June 2012 election, plans are separate statute, can be challenged by referendum

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110713_2c	7132011	Rosalind Gold	yes	National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Education Fund, Senior Director of Policy, Research and Advocacy			no	
general_20110713_3c	7132011	Alma Flores	no		El Centro	Imperial	yes	Do not use 61011 maps; put Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley in same district;
general_20110713_4c	7132011	Dan Martinez, duplicate see comment 4 in this spreadsheet	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110713_2c				no	no		
general_20110713_3c				no	yes	Both desert communities are in same desert, share history, water and utiltiy district, same climate, common problems regarding the Salton Sea	Both valleys share tourism, agriculture industries
general_20110713_4c				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
							No 2nd draft maps impairs public input; CRC should make calendar of when each region to be discussed; include identifiable features and release datatables with visualizations; release daily business mtg summaries; say when maps are near-final
general_20110713_2c			no				
general_20110713_3c			no				
general_20110713_4c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110713_5c	7132011	Jim Wright	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	no	
general_20110713_6c	7132011	David Pratt	no				no	
general_20110713_7c	7132011	Edward Hartman	no				no	
general_20110713_8c	7132011	C.T. Weber	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110713_5c				no	no		
general_20110713_6c				no	no		
general_20110713_7c				no	no		
general_20110713_8c				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110713_5c			no				It is unacceptable that some of the commissioners are not present and did not participate remotely from hearings in July. Those that cannot make the time commitment should withdraw and be replaced.
general_20110713_6c			no				July meetings have turned into another round of public input hearings, at the expense of CRC not having enough time to spend drawing lines; suggest limiting public testimony to written comments; currently some groups are fillibustering CRCs work
general_20110713_7c			no				Consider redistricting based on ZIP codes, which are identified by population and not by special interests.
general_20110713_8c			no				Nest two ADs inside each SD; Ten state SDs should be nested within one State Board of Equalization district

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110713_9c	7132011	Jothi Venkatesan, Chaitanya Vadlakonda	no				no	
general_20110713_10c	7132011	Louis Alonzo	no				no	
general_20110713_11c	7132011	Sandy Kozlen	no				no	
general_20110713_12c	792011	Richard Blackston	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	SEE MAPS AND LISTS OF FIGURES
supporterslhabra_20110713_1c	7132011	Marisela Gomez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_2c	7132011	Christine Ryan	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_3c	7132011	Teri Carr	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110713_9c				no	no		
general_20110713_10c				no	no		
general_20110713_11c				no	no		
general_20110713_12c				no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_1c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_2c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_3c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110713_9c			no			Disapproves of any changes from the 2007 district map	
general_20110713_10c			no			Keep the legistative boundaries the same, do not change them	
general_20110713_11c			no				Objective of creating maps with common geographic basis has failed. Transportation mathematics method are being replaced wselective political criteria; creating single-party system, disenfranchising rural voters.
general_20110713_12c			no				Submitted suggested maps including data for each district, based on CRC criteria (VRA, keeping citiescounties whole, uniting economic and ethnic COIs, etc)
supporterslhabra_20110713_1c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_2c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_3c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslhabra_20110713_4c	7132011	Jeffrey Davis	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_5c	7132011	Ginger Villegas	no				yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_6c	7132011	Haley A. Testa	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_7c	7132011	Belle Cervantes	no				yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_8c	7132011	Maria E. Cruz	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_9c	7132011	Dave and Fran Parpala	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_10c	7132011	Marguerite Soto	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_11c	7132011	Cathy Granados	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_12c	7132011	Wesley and Kathryn Shaw	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_13c	7132011	Betty L. Brisco	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_14c	7132011	Allyson Jones Wong	no				yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslhabra_20110713_4c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_5c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_6c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_7c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_8c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_9c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_10c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_11c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_12c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_13c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_14c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslhabra_20110713_4c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_5c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_6c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_7c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_8c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_9c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_10c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_11c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_12c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_13c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_14c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterslhabra_20110713_15c	7132011	Nancy M. Gallardo	no				yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_16c	7132011	Clydine Bailey	no				yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_17c	7132011	Kimberly Cook	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_18c	7132011	Steven Herbets	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterslhabra_20110713_19c	7132011	Bobbie Mahoney	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with Orange county
supporterslhabra_20110713_20c	7132011	Clydine Bailey, duplicate	no				no	
supporterslhabra_20110713_21c	7132011	Sharon E. Corthell	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra in the LA county district, put it with other north Orange county cities
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_1c	7132011	Freda M. Falk	no				yes	Do not use 7811 visualization for Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNortheast San Fernando Valley SD; connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura county
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_2c	7132011	Debbie Glasnow	no				yes	Do not use 7811 visualization for Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNortheast San Fernando Valley SD; connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura county
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_3c	7132011	Mary Topalian	no				yes	Do not use 7811 visualization for Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNortheast San Fernando Valley SD; connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura county

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterslhabra_20110713_15c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_16c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_17c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_18c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_19c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_20c				no	no		
supporterslhabra_20110713_21c	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_1c	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are similar, have been in the same SD since 1982	
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_2c	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are similar, have been in the same SD since 1982	
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_3c	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are similar, have been in the same SD since 1982	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterslhabra_20110713_15c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_16c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_17c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_18c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_19c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_20c			no				
supporterslhabra_20110713_21c			no				
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_1c			no				
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_2c			no				
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_3c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_4c	7132011	Carlo Basail	no				yes	Do not use 7811 visualization for Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNortheast San Fernando Valley SD; connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura county
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_5c	7132011	Carlo Basail, duplicate	no				no	
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_6c	7132011	Alan Eggers	no				yes	Do not use 7811 visualization for Antelope ValleySanta Clarita ValleyNortheast San Fernando Valley SD; connect Santa Clarita Valley with East Ventura county
2riverside_20110715_5e	7152011	Alejandrina Mercado	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio with Imperial Valley.
2riverside_20110715_7e	7152011	Beth Groves	no		Norco	Riverside	yes	Boundaries for Norco should be sure to consider entire river,trail or open space.
2riverside_20110715_8e	7152011	John Kopp	no		Eastvale	Riverside	yes	Keep Eastvale and Jurupa Valley in same CD RVMVN.
2riverside_20110715_9e	7152011	George Duran	no		Coachella Valley	Riverside	yes	Keep East Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley.Keep together in Senate and Congressional,assembly districts.
2riverside_20110715_10e	7152011	Eduardo Guevara	no		Mecca	Riverside	yes	Keep East part of Coachella Valley with Imperial in all districts.
2sbernardino_20110715_1e	7152011	Benjamin Gamboa	no				yes	Highland belongs with San Bernardino County cities instead of Rural east cities like Bishop,Mono,Inyo.
2sbernardino_20110715_2e	7152011	Walter Hawkins	yes	IEAARC			yes	Q2 should take point with P2 and P4 population variables and run true density map.This would resolve questions regarding API COI in San Diego Co.An example of this map is included in June 19th San Bernardino map regarding Ebony Triangle

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_4c	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are similar, have been in the same SD since 1982	
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_5c				no	no		
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_6c	Ventura			no	yes	Santa Clarita Valley and East Ventura are similar, have been in the same SD since 1982	
2riverside_20110715_5e	Riverside,Imperial	Indio		no	no		
2riverside_20110715_7e	Riverside	Norco		no	yes	Rivers,Open Space,trail maintenance	
2riverside_20110715_8e	Riverside	Eastvale,Jurupa Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110715_9e	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes		
2riverside_20110715_10e	Riverside,Imperial			no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110715_1e	San Bernardino	Highland,Bishop,Mono,Inyo		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110715_2e	San Diego,San Bernardino			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_4c			no				
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_5c			no				
supporterssclaritaeventura_20110713_6c			no				
2riverside_20110715_5e			no				
2riverside_20110715_7e			no				
2riverside_20110715_8e			no				
2riverside_20110715_9e	Similar interests and problems.		no				
2riverside_20110715_10e	Similar interests and problems.		no				
2sbernardino_20110715_1e	Inland area needs to be kept together.		no				
2sbernardino_20110715_2e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110715_3e	7152011	Brad Mitzelfelt	no				yes	Wrightwood is part of Tri Community,with Phelan,Pinon Hills should be with MISBK district. Senate SBBAN,these 3 cities should be with MISKL
3orange_20110715_1e	7152011	Paul Fu Jr	no		San Clemente	Orange	yes	San Clemente, Dana Point,San Juan Capistrano should be in South Orange,STHOC or WSTCST.Rancho Santa Margarita,Mission Viejo,Laguna Niguel,should also be with Orange cities,instead of San Diego.
3orange_20110715_2e	7152011	Beverly and James Riggs	no		La Habra Crest	Orange	no	
3orange_20110715_3e	7152011	Rick D. Vigil	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange County. If it cannot be, place La Habra in Anaheim-Fullerton AD first. If this cannot happen, put into Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda SD
3orange_20110715_4e	7152011	Bill Sanders	yes	Environment Control Building Maintenance Company, Inc. Sanders Maintenance Services, Inc.	La Habra	Orange	yes	Put La Habra in Orange ADSD
3orange_20110715_5e	7152011	Andy Montoya	no			Orange	yes	Do not combine City of Orange and Villa Park
3orange_20110715_6e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Put Coto with Mission Viejo or RSM
3orange_20110715_7e	7152011	Marilyn J. Hemingway	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Keep Dana Point with San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, South OC
3orange_20110715_8e	7152011	Joyce L. Riker	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra and Brea with Orange

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110715_3e	San Bernadino,	Wrightwood,Phelan,Pinon Hills,Victor Valley,Adelanto,Apple Valley,Hesperia		no	yes	shared school districts,transportation	monetary concerns.
3orange_20110715_1e	San Diego,Orange	San Clemente,Dana Point,San Juan Capistrano,Rancho Santa Margarita,Mission Viejo,Aliso Viejo,Laguna Niguel,San Juan Capistrano		yes	no		
3orange_20110715_2e				no	no		
3orange_20110715_3e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110715_4e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110715_5e	Orange	Orange, Villa Park		no	no		
3orange_20110715_6e		Coto, Mission Viejo		no	no		
3orange_20110715_7e	Orange	Dana Point, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano		no	no		
3orange_20110715_8e	Orange	La Habra, Brea		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110715_3e			no				
3orange_20110715_1e			no				
3orange_20110715_2e			no				Opposed to Citizens Redistricting Commission
3orange_20110715_3e			no				
3orange_20110715_4e			no				
3orange_20110715_5e			no				
3orange_20110715_6e			no				
3orange_20110715_7e			no				
3orange_20110715_8e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110715_9e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Keep La Habra and Buena Park with Orange. Do not include Chino with Orange
3orange_20110715_10e	7152011	Larry Hughes	yes	TECHNIP USA Electrical		Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange
3orange_20110715_11e	7152011	Michelle R. Houser	no			Orange	yes	Read letter and see attached maps, which gives lots of specific suggestions for improvements
3orange_20110715_12e	7152011	Linda Lane Deniz	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange
3orange_20110715_13e	7152011	Carolyn Cavecche	yes	City of Orange, Mayor	Orange	Orange	yes	Keep Orange separate from Santa Ana. If must use Orange as a bridge, keep Orange east of 57 together with Tustin and Anaheim Hills
3orange_20110715_14e	7152011	Carolyn Cavecche	yes	City of Orange, Mayor	Orange	Orange	yes	Keep City of Orange with Tustin, Anaheim Hills, other cities in North Orange County. Keep City of Orange separate from Santa Ana.
3orange_20110715_15e	7152011	Peter Kim	no		La Palma	Orange	yes	Keep La Palma with Orange County, Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra, Cypress, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor in CD
3orange_20110715_16e	7152011	Jesse Silva	no			Orange	yes	Approve of keeping South Fullerton, Anaheim Flatlands, Santa Ana together
3orange_20110715_17e	7152011	Jesus Silva	no			Orange	yes	Keep South Fullerton with Anaheim Flats
3orange_20110715_18e	7152011	Carolyn Cavecche	no		Orange	Orange	yes	If have to split city of Orange, keep everything east of 57 freeway together
3orange_20110715_19e	7162011	Heidi Larkin-Reed	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Put City of Orange with Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hills, Orange Park Acres and separate from Santa Ana.
3orange_20110715_20e	7162011	Amanda Lamb	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra separate from LA in ADSD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110715_9e	Orange	La Habra, Chino, Buena Park		no	no		
3orange_20110715_10e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110715_11e	Orange	La Habra, Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Anaheim, Midway, Stanton		no	no		
3orange_20110715_12e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110715_13e	Orange	Orange, Tustin, Santa Ana, Anaheim		no	no		
3orange_20110715_14e	Orange	Tustin, Anaheim, Santa Ana		no	no		
3orange_20110715_15e	Orange	La Palma, Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra, Cypress, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor		no	no		
3orange_20110715_16e	Orange	South Fullerton, Anaheim Flatlands, Santa Ana		no	yes		
3orange_20110715_17e	Orange	South Fullerton, Anaheim Flats		no	yes	Demographics, API scores	
3orange_20110715_18e	Orange	Orange	57 freeway	no	no		
3orange_20110715_19e	Orange	Orange, Tustin Hills, Anaheim Hills		no	yes	rural, equestrian	
3orange_20110715_20e	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110715_9e			no				
3orange_20110715_10e			no				
3orange_20110715_11e			no				
3orange_20110715_12e			no				
3orange_20110715_13e			no				
3orange_20110715_14e			no				
3orange_20110715_15e			no				
3orange_20110715_16e			no				
3orange_20110715_17e			no				
3orange_20110715_18e			no				
3orange_20110715_19e			no				
3orange_20110715_20e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110715_21e	7152011	Michael Patino	yes	Indoff, Inc. - Material Handling Division		Orange	yes	Keep Coto de Caza and adjacent surrounding area, San Clement, Dana Point, with Orange County
3orange_20110715_22e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Disapproves of Option 3
3orange_20110715_23e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Keep north Orange County with La Habra, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights
3orange_20110715_24e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Regarding Visualization 3, unite north Orange County and give up more of Los Angeles County area
3orange_20110715_25e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Last weeks Congressional option gives more fairness to communities in north Orange County
3orange_20110715_26e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Option 1 and 2 protect North Orange County
2riverside_20110715_6e	7152011	Dean Kimberly	no				yes	Riverside Vs San Bernardino.Do not cut up City of Jurupa Valley, this will damage my business.
3orange_20110715_27e	7152011	Michael Patino	no			Orange	yes	Option 3 should lose Chino Hills and give La Habra and Buena Park back to Orange. Orange could work well with Rowland Heights
3orange_20110715_28e	7152011	Misha Houser	no			Orange	yes	Keep Garden Grove, Westminster with Long Beach
3orange_20110715_29e	7152011	Misha Hosuer	no			Orange	yes	Take Villa Park, Orange Hills add to purple. Add Garden Grove to blue. Take southern purple finger and add to green.
3orange_20110715_30e	7152011	Everett Dewayne Sims	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110715_21e	Orange	Coto de Caza, San Clemente, Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110715_22e				no	no		
3orange_20110715_23e	Orange	la Habra, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights		no	no		
3orange_20110715_24e	Orange, Los Angeles			no	no		
3orange_20110715_25e	Orange			no	no		
3orange_20110715_26e	Orange			no	yes	regional fire interests	new home development
2riverside_20110715_6e	Riverise,San Bernardino	Jurupa		no	yes		
3orange_20110715_27e	Orange	Chino Hills, La Habra, Buena Park, Rowland Heights		no	no		
3orange_20110715_28e		Long Beach, Garden Grove, Westminster		no	no		
3orange_20110715_29e		Villa Park, Orange Hills, garden Grove		no	no		
3orange_20110715_30e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110715_21e			no				
3orange_20110715_22e			no				
3orange_20110715_23e			no				
3orange_20110715_24e			no				
3orange_20110715_25e			no				
3orange_20110715_26e			no				
2riverside_20110715_6e	My mortuary business is in Riverside,if you split and put me in San Bernardino, I will lose contracts with my county and pay money.		no				
3orange_20110715_27e			no				
3orange_20110715_28e			no				
3orange_20110715_29e			no				
3orange_20110715_30e	would diminish La Habras voice		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110715_31e	7152011	Thomas Lee	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with Orange
3orange_20110715_32e	7152011	Merry Rossini	yes	Prudential California Realty	La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with north Orange County
3orange_20110715_33e	7152011	Joseph Rosen	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with north Orange County
3orange_20110715_34e	7152011	Terry Goller	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Support CRC July 14 Visualizations-SoCal Assembly - District STHOC
3orange_20110715_35e	7152011	John Lewis	no			Orange	yes	See map, which shows the real Orange Couny Option 1
4langeles_20110715_1d	7152011	Elektra Kruger	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	See letter for specific suggestions
4langeles_20110715_2d	7152011	Elizabeth Schoonover	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne with other South Bay cities such as Torrance, Redondo Beach, Lawndale, El Segondo, Del Amo
4langeles_20110715_3d	7152011	Gerhard Kruger	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep these communities together; Kagel Canyon, Tujunga, Lake Veiw Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110715_31e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110715_32e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110715_33e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110715_34e	Orange	Dana Point		no	no		
3orange_20110715_35e	Orange			no	no		
4langeles_20110715_1d	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110715_2d		Hawthorne, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Lawndale, El Segondo, Del Amo		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_3d	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Tujunga, Lake Veiw Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110715_31e			no				
3orange_20110715_32e			no				
3orange_20110715_33e			no				
3orange_20110715_34e			no				
3orange_20110715_35e			no				
4langeles_20110715_1d			no				
4langeles_20110715_2d	shared police helicopter		no				
4langeles_20110715_3d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_4d	7152011	Manuel Marquez, Jorge Marquez, Francisca Marquez, Emily Marquez, Donaly Marquez, Stephanie Fernandez, Sara Marquez, Delfina Sanchez	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena Unified School district should be kept intact. See attached map for boundaries.
4langeles_20110715_5d	7152011	Annelene Voigt	no		La Crescenta	Los Angeles	yes	Keep these communities together; Kagel Canyon, Tujunga, Lake Veiw Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank.
4langeles_20110715_6d	7142011	Martin Enriquez (duplicate)	no				no	
4langeles_20110715_7d	7152011	Tanya Barsghian	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council, Public Safety Committee Chair	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries North-south of Victory Boulevard. South North of Mulholland Drive. East West of I-405, West east of Lindley Avenue
4langeles_20110715_8d	7142011	Martin Enriquez (duplicate)	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_4d	Los Angeles	Pasadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_5d	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Tujunga, Lake Veiw Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank.		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_6d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_7d	Los Angeles	Encino	Victory Boulevard, Mulholland Drive, I-405, Lindley Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_8d				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_4d			no			Please consider zip codes when drawing lines	
4langeles_20110715_5d			no				
4langeles_20110715_6d			no				
4langeles_20110715_7d			no				
4langeles_20110715_8d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_7d	7152011	Shelley Rivlin	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council, Secretary	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries North-south of Victory Boulevard. South North of Mulholland Drive. East West of I-405, West east of Lindley Avenue
4langeles_20110715_8d	7152011	Cameron Ruh	no				no	
4langeles_20110715_9d	7152011	Shelley Rivlin (duplicate)	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council, Secretary	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries North-south of Victory Boulevard. South North of Mulholland Drive. East West of I-405, West east of Lindley Avenue
4langeles_20110715_10d	7152011	Cameron Ruh (duplicate)	no				no	
4langeles_20110715_11d	7152011	Louis Krokover	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council, President	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries North-south of Victory Boulevard. South North of Mulholland Drive. East West of I-405, West east of Lindley Avenue
4langeles_20110715_12d	7142011	Juliana Onate, Ruben Enriquez, Maria M. Enriquex, Angelina Enriquez, Veronica Onate	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	no	Pasadena Unified School district should be kept intact. See attached map for boundaries.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_7d	Los Angeles	Encino	Victory Boulevard, Mulholland Drive, I-405, Lindley Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_8d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_9d	Los Angeles	Encino	Victory Boulevard, Mulholland Drive, I-405, Lindley Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_10d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_11d	Los Angeles	Encino	Victory Boulevard, Mulholland Drive, I-405, Lindley Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_12d				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_7d			no				
4langeles_20110715_8d			no				Do not consider comments from elected official who claims to speak for anyone besides himherself
4langeles_20110715_9d			no				
4langeles_20110715_10d			no				Do not consider comments from elected official who claims to speak for anyone besides himherself
4langeles_20110715_11d			no				
4langeles_20110715_12d			no			Please take zip codes into account when drawing districts.	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_13d	7152011	Katey Maghimi-Patterson	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council, Representative	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries North-south of Victory Boulevard. South North of Mulholland Drive. East West of I-405, West east of Lindley Avenue
4langeles_20110715_14d	7152011	Hoda Shawky	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne with South BayBeach Cities
4langeles_20110715_15d	7152011	Judy Baldwin	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Valley Village whole in one CD.
4langeles_20110715_16d	7152011	Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Mid City should not be with Westwood or Malibu, but with South Los Angeles, Culver City, Koreatown west, West Adams, La Brea, Crenshaw, Western, Adams, Washington, Venice, Leimert Park, Little Ethiopia
4langeles_20110715_17d	7152011	Laurie kelson	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council, Vice President	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Boundaries North-south of Victory Boulevard. South North of Mulholland Drive. East West of I-405, West east of Lindley Avenue
4langeles_20110715_18d	7142011	Alex Onate	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	See map, letter for specific boundaries.
4langeles_20110715_19d	7152011	B. Rao	no			Los angeles	yes	Support Joseph M. Sanchez Memorial Plan submitted by Alan Clayton and John T. Wong, the Velasquez-Clayton Plan, Leo Estrada LA County Board of Supervisors Redistricting map

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_13d	Los Angeles	Encino	Victory Boulevard, Mulholland Drive, I-405, Lindley Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_14d		Hawthorne		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_15d		Valley Village		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_16d	Los Angeles	Mid City, Westwood, Malibu, but with South Los Angeles, Culver City, Koreatown west, West Adams, La Brea, Crenshaw, Western, Adams, Washington, Venice, Leimert Park, Little Ethiopia		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_17d	Los Angeles	Encino	Victory Boulevard, Mulholland Drive, I-405, Lindley Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_18d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_19d				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_13d			no				
4langeles_20110715_14d			no				
4langeles_20110715_15d			no				
4langeles_20110715_16d			no				
4langeles_20110715_17d			no				
4langeles_20110715_18d			no				
4langeles_20110715_19d		Support section 2	no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_20d	7142011	Claudia Enriquez, Andrea Garcia, Rosa Alvarado, Pascual Marquez, Ascension Marquez, Maria R. Marquez	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena Unified School district should be kept intact. See attached map for boundaries.
4langeles_20110715_21d	7152011	Anthony J. Braswell, Virginia M. Hatfield	yes	Neighborhood Council Valley Village, President and Vice President	Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Valley Village whole in CD. See maps
4langeles_20110715_22d	7142011	Sandra Mondragon, Anne	no		Duarte, Pico Rivera	Los Angeles	yes	Has COI in common
4langeles_20110715_23d	7152011	Maison Gurpal Soid	no		Cerritos	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Montebello with district north of LAPRW
4langeles_20110715_24d	7152011	Ed Conklin	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Venice
4langeles_20110715_25d	7152011	Barbara Patton	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep these communities together; Kagel Canyon, Tujunga, Lake Veiw Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank.
4langeles_20110715_26d	7142011	Javier Marquez, Gabriel R. Ayala, Elizabeth Ayala	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena Unified School district should be kept intact. See attached map for boundaries.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_20d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_21d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_22d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_23d	Los Angeles	Montebello		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_24d	Los Angeles	Venice		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_25d	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Tujunga, Lake Veiw Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank.		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_26d				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_20d			no			Please take zip codes into account when drawing districts.	
4langeles_20110715_21d			no				
4langeles_20110715_22d			no				
4langeles_20110715_23d			no				
4langeles_20110715_24d			no				
4langeles_20110715_25d			no				
4langeles_20110715_26d			no			Please take zip codes into account when drawing lines	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_27d	7162011	James Horrick	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Valley Village whole
4langeles_20110715_28d	7142011	Andres Martinez, Diego Vargas, Angel Vargas, Oscar Garcia, Juan Carlos Garcia	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena Unified School district should be kept intact. See attached map for boundaries.
4langeles_20110715_29d	7152011	Jeffrey C. Walker	yes	Neighborhood Council Valley Village, President and Vice President	Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Valley Village whole in CD. See maps
4langeles_20110715_30d	7142011	Javier Marquez, Gabriel R. Ayala, Elizabeth Ayala (duplicate)	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Pasadena Unified School district should be kept intact. See attached map for boundaries.
4langeles_20110715_31d	7152011	Beverly A. Williams	no		Palmdale, Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Palmdale, Lancaster with High Desert and separate from San Fernando Valely
4langeles_20110715_32d	7152011	Robert E. Mason	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Hollywood, Silverlake, Los Feliz, Glendale, Burbank. Keep Los Feliz, Echo Park to Lincoln Heights together
5slobispo_20110715_1e	7152011	Jordan Cunningham	no			San Luis Obispo	yes	SD combine San Luis Obisponorthern Santa Barbara AD with south Santa BarbaraVentura AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_27d		Valley Village		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_28d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_29d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_30d				no	no		
4langeles_20110715_31d		Palmdale, Lancaster		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_32d		Hollywood, Silverlake, Los Feliz, Glendale, Burbank, Echo Park, Lincoln heights		no	yes	LGBT	
5slobispo_20110715_1e	Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Ventura			no	yes	High school sports, recreation	Business advertising

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_27d			no				
4langeles_20110715_28d			no			Please take zip codes into account when drawing lines	
4langeles_20110715_29d			no				
4langeles_20110715_30d			no			Please take zip codes into account when drawing lines	
4langeles_20110715_31d			no				
4langeles_20110715_32d			no				
5slobispo_20110715_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110715_1d	7152011	Ryan Smith	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley with Santa Clarita in SD to protect and incumbent member of Legislature
5ventura_20110715_1e	7162011	Ken Brown	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep Santa Clarita whole
5ventura_20110715_2e	7152011	Michael and Jima Garrett	no		Moorpark	Ventura	yes	Keep Moorpark with Ventura
6inyo_20110715_1e	7152011	Brian Law	no		Bishop	Inyo	yes	Do not put Inyo with Southern California for CD
6kern_20110715_1e	7152011	Portia K. Beebe	no			Kern	yes	Keep Kern River Valley in AD 32. Oppose moving Kern River Valley to District 34
6mono_20110715_1e	7152011	Larry Johnson	yes	District 1, Supervisor		Mono	yes	Mono should be conntected with northern California counties Mariposa, Merced, Madera, Alpine, Placer
7monterey_20110715_1e	7152011	Linda Tulett	yes	Monterey County Registrar of Voters		Monterey	yes	Please see map for request to make minor adjustment to SD.
7sclara_20110715_1e	7152011	Betty Martinez	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep East San Jose whole
7sclara_20110715_2e	7152011	Marcella A. Velasco	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep San Jose as whole as possible
7sclara_20110715_3e	7152011	Jim S. Gonzales	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Maintain 23rd and 28th AD. Nest them together to form a SD.
7sclara_20110715_4e	7152011	Mary Jane Solis	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Maintain 23rd and 28th AD. Nest them together to form a SD.
7sclara_20110715_5e	7152011	James Atkins	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_6e	7152011	Kelsey Ramage	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_7e	7152011	Blu Forman	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	no	
7sclara_20110715_8e	7152011	Tim Sylvester	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_9e	7152011	Erin Lee	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110715_1d		Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110715_1e		Santa Clarita		no	no		
5ventura_20110715_2e	Ventura	Moorpark		no	no		
6inyo_20110715_1e	Inyo			no	no		
6kern_20110715_1e	Kern			no	no		
6mono_20110715_1e	Mono, Mariposa, Merced, Madera, Alpine, Placer			no	no		
7monterey_20110715_1e	Monterey			no	no		
7sclara_20110715_1e	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	yes	Latino community	
7sclara_20110715_2e	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_3e	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	yes	Latino community	
7sclara_20110715_4e	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	yes	Latino community	
7sclara_20110715_5e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_6e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_7e				no	no		
7sclara_20110715_8e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_9e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110715_1d			no				Please explain the term COI at the start of every hearing
5ventura_20110715_1e			no				
5ventura_20110715_2e			no				
6inyo_20110715_1e	Different from millions who live in Southern California		no				
6kern_20110715_1e			no				
6mono_20110715_1e			no				
7monterey_20110715_1e			no				
7sclara_20110715_1e			no				
7sclara_20110715_2e			no				
7sclara_20110715_3e			no				
7sclara_20110715_4e			no				
7sclara_20110715_5e			no				
7sclara_20110715_6e			no				
7sclara_20110715_7e			no				Seems to dilute normalyl liberal-planning voting populace, share pain equally.
7sclara_20110715_8e			no				
7sclara_20110715_9e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110715_10e	7152011	Rachel Dewey Thorsett	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_11e	7152011	Sharon Ross	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_12e	7152011	Susan Maria Bayer	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_13e	7152011	J. Williams	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_14e	7152011	Deb Wirkman	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_15e	7152011	James Anderson Merritt	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_16e	7152011	Natalie Steinberg	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_17e	7152011	Josh Goldberg	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_18e	7152011	Ethan Miller	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_19e	7152011	C. Wolters	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_20e	7152011	John Purchase	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_21e	7152011	Mary Talpas	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_22e	7162011	Isabelle Tuncer	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_23e	7162011	Karen Belford	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD
7sclara_20110715_24e	7152011	Pam Newbury	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Santa Cruz whole in CD. Keep Santa Cruz, Aptos, Capitola, Soquel, Scotts Valley, Felton, Ben Lomond, Boulder Creek, Lompico, Zayante, Davenport, Bonny Doon together
7sutter_20110715_1e	7162011	Marc Weinstein	no			Sutter	yes	Approve of Sutter maps
7trinity_20110715_1e	7152011	Kathy Smith	no			Trinity	yes	Approve of joining Trinity County with coastal area

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110715_10e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_11e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7sclara_20110715_12e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_13e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_14e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_15e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7sclara_20110715_16e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Decentralized infrastructure and nature	
7sclara_20110715_17e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_18e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	yes	Relatively isolated	
7sclara_20110715_19e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_20e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7sclara_20110715_21e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_22e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_23e	Santa Clara	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7sclara_20110715_24e	Santa Clara	Keep Santa Cruz, Aptos, Capitola, Soquel, Scotts Valley, Felton, Ben Lomond, Boulder Creek, Lompico, Zayante, Davenport, Bonny Doon		no	yes		
7sutter_20110715_1e	Sutter			no	no		
7trinity_20110715_1e	Trinity			no	yes	rural living	logging

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110715_10e			no				
7sclara_20110715_11e			no				
7sclara_20110715_12e			no				
7sclara_20110715_13e			no				
7sclara_20110715_14e			no				
7sclara_20110715_15e			no				
7sclara_20110715_16e			no				
7sclara_20110715_17e			no				
7sclara_20110715_18e			no				
7sclara_20110715_19e			no				
7sclara_20110715_20e			no				
7sclara_20110715_21e			no				
7sclara_20110715_22e			no				
7sclara_20110715_23e			no				
7sclara_20110715_24e			no				
7sutter_20110715_1e			no				
7trinity_20110715_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110715_1e	7152011	Pat Ferguson	no		Livermore	Alameda	yes	Keep cities and counties together, rather than communities of interest.
8alameda_20110715_2e	7152011	Anil K. Gupta, Suman Gupta, Garima Gupta, Tarun K. Gupta	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Newark, Union City together
8alameda_20110715_3e	7152011	Marilyn Campbell	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole and keep Tri-City area (Fremont, Newark, Union City) together
8alameda_20110715_4e	7152011	Janet Crocker	no		Newark	Alameda	yes	Keep Tri-City area together.
8alameda_20110715_5e	7152011	John Chacon	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Support CD connecting golden triangle in San Jose to Livemore Labs
8ccosta_20110715_1e	7152011	Phillip Vince	yes	City of Martinez, Recreation Manager	Martinez	Contra Costa	yes	Keep Martinez with Contra Costa
8ccosta_20110715_2e	7152011	Anonymous	yes	California Young Republican Federation		Contra Costa	yes	Keep San Ramon Valley from Tri-Valley
8marin_20110715_1e	7152011	Linda Graber	no		Novato	Marin	yes	Approve of separating Marin from San Francisco
8sfrancisco_20110715_1e	7152011	Edwin Lee	yes	City of San Francisco, Mayor	San Francisco	San Francisco	yes	Approve of CD for San Francisco (July 11, 2011) proposed on July 5, 2011
8sonoma_20110715_1e	7152011	Zachary Britton	no			Sonoma	yes	Support keeping Santa Rosa, Napa, Vallejo, American Canyon, Benicia, Martinez together. If need to change, keep Santa Rosa, Napa, Vallejo together
9dnorte_20110715_1e	7152011	Susan Botts	no			Del Norte	yes	Support placing Del Norte with northern coastal districts
9edorado_20110715_1e	7152011	Cris Alarcon	no			El Dorado	yes	See maps for specific request. Include Auburn in Placer County. Include El Dorado Hills in El Dorado Hills

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110715_1e				no	no		
8alameda_20110715_2e	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	no		
8alameda_20110715_3e	Alameda	Fremont		no	no		
8alameda_20110715_4e	Alameda			no	yes		
8alameda_20110715_5e	Alameda, Santa Clara	San Jose, Livermore		no	yes		
8ccosta_20110715_1e	Contra Costa	Martinez		no	yes	coordinate safety and public services with Contra Costa County	
8ccosta_20110715_2e				no	no		
8marin_20110715_1e	Marin, San Francisco			no	no		
8sfrancisco_20110715_1e				no	no		
8sonoma_20110715_1e	Napa	Santa Rosa, Napa, Vallejo, American Canyon, Benicia, Martinez		no	no		
9dnorte_20110715_1e	Del Norte			no	yes		
9edorado_20110715_1e	Placer	Auburn, El Dorado Hills		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110715_1e			no				
8alameda_20110715_2e			no				
8alameda_20110715_3e			no				
8alameda_20110715_4e			no				
8alameda_20110715_5e			no				
8ccosta_20110715_1e			no				
8ccosta_20110715_2e			no				
8marin_20110715_1e			no				
8sfrancisco_20110715_1e			no				
8sonoma_20110715_1e			no				
9dnorte_20110715_1e			no				
9edorado_20110715_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9edorado_20110715_2e	7152011	Zoe McNevin	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Keep El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park with this side of American River and along Highway 50 corridor
9edorado_20110715_3e	7152011	Ron and Kathleen Barnett	no		El Dorado Hills	El Dorado	yes	Respect Highway 50 corridor northern boundary to separate from Highway 80 people
9humboldt_20110715_1e	7162011	Justin L.	no			Humboldt	yes	Please maintain northern Californias fisher districts. If needed, please consolidate with intra state rather than down coast
9placer_20110715_1e	7152011	Laura Riedel	no			Placer	yes	In SD, include Redding with northern Sacramento Valley. Keep Roseville with southern Placer County
9shasta_20110715_1e	7152011	Valerie Gottschalk	no			Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta separated from coastal area
9shasta_20110715_2e	7152011	Kathie Woodring	no			Shasta	yes	Do not change lines for Shasta
9shasta_20110715_3e	7152011	Ann and Fred Meyer	no			Shasta	yes	Let Shasta County remain in I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110715_4e	7152011	Janet Burkenpas	no			Shasta	yes	Do not lump Shasta with another county
9sjoaquin_20110715_1e	7152011	Chuck Hill	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	Approve of maps of Lodi
9sjoaquin_20110715_2e	7152011	Marlene Jones	yes	Tracy arts, Commissioner		San Joaquin	yes	Approve of putting Tracy and Stockton together. Approve of putting Lodi with Central Valley by pairing with Galt and Elk Grove
9sjoaquin_20110715_3e	7152011	Nicholas Hatten	yes	San Joaquin Pride Center		San Joaquin	no	
9yolo_20110715_1e	7152011	Timothy Fenton	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo whole and separate from Vacaville, Pittsburgh, Farifield, Napa, Lake. Keep West Sacramento with Sacramento.Keep Davis, Woodland, Winters in one AD
9yolo_20110715_2e	7152011	Michael Bartolic	no			Yolo	yes	Keep all of Yolo except West Sacramento in one AD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9edorado_20110715_2e		El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park	American River, Highway 50	no	no		
9edorado_20110715_3e			Highway 80	no	no		
9humboldt_20110715_1e				no	yes		Money
9placer_20110715_1e	Placer	Redding, Roseville		no	no		
9shasta_20110715_1e	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110715_2e	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110715_3e	Shasta			no	no		
9shasta_20110715_4e	Shasta			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110715_1e	San Joaquin			no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110715_2e	San Joaquin	Tracy, Stockton, Galt, Elk Grove		no	no		
9sjoaquin_20110715_3e				no	no		
9yolo_20110715_1e	Napa, Lake, Yolo	Davis, Woodland, Winters, West Sacramento, Fairfield, Vacaville, Pittsburgh		no	no		
9yolo_20110715_2e	Yolo	West Sacramento		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9edorado_20110715_2e			no				
9edorado_20110715_3e			no				
9humboldt_20110715_1e			no				
9placer_20110715_1e			no				
9shasta_20110715_1e			no				
9shasta_20110715_2e			no				
9shasta_20110715_3e			no				
9shasta_20110715_4e			no				
9sjoaquin_20110715_1e			no				
9sjoaquin_20110715_2e			no				
9sjoaquin_20110715_3e			no				Wants support
9yolo_20110715_1e			no				
9yolo_20110715_2e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110715_3e	7152011	Marlene Bell	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo whole
9yolo_20110715_4e	7152011	Charlotte Dorsey	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo whole
9yolo_20110715_5e	7152011	Carl Schmid	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Davis and Woodland in same ADSD
9yolo_20110715_6e	7162011	Brian Sway	no			Yolo	yes	Support of visualizations 2011-0711 0246PM assembly norcal, 2011-0711 0543PM congress norcal, 2011-0711 0546PM senate norcal, 2011-0713 0943AM board of equalization norcal
9yolo_20110715_7e	7152011	Don Morrill	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo in one AD
9yolo_20110715_8e	7152011	Barry Melton	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo whole in AD
general_20110715_1e	7152011	Eugene Lee	no				no	
general_20110715_2e	7152011	Richard Seyman	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	See attached statistics for AD in northern California
general_20110715_3e	792011	Richard Blackston	no		Lodi	San Joaquin	yes	See attached maps
general_20110715_4e	7152011	Richard J. Seyman	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	See attached maps
general_20110715_5e	7152011	David Williams	no				no	
general_20110715_6e	7152011	David Williams (duplicate)	no				no	
general_20110715_7e	7162011	Rebecca Jordan Glum	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Valley Village whole. Draw maps to follow 170 freeway
supporters_lhabra_20110715_1e	7152011	Anonymous	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with north Orange County cities

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110715_3e	Yolo			no	yes	dedicated to preserving open space	
9yolo_20110715_4e	Yolo			no	yes	Services and transportation challenges	
9yolo_20110715_5e	Yolo	Davis, Woodland		no	no		
9yolo_20110715_6e	Yolo			no	no		
9yolo_20110715_7e	Yolo			no	no		
9yolo_20110715_8e	Yolo			no	yes		
general_20110715_1e				no	no		
general_20110715_2e				no	yes	major regional community-land use patterns	
general_20110715_3e				no	no		
general_20110715_4e	Yolo, Marin			no	no		
general_20110715_5e				no	no		
general_20110715_6e				no	no		
general_20110715_7e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110715_1e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110715_3e			no				
9yolo_20110715_4e			no				
9yolo_20110715_5e			no				
9yolo_20110715_6e			no				
9yolo_20110715_7e			no				
9yolo_20110715_8e			no				
general_20110715_1e		See letter regarding 14-posting requirement for maps	no				
general_20110715_2e			no				
general_20110715_3e			no				
general_20110715_4e			no				
general_20110715_5e			no				Want competitive districts
general_20110715_6e			no				
general_20110715_7e			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110715_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_lhabra_20110715_2e	7152011	Anonymous	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with north Orange County cities
supporters_lhabra_20110715_3e	7152011	Randall J. Rivera	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with north Orange County cities
supporters_lhabra_20110715_4e	7152011	Anonymous	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with north Orange County cities
supporters_lhabra_20110715_5e	7152011	Anonymous	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with north Orange County cities
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110715_1e	7152011	Nate and Suzy Selden	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with DB-YL SD and either DBRYL or ANAFULL AD.
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110715_2e	7152011	Florence M. Gregory	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with DB-YL SD and either DBRYL or ANAFULL AD.
1imperial_20110715_1e	7152011	Eduardo A Guevara	no		Brawle	Imperial	yes	Keep Brawle, Imperial with East part of Coahelle valley(Riverside) . Keep it together for Senate and Congress
1sdiego_20110715_1e	7152011	Eugene Lee	yes	Asian Pacific American Legal Center,Southwest Center for Asian Pacific American Law			yes	Move Spring Valley,Lemon Grove,La Mesa,El Cajon From CSAND to NESAN districts. Move Mira Mesa,Rancho Penasquitos,Rancho Bernardo,Miramar,Sorrento Valley,Carmel Valley from NESAN to CSAND.Powal is also AAPI interest,should be moved to CSAND if possible.
1sdiego_20110715_2e	7152011	Eugene Lee	yes	Asian Pacific American Legal Center,MALDEF,AARC			yes	CAPAFRs interests in San Diego CO at senate level are in CAPAFR,MALDEF,AARC unity Senate map for Southern CA.,San Diego CO.
1sdiego_20110715_3e	7152011	Karen Grube	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	I do not want to lose my current congressman.Do not put Carmel Mountain Ranch, do not put it with Congressman Bilbrays district.I will move if you change this.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_lhabra_20110715_2e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110715_3e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110715_4e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110715_5e	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110715_1e	Orange	La Habra		no	yes	Education, Transportation, water district	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110715_2e	Orange	La Habra		no	yes	Education, Transportation, water district	
1imperial_20110715_1e	Imperial,Riverside	Brawle		no	no		
1sdiego_20110715_1e	San Diego,Riverside,Imperial			yes	yes		
1sdiego_20110715_2e	San Diego			no	no		
1sdiego_20110715_3e	San Diego			yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_lhabra_20110715_2e			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110715_3e			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110715_4e			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110715_5e			no				
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110715_1e			no				
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110715_2e			no				
1imperial_20110715_1e			no				
1sdiego_20110715_1e	Asian and Latino Populations need to stay together in this area.		no				
1sdiego_20110715_2e			no				
1sdiego_20110715_3e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110715_1e_2	7152011	George and Terese Di Leo	no		Temecula	Riverside	yes	Do not split Temecula into two congressional districts.Do not split into Riverside and San Diego.We do not belong with San Diego.
2riverside_20110715_1e	7152011	Glenn A. Miller	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio with Riverside,Coachella Valley and not Imperial County.Biggest industry here is tourism,not agriculture
2riverside_20110715_2e	7152011	Patti Thormahlen	no			Riverside	yes	Keep Mary Bono in San Jacinto Hemet Area.
2riverside_20110715_3e	7152011	Joaquin Uribe	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio with Imperial Valley.
2riverside_20110715_4e	7152011	Emmanuel Marquez	no		Indio	Riverside	yes	Keep Indio with Imperial Valley.
2sbernardino_20110717_1e	7172011	Nicole Miller	no			San Bernadino	yes	Endorses the petition made by Mayor Rigsby to move Loma Lindo from the ColtonSan BernadinoRialtoFontana district to the RedlandsYucaipaHighland district.
3orange_20110717_1e	7172011	Jim Kuhn	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Does not support placing La Habra in a district comprised of only Los Angeles county cities. Interests are far more aligned with Orange county than with LA county.
3orange_20110717_2e	7172011	Yvette Ollada	no	Eastshore Elementary School (PTA), Irvine Public School Foundation (volunteer)	Irvine	Orange	yes	Appreciates the efforts made by the CRC to keep Irvine in South Orange county. It belongs with El Toro cities like Lake Forest and Mission Viejo. Hopes this will continue for the assembly and state maps for Irvine.
3orange_20110717_3e	7172011	Michelle Alipio	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Supports the maps that place Irvine in South Orange County legislative district. Also supports maps that keep Irvine whole in the congressional maps, and hopes this will continue into the assembly and state sentate maps as well.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110715_1e_2	San Diego,Riverside	Temecula		no	no		
2riverside_20110715_1e	Imperial,Riverside	Indio,Coachella		no	yes		
2riverside_20110715_2e	Riverside			no	no		
2riverside_20110715_3e	Riverside,Imperial	Indio		no	yes		
2riverside_20110715_4e	Riverside,Imperial	Indio		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110717_1e	San Bernadino	Colton, San Bernadino, Rialto, Fontana, Redlands, Yucaipa, Highland		no	no		
3orange_20110717_1e	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra, Los Angeles		no	no		
3orange_20110717_2e	Orange	Irvine, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo		no	no		
3orange_20110717_3e	Orange	Irvine		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110715_1e_2			no				
2riverside_20110715_1e	Hospitality and tourist industry.,shared with Coachelle Valley.		no				
2riverside_20110715_2e			no				
2riverside_20110715_3e	Similar interests		no				
2riverside_20110715_4e			no				
2sbernardino_20110717_1e			no				
3orange_20110717_1e			no				
3orange_20110717_2e			no				
3orange_20110717_3e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110717_4e	7172011	Anthony Kuo	no	Irvine Planning Commissioner	Irvine	Orange	yes	Supports maps that place Irvine with fellow south Orange county cities like Lake Forest and Mission Viejo. Please keep Irvine with neighboring South Orange County communities of interest in all legislative district maps.
3orange_20110717_5e	7172011	Brenda Gomez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Opposes the redistricting of La Habra into districts comprised of LA county cities. La Habra should be kept with Orange county cities.
3orange_20110717_6e	7172011	Richard D Runge	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Encourages maps in which Dana Point is entirely in one district. Dana Point has more in common with San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente than with OceansideSan Diego county.
3orange_20110717_7e	7172011	Helen C Runge	no		Dana Point	Orange	yes	Encourages maps in which Dana Point is entirely in one district. Dana Point has more in common with San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente than with OceansideSan Diego county.
3orange_20110717_8e	7172011	Joann Fleming	no				yes	The boundary lines for the 48th assembly district are troubling because it will impact the African-American, Latino, and other minority groups in the area.
4langeles_20110717_1e	7172011	Franklin N Hanock	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned that the new maps will divide Valley Village into halves. Redraw the line so that it follows the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110717_2e	7172011	Jamie Allen	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Valley Village into two separate congressional districts. Redraw the map to use the 170 Freeway as the south boundary, not Colfax Avenue.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110717_4e	Orange	Irvine, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo.		no	no		
3orange_20110717_5e	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110717_6e	Orange, San Diego	Dana Point, Oceanside, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente		no	no		
3orange_20110717_7e	Orange, San Diego	Dana Point, Oceanside, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente		no	no		
3orange_20110717_8e	Orange			no	no		
4langeles_20110717_1e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_2e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway, Colfax Avenue	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110717_4e			no				
3orange_20110717_5e			no				
3orange_20110717_6e			no				
3orange_20110717_7e			no				
3orange_20110717_8e			no				
4langeles_20110717_1e			no				
4langeles_20110717_2e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110717_3e	7172011	Barbara Rabelo	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Montebello would be better served in the district directly north of LAPRW. It should be part of the San Gabriel Valley, not the Gateway Cities or Southeast cities. This is also demonstrated in the maps proposed by the Chinese American Citizens Alliance.
4langeles_20110717_4e	7172011	Madelyn Glickfeld	no			Los Angeles	yes	The EVENT senate district should include Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, and the Santa Monica Mountains west of the 405 fwy. Exclude Northwest LA county north of 118 fwy and along I-5. Splitting Santa Clarita and Stevenson Ranch makes no sense.
4langeles_20110717_5e	7172011	Caleb Huey	no			Los Angeles	yes	Please take cultural preferance and identification into consideration when drawing district lines. Doing so has been neglected in areas like Torrance and Palos Verdes, which are simply gerrymandered into two separate parts.
4langeles_20110717_6e	7172011	Joanne Russell	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Pleased with the districting for South Los Angeles and the USC community. Identifies as an African American and feels as though her voice is being culturally represented.
4langeles_20110717_7e	7172011	Jose Escarce	yes	Board of Education of the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District, President	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	It is crucial that Santa Monica and Malibu remain in the same district, as to split them would significantly harm the high standards of education in that district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110717_3e	Los Angeles	Montebello	San Gabriel Valley, Gateway Cities, Southeast cities	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_4e	Los Angeles	Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, Santa Clarita, Stevenson Ranch	405 Freeway, 118 Freeway, I-5.	no	yes	Strong community of interest that bonds Santa Monica and Malibu. They are in the same school district, share the PCH commute corridor, and share brush fire issues.	
4langeles_20110717_5e	Los Angeles	Torrance, Palos Verdes		no	yes	The inhabitants of the south bay (of Los Angeles county) share a strong cultural tie to the area and to each other.	
4langeles_20110717_6e				no	no		
4langeles_20110717_7e	Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Malibu		no	yes	Santa Monica and Malibu have deeply ingrained historical and community ties that bind the two. The current maps do not respect these ties.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110717_3e			no				
4langeles_20110717_4e			no				
4langeles_20110717_5e			no			Supports the preliminary maps.	
4langeles_20110717_6e			no				
4langeles_20110717_7e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110717_8e	7172011	Jessamine Campbell	no			Los Angeles	yes	The South Bay (of Los Angeles) should be kept as one whole district - it should be Palos Verdes up to El Segundo. Lomita is also a part of the South Bay, and it can be argued that Hawthorne and Gardena are too. Do not split up these cities.
4langeles_20110717_9e	7172011	Nancy Fretheim	no			Los Angeles	yes	Please direct Q2 to present the CRC a map that keeps the Santa Clarita Valley as a whole area within East Ventura County.
4langeles_20110717_10e	7172011	Haig Kartounian	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the city of Glendale together, as demonstrated in the July 14 plan.
4langeles_20110717_11e	7172011	Ann Tomkins	no			Los Angeles	yes	Disappointed that Pomona is removed from the rest of Los Angeles. Those who live in Pomona often work in Los Angeles and socialize in Claremont, San Dimas, and LaVerne. The border between these cities is porous and the district maps should keep them whole
4langeles_20110717_12e	7172011	Judith Kolker	no			Los Angeles	yes	Reconsider the lines drawn for the congressional district for valley village. Colfax Avenue is an unnatural line, and it would be more appropriate to use the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110717_13e	7172011	Larry and Lorraine Spencer	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned that the latest draft maps will split Valley Village into two parts. Please redraw the lines such that the 170 Freeway is the new border.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110717_8e	Los Angeles	Torrance, Palos Verdes, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Gardena, Lomita		no	no		
4langeles_20110717_9e	Ventura	Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110717_10e	Los Angeles	Glendale		no	no		
4langeles_20110717_11e	Los Angeles	Pomona, Claremont, San Dimas, LaVerne		no	no		
4langeles_20110717_12e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_13e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	yes	Valley Village is unique, as it has a tight knit community and small town atmosphere. Dividing Valley Village will destry these characteristics.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110717_8e			no				
4langeles_20110717_9e			no				
4langeles_20110717_10e			no				
4langeles_20110717_11e			no				
4langeles_20110717_12e			no				
4langeles_20110717_13e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110717_14e	7172011	Micheline K Ducharme	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Reconsider placing Westchester with cities south of El Segundo or north of Playa Vista. These cities do not share similar concerns regarding the Los Angeles airport.
4langeles_20110717_15e	7172011	Margaret Mellody	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Pasadena. Cong. Dist do not cut off Pasadena down to Lake Avenue. Assem. Dist Place Arcadia, San Marino in the district, remove San Dimas and Upland. Sen. Dist odd to skip over Azusa and Glendora, include Alhambra, Temple City, San Gabriel
4langeles_20110717_16e	7172011	Elizabeth Bolwell	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the boundary line for Valley Village at the 170 freeway.
4langeles_20110717_17e	7172011	Lovina Bolwell	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the boundary line for Valley Village at the 170 freeway.
4langeles_20110717_18e	7172011	Dorothy Paul	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the boundary line for Valley Village at the 170 freeway.
4langeles_20110717_19e	7172011	Debbie Neal	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	Do not carve out Glendora, Azusa, and Duarte from the Foothill Communities and insert Pasadena. Glendora shares strong ties to San Dimas, La Verne, and Claremont.
4langeles_20110717_20e	7172011	Joshua Levy	no	Neighborhood Council of Valley Village, elected board member	Valley Village, Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned about the division of Valley Village. Please redraw the line such that if follows the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110717_21e	7172011	John Dortch	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep Santa Clarita Valley whole.
4langeles_20110717_22e	7172011	Jo Von Tiehl	no			Los Angeles	yes	Pleased to see South Pasadena with San Gabriel Valley cities. It is odd to carve pieces of westsouthwest Pasadena off in order to other eastern cities likes La Verne, Claremont, and San Dimas.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110717_14e	Los Angeles	Westchester	Los Angeles Airport	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_15e	Los Angeles	Pasadena, Arcadia, San Marino, Monrovia, San Dimas, Upland, Azusa, Glendora, Alhambra, Temple City, San Gabriel	Lake Avenue	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_16e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_17e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_18e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_19e	Los Angeles	Glendora, Azusa, Duarte, Pasadena, San Dimas, La Verne, Claremont		no	yes	The foothill communities share the Citrus Community College, 201 freeway, shopping, and community events. Do not split them up.	
4langeles_20110717_20e	Los Angeles	Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110717_21e	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110717_22e	Los Angeles	Pasadena, La Verne, Claremont, San Dimas		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110717_14e			no				
4langeles_20110717_15e			no				
4langeles_20110717_16e			no				
4langeles_20110717_17e			no				
4langeles_20110717_18e			no				
4langeles_20110717_19e			no				
4langeles_20110717_20e			no				
4langeles_20110717_21e			no				
4langeles_20110717_22e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110717_23e	7172011	Joseph T Edmiston	yes	American Institute of Certified Planners, Fellow	Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Important to keep the entire Santa Monica Mountains community whole (Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, and the cities west of the 405 fwy - Topanga, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Las Virgenes, Westlake Village).
4langeles_20110717_24e	7172011	Suzanne Rosenblatt Buhai	no			Los Angeles	yes	Keep the neighborhood of Windsor Square intact when redistricting.
4langeles_20110717_25e	7172011	Jill Furtado	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale together (comprises the Antelope Valley). The bulk of the population should not be placed in a senate district with Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima.
4langeles_20110717_26e	7172011	Madelyn Glickfeld	no	Member of the American Planning Association, and Member of Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board	Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Important to keep the entire Santa Monica Mountains community whole (Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, and the cities west of the 405 fwy - Topanga, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Las Virgenes, Westlake Village).
4langeles_20110717_27e	7172011	Cynthia Chvatal-Keane	yes	Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, Member. Hancock Park Homeowners Association, President. Hancock Park Historic Preservation Advocacy Group, Member	Hancock Park	Los Angeles	yes	Reconsider the draft maps that split Hancock ParkWindsor Square neighborhood. The correct boundary line should be drawn at Western Avenue, not Plymouth Boulevard. Additionally, the entirety of the Greater Wilshire neighborhood should be whole.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110717_23e	Los Angeles	Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, Topanga, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Las Virgenes, Westlake Village	405 Freeway	no	yes	Malibu shares fire and PCH corridor issues with Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, and Brentwood. It should be kept with the Santa Monica Mountains community.	
4langeles_20110717_24e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Windsor Square)		yes	no		
4langeles_20110717_25e	Los Angeles	Lancaster, Palmdale	Antelope Valley	no	yes	Lancaster and Palmdale have unified interests, concerns, etc. They need common representation.	
4langeles_20110717_26e	Los Angeles	Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, Topanga, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Las Virgenes, Westlake Vilalge	405 Freeway	no	yes	Malibu shares fire and PCH corridor issues with Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, and Brentwood. It should be kept with the Santa Monica Mountains community.	
4langeles_20110717_27e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire)	Plymouth Boulevard, Western Avenue	yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110717_23e			no				
4langeles_20110717_24e			no				
4langeles_20110717_25e			no				
4langeles_20110717_26e			no				
4langeles_20110717_27e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5sbarbara_20110717_1e	7172011	John Wical	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Endorses the petition made by Mayor Rigsby to move Loma Linda from the ColtonSan BernadinoFontana district to the RedlandsYucaipaHighland district.
5sbarbara_20110717_2e	7172011	Paul G Rosso	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Appreciates the cong dist that includes San Luis Obispo, San Bernadino, and parts of West Ventura. Appreciates the assem dist for San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara (plus Lompoc). Include this district with the one to its north for sen dist.
5sbarbara_20110717_3e	7172011	Hans and El-Jay Hansson	no			Santa Barbara	yes	Please keep all of San Luis Obispo whole.
6kern_20110717_1e	7182011	Judy Deems	no		Lake Isabella	Kern	yes	Do not add the Kern River Valley to Tulare in District 34. Keep it with Bakersfield.
6stanislaus_20110717_1e	7172011	Carmela Perez	no		Modesto	Stanislaus	yes	Thanks the CRC for keeping the areas of southern Modesto in one assembly district, and placing Turlock, northern Modesto, Riverbank, and Waterford together in another district.
6stanislaus_20110717_2e	7172011	Tommy Flores	no			Stanislaus	yes	Thank you for placing Turlock in an assembly district separate from Merced County and the southern Modesto area of Stanislaus.
7sclara_20110717_1e	7172011	Robert Van Cleef	no			Santa Clara	yes	Does not make sense to break up San Jose, a move which isolates the majority of its citizens from the downtown area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5sbarbara_20110717_1e	Santa Barbara	Colton, San Bernadino, Fontana, Redlands, Yucaipa, Highland		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110717_2e	Santa Barbara, Ventura	Lompoc, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara		no	no		
5sbarbara_20110717_3e	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo		no	no		
6kern_20110717_1e	Kern			no	yes	Kern River Valley should be kept with Bakersfield because it would be easier on its representatives, and it would be easier on the seniordisabled population.	
6stanislaus_20110717_1e	Stanislaus	Modesto, Turlock, Riverbank, Waterford		no	no		
6stanislaus_20110717_2e	Stanislaus, Merced	Modesto, Turlock		no	no		
7sclara_20110717_1e	Santa Clara	San Jose		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5sbarbara_20110717_1e			no				
5sbarbara_20110717_2e			no				
5sbarbara_20110717_3e			no				
6kern_20110717_1e			no				
6stanislaus_20110717_1e			no				
6stanislaus_20110717_2e			no				
7sclara_20110717_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110717_2e	7172011	Terry Christensen	yes	San Jose State University, Professor of Political Science	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Keep the area bounded by highways 87, 101, 280 together, and keep it in the San Jose district, not the FremontOakland district.
7sclara_20110717_3e	7172011	Martha Campos	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Dissatisfied with draft maps that split the San Jose area. Please maintain the 23rd Assem. Dist, and maintain the 28th Assem. District. Nest these together to form a Sen. Dist. That combines Santa Clara, Monterey, and San Benito counties.
8alameda_20110717_1e	7172011	Bridget Mayberry	no			Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Neward, and Union City whole within the Tri-City area.
8alameda_20110717_2e	7172011	Alan Nagy	yes	City of Newark, Councilmember	Newark	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Neward, and Union City whole within the Tri-City area.
8alameda_20110717_3e	7172011	Luck Rukchart	no		Newark	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Neward, and Union City whole within the Tri-City area.
8ccosta_20110717_1e	7172011	Randy Khalil	no			Contra Costa	yes	Combine the area of Livermore, Dublin, Pleasanton, Sunol, San Ramon, Danville (Blackhawk, Tassajara), Alamo together in one district - with parts of Eastern Contra Costa county like Clayton, Brentwood, Oakley, Discovery Bay, and Castro Valley.
8ccosta_20110717_2e	7172011	Pam Farly	no		Alamo	Contra Costa	yes	Supports maps drawn by the California Conservative Action Group, which respects topographical divisions (and is not gerrymandered for Stark and Miller).

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110717_2e	Santa Clara	San Jose, Fremont, Oakland	87 Highway, 101 Highway, 280 Highway	no	no		
7sclara_20110717_3e	Santa Clara, Monterey, San Benito	San Jose		no	yes	The counties of Santa Clara, Monterey, and San Benito counties are communities of interest, as they have similar educational needs, cultural similarities, and similar employment needs. To do otherwise would be discrimination against Latino populations.	
8alameda_20110717_1e	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City.		no	no		
8alameda_20110717_2e	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City.		no	no		
8alameda_20110717_3e	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City.		no	no		
8ccosta_20110717_1e	Contra Costa	Livermore, Dublin, Pleasanton, Sunol, San Ramon, Danville, Alamo, Clayton, Brentwood, Oakley, Discovery Bay, Castro Valley.		no	no		
8ccosta_20110717_2e	Contra Costa			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110717_2e			no				
7sclara_20110717_3e			no				
8alameda_20110717_1e			no				
8alameda_20110717_2e			no				
8alameda_20110717_3e			no				
8ccosta_20110717_1e			no				
8ccosta_20110717_2e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110717_1e	7182011	Stefan Williams	no			Marin	yes	Rethink placing Marin with counties that border Oregon. Marin and Crescent City have little in common.
9edorado_20110717_1e	7172011	Paul Raveling	no			El Dorado	yes	Do not leave El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park in a district based on the I-80 corrdidor and areas to the north. They have no affinity for Placer County. Attaches maps that would be far preferable.
9humboldt_20110717_1e	7172011	Samuel Valdez	no			Humboldt	yes	Favors keeping Napa County out of the North Coastal District.
9lake_20110717_1e	7172011	Victoria Brandon	no			Lake	yes	Lake county should nto be separated from the North Coastwine countrynorthern Coastal Range communities, and it should not be placed with the Central Valley.
9lake_20110717_2e	7172011	Marta Williams	no			Lake	yes	Lake county is not part of the central valley, and should be kept with Sonoma, Mendocino, and Napa.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110717_1e	Marin			no	no		
9edorado_20110717_1e	El Dorado, Placer	El Dorado, Cameron Park	I-80	no	no		
9humboldt_20110717_1e	Napa, Humboldt			no	yes	Napa should be separate from Humboldt because of differing opinions on at-risk salmon and steelhead.	
9lake_20110717_1e	Lake			no	yes	While Lake county is a farming county, it trades in speciality agriculture, not commodity. This alone separates it from Central Valley. It should be placed with other wine-growing areas like Napa, Mendocino, and Sonoma.	
9lake_20110717_2e	Lake, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino			no	yes	The wine industry links Lake to Sonoma, Mendocino, and Napa.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110717_1e			no				
9edorado_20110717_1e			no				
9humboldt_20110717_1e			no				
9lake_20110717_1e			no				
9lake_20110717_2e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9lake_20110717_3e	7172011	Tova Fry	no			Lake	yes	Lake county should nto be separated from the North Coastwine countrynorthern Coastal Range communities, and it should not be placed with the Central Valley.
9lake_20110717_4e	7172011	Michael E Bailly and Julie Ann Kreis	no			Lake	yes	Lake should not be placed with the central Sacramento Valley and the farming districts. It is a wine region that should be placed with Calistoga and Napa, as residents often go to Santa Rosa, Ukiah, and Healdsburg.
9sacramento_20110717_1e	7172011	Joan Pederson	no			Sacramento	no	
9sacramento_20110717_2e	7172011	duplicate of comment 58	no				no	
9sacramento_20110717_3e	7172011	Steven Pederson	no			Sacramento	no	
9shasta_20110717_1e	7172011	Orvil and Myra Swarts	no			Shasta	no	Keep Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc, Lassen, and Tehama counties in the same district. Do not place the mountain and valley areas with the coastal communities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9lake_20110717_3e	Lake			no	yes	While Lake county is a farming county, it trades in speciality agriculture, not commodity. This alone separates it from Central Valley. It should be placed with other wine-growing areas like Napa, Mendocino, and Sonoma.	
9lake_20110717_4e	Lake	Sacramento, Napa, Healdsburg, Ukiah, Santa Rosa		no	no		
9sacramento_20110717_1e				no	no		
9sacramento_20110717_2e				no	no		
9sacramento_20110717_3e				no	no		
9shasta_20110717_1e	Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc, Lassen, Tehama			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9lake_20110717_3e			no				
9lake_20110717_4e			no				
9sacramento_20110717_1e			no				Does not want to be represented by Doris Matsui, and prefers to be represented by Dan Lundgren.
9sacramento_20110717_2e			no				
9sacramento_20110717_3e			no				Opposes any redistricting move that would cause Sacramento to lose Dan Lundgren as representative.
9shasta_20110717_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110717_1e	7172011	Dave Salaverry	yes	California Conservative Action Group	Albany	Alameda	no	
general_20110717_2e	7172011	Virginia W Martin	no		Rancho Santa Fe	San Diego	no	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_1e	7172011	Rebecca Gresham	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_2e	7172011	G Robert Cash	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_3e	7172011	Raul R Rodriguez	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110717_1e				no	no		
general_20110717_2e				no	no		
supporters_gwnc_20110717_1e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_2e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_3e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110717_1e			no				Urges the CRC to figure out if there must be a dead zone from August 1 to August 15 with respect to the potential maps. The CRC is becoming a self-protecting and self-aggrandizing Politburo.
general_20110717_2e			no				Redistricting is nothing but a political ploy.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_1e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_2e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_3e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110717_4e	7172011	Gail Gardner	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_5e	7172011	Jake James	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_6e	7172011	Richard Chisholm	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_7e	7172011	Melodie A Simond	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110717_4e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_5e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_6e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_7e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110717_4e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_5e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_6e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_7e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110717_8e	7172011	John Welborne, Jane Ulsher, Liz Fuller, Jack Humpreville, Owen Smith, Wendy Savage, Cindy Chvatal-Keane, John Greshamn, George Stoneman	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_9e	7172011	Jehan Agrama	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_10e	7172011	Marilyn Levin	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110717_8e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_9e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_10e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110717_8e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_9e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_10e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110717_11e	7172011	Sheila Novak	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_12e	7172011	Sue Horwitz	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_13e	7172011	signatures duplicate to comment 71	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_14e	7172011	Moshe Fridman	yes	Board Member of Sycamore Square Neighborhood Association	Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110717_11e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_12e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_13e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_14e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110717_11e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_12e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_13e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_14e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110717_15e	7172011	Ann Eggleston	yes	President of Sycamore Square Neighborhood Association	Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_16e	7172011	Antonia D Schuman	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_gwnc_20110717_17e	7172011	Annie Goepel	no		Greater Wilshire (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
supporters_lhabra_20110717_1e	7172011	Jose Flores	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not place La Habra with the Los Angeles county district. It is an Orange county city.
supporters_lhabra_20110717_2e	7172011	Randall J Rivera	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Opposed to placing La Habra in Los Angeles county district. It should be placed with North Orange county cities.
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110717_1e	7172011	Alejandro Flores and family	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Opposed to placing La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts comprised of Los Angeles county cities. It belongs with other north Orange county cities. It should be placed in the DB-YL senate district, and either the DBRYL or ANAFULL assembly district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110717_15e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_16e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_gwnc_20110717_17e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
supporters_lhabra_20110717_1e	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabra_20110717_2e	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110717_1e	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra shares common interests (of identity, history, characteristics, education) with Orange county - not Los Angeles.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110717_15e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_16e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110717_17e			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110717_1e			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110717_2e			no				
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110717_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_vvillage_20110717_1e	7172011	Henry Masao Kingi Jr	no		Valley Village (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw the line such that it follows the 170 Freeway.
supporters_vvillage_20110717_2e	7172011	Franklin Hanock	no		Valley Village (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw the line such that it follows the 170 Freeway.
supporters_vvillage_20110717_3e	7172011	Barbara Gauthier	no		Valley Village (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw the line such that it follows the 170 Freeway.
supporters_vvillage_20110717_4e	7172011	Todd Stockert	no		Valley Village (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw the line such that it follows the 170 Freeway.
supporters_vvillage_20110717_5e	7172011	Jay Sloat	no		Valley Village (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw the line such that it follows the 170 Freeway.
supporters_vvillage_20110717_6e	7172011	Brian French	no		Valley Village (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw the line such that it follows the 170 Freeway.
6mono_20110718_1f	7192011	Erik (last name withheld)	no			Mono	yes	Mono and Inyo counties should not be split.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_1f	7182011	Victor S LoCicero	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_vvillage_20110717_1e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110717_2e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110717_3e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110717_4e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110717_5e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110717_6e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
6mono_20110718_1f	Inyo, Mono			no	yes	Mono and Inyo share a unique community of interest because of their seperation from the Western Sierra by snow for 6 months of the year, and their shared history of water battles with LA.	
supporters_beachcities_20110718_1f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_vvillage_20110717_1e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110717_2e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110717_3e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110717_4e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110717_5e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110717_6e			no				
6mono_20110718_1f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_1f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_2f	7182011	Deborah Berger	no		Palos Verdes	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_3f	7182011	Sandy Cobb	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_4f	7182011	Billie Johnson	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_5f	7182011	Sutter Kunkel	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_2f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_3f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_4f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_5f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_2f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_3f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_4f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_5f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_6f	7182011	Jeff Strutzel	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_7f	7182011	Marilyn Sears	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_8f	7182011	Patricia Meccia	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_9f	7182011	Kenneth A Hartley	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_6f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_7f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_8f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_9f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_6f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_7f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_8f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_9f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_10f	7182011	Howard Towle	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_11f	7182011	Diane Schrader	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_12f	7182011	Kim Whitcombe	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_13f	7182011	Nell Holder	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_10f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_11f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_12f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_13f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_10f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_11f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_12f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_13f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_14f	7182011	Cindy Walker	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_15f	7182011	Lori Carlson	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_16f	7182011	Lee and Jim McGann	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_17f	7182011	Charles Berman	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_14f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_15f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_16f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_17f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_14f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_15f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_16f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_17f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_18f	7182011	Michael Berry	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_19f	7182011	Dotti Towle	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_20f	7182011	William Kelley	no		Palos Verdes	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_21f	7182011	Sandra Peterson	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_18f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_19f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_20f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_21f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_18f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_19f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_20f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_21f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_22f	7182011	Kaye Furlong	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_23f	7182011	Carol Holmes	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_24f	7182011	Cathleen Stain	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_25f	7182011	Richard L Seaberg	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_22f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_23f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_24f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_25f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_22f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_23f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_24f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_25f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_26f	7182011	Carol Mueller	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_27f	7182011	Carol M Seaberg	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_28f	7182011	Robert E and Marilyn S Baker	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_29f	7182011	Prim Hamilton	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_26f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_27f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_28f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_29f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_26f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_27f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_28f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_29f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_30f	7182011	Linda Calhoun	no		Rolling Hills	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_31f	7182011	Karen Schoenbaum	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_32f	7182011	Carolyn Heyn	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_33f	7182011	H Fujii	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_30f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_31f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_32f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_33f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_30f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_31f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_32f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_33f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_34f	7182011	Lee F	no		Torrance	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_35f	7182011	Laura and David Duffy	no		Redondo Beach	Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
supporters_beachcities_20110718_36f	7182011	William Scott Cameron	no			Orange	yes	Place Torrance with the Beach Cities Assem. District. All told, the 36th Cong. Dist. Should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, and Wilmington.
2riverside_20110718_1g	7142011	Bob Buster	no	Board of Supervisors, County of Riverside, Chairman		Riverside	yes	The Board of Supervisors urges the CRC to reconsider the proposal for western Riverside county and to keep it whole (as in the draft maps).
2sbernardino_20110718_1g	7182011	John Monsen	no	Citizens for the San Gabriel Mountains	Tujunga	San Bernadino	yes	Recommends that the San Gabriel Mountains be placed in the same congressional districts as the foothill and San Gabriel River watershed communities (within the 210 Freeway, I14, and I-5 borders).
3orange_20110718_1g	7142011	Ron Woodward	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Please leave La Habra in Orange county. It has little in common with Los Angeles county.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_34f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_35f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_36f	Orange	Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington.		no	no		
2riverside_20110718_1g	Riverside	Eastvale, Jurupa Valley, Norco, Riverside, Moreno Valley.		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110718_1g	San Bernadino	Rancho Cucamonga	210 Freeway, I14, I-5	no	yes	San Bernadino and Angeles National Forest have a strong history of cooperative managed for the San Gabriel Mountains.	
3orange_20110718_1g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_34f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_35f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_36f			no				
2riverside_20110718_1g			no				Board of Supervisors for Riverside County commend the CRC for a job well done.
2sbernardino_20110718_1g			no				
3orange_20110718_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_2g	7142011	Amalia Mireles	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7122011	M Patricia Deyo	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7122011	Mark McCurdy	no	Fountain Valley Council	Fountain Valley	Orange	yes	Fountain Valley should not be placed with Irvine, but rather with Huntington Beach and Costa Mesa.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange	Irvine, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa		no	yes	Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, and Costa Mesa share santitation districts, school districts, community service clubs, sports leagues, and shopping zones.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_2g	7152011	Jean Farman	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7142011	Christine Young	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7142011	Claus and Lisa Schulz	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_2g	7132011	Maria L Vega	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7142011	Robert Clark	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7182011	(signature illegible)	no		Brea	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_2g	7182011	(signature illegible)	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7182011	David (last name illegible)	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.
3orange_20110718_2g	7182011	Marie E (last name illegible)	no		La Habra	Orange	no	Strongly opposed to places La Habra in Senate and Assembly districts with Los Angeles cities. It is more closely aligned with Orange. It should be placed in the Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda district and either the DBYL or Anaheim-Fullerton Assembly district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no	La Habra does not share with Los Angeles county communities the same community idenity, history, characteristics, and relationships. It is more closely related to Orange with respect to educational institutions, transportation, and water districts.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
3orange_20110718_2g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_2g	7132011	Judy Klabouch	yes	Los Alamitos Chamber of Commerce, President	Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Los Alamitos should not be placed with Long Beach in the same congressional district.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7182011	Barbara Patton	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	Sara Chavez	no		Burbank	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	Marie E Huspeth	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_2g	Orange	Long Beach, Los Alamitos		no	yes	Los Alamito has concerns that revolve around its position as a bedroom community, while Long Beach has concerns that revolve around its urban nature. Placement with Long Beach would also weaken its ties to Cypress, Seal Beach, Stanton, Garden Grove, etc.	
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_2g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	Elizabeth Likes	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	Delora A Climaco	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	Michael Pelatt	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	Alexandra Harashevsky	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	David Halleran	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7152011	William and Suzane Gordon	no		Studio City	Los Angeles	yes	Make Studio City whole in one district (LASCV), a move which would connect it to other San Fernando Valley cities along the Ventura Blvd and 101 fwy corridors.
4langeles_20110718_1g	4272011	Peter Tucker	yes	City of Hermosa Beach, Mayor	Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Please keep the Santa Monica Bay cities together when drawing new district boundaries.
4langeles_20110718_1g	7182011	Marco Frausto	yes	International of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental, and Reinforcing Iron Workers, Business AgentPresident		Los Angeles	yes	City of Montebello should be placed in the district north of LAPRW. It is part of the San Gabriel Valley, not the Gateway Cities or Southeast cities. This follows the map proposed by the Chinese American Citizens Alliance.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Studio City	Ventura Boulevard, 101 Freeway	no	yes	Studio City has little in common with the north half of the LASCV map (Santa Clarita, Castaic, Gorman) nor with LADNT (downtown and southern communities). It has the most in common with cities running along the 101 freeway corridor and the Santa Monica Mt	
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Hermosa Beach,	Santa Monica Bay	no	yes	The Santa Monica Bay cities share common goals, lifestyles, living standards, use of a common transportation system, and a concern for the Bay as an economic, cultural, and environmental resource.	
4langeles_20110718_1g	Los Angeles	Montebello	San Gabriel Valley	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				
4langeles_20110718_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_2g	7182011	Christine Vinquist	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Collected a petition of 371 signatures that are in favor of keeping Westchester and Play del Rey together and included with the Beach Cities.
4langeles_20110718_3g	7182011	David Zelaskowski	no		Valley Village (Los Angeles)	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village. The boundary should be the 170 freeway.
4langeles_20110718_3g	7182011	John Welborne, Jane Usher, Liz Fuller, Jack Humpreville, Owen Smith, Wendy Savage, Cindy Chvatal-Keane, John Gresham	no	Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council	Greater Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Return Greater Wilshire to the LA district for Board of Equalization. Greater Wilshire belongs with WLADT for congressional districts -boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave. Do not divide Greater Wilshire for assem dist.
4langeles_20110718_3g	7182011	Yoseph Kiros	no		Shadow Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110718_3g	7182011	Marianne Tyler	no		Playa del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Place Playa del Rey and Westchester (in their entirety) together within State Senate and Congressional district maps. The first draft map versions were correct. Retain the second visualization for the Assembly district map.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_2g	Los Angeles	Beach Cities, Westchester, Playa del Rey		no	yes	Westchester and Playa del Rey have common concerns regarding environmental coastal concerns, common traffic thoroughfares.	
4langeles_20110718_3g	Los Angeles	Valley Village		yes	no		
4langeles_20110718_3g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square)	Western Avenue	yes	yes	Required to keep Hancock Park, Windsor Square, and Greater Wilshire together because it forms a community of interest under the law.	
4langeles_20110718_3g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_3g	Los Angeles	Playa del Rey, Westchester, Los Angeles		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_2g			no				
4langeles_20110718_3g			no				
4langeles_20110718_3g			no				
4langeles_20110718_3g			no				
4langeles_20110718_3g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_3g	7182011	Richard Byrd	yes	KRST Unity Center of Afrakan Spiritual Science	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	no	
5ventura_20110718_1g	7142011	Laura Behjan	yes	City of Simi Valley, Assistant City Manager	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Testimony of Mayor Bob Huber for the CRC. Requests Simi Valley not be placed with Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita, but instead with Moorpark in the East Ventura County district.
6stanislaus_20110718_1g	7182011	Teresa Guerrero	no		Ceres	Stanislaus	yes	Supports the draft maps for Stanislaus county.
6stanislaus_20110718_1g	7182011	Alicia Salcedo	no			Stanislaus	yes	Supports the MERCED map for Stanislaus county.
6stanislaus_20110718_1g	7182011	Tony and Rebecca Carr	no		Ceres	Stanislaus	yes	Supports the inclusion of Ceres with Southern Modesto. Supports the MERCED maps.
8sonoma_20110718_1g	7122011	Ernesto Olivares	yes	City of Santa Rosa, Mayor	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Urges the CRC to reconsider the proposed district boundaries identified in the first draft maps to take into consideration the connections of Santa Rosa to Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino, and Marin.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_3g				no	yes	Honor the community of interest composed of the KRST Unity Community. The area in which this community is located has unique issues relating to employment opportunities, mental and physical health care services, social services, child care, etc.	
5ventura_20110718_1g	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
6stanislaus_20110718_1g	Stanislaus			no	no		
6stanislaus_20110718_1g	Stanislaus			no	no		
6stanislaus_20110718_1g	Stanislaus	Ceres, Southern Modesto		no	no		
8sonoma_20110718_1g	Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino, Marin	Santa Rosa		no	yes	Santa Rosa shares a North Bay community of interest with Sonoma, Napa, Marin, and Mendocino counties.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_3g			no				Provide an opportunity for African Americans to elect candidates of their choice.
5ventura_20110718_1g			no				
6stanislaus_20110718_1g			no				
6stanislaus_20110718_1g			no				
6stanislaus_20110718_1g			no				
8sonoma_20110718_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110718_1g	7132011	Phil Serna	yes	County of Sacramento, Board of Supervirors, Supervisor for District 1	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Objects to placing the Sacramento airport outside of the district to which Sacramento downtown belongs.The airport does not have any connection to Glenn County, and Sacramento will lose the federal resources required to develop the airport.
9yolo_20110718_1g	7132011	Artemio Pimental	yes	City of Woodland, Mayor	Woodland	Yolo	yes	Opposes the redistricting of Yolo into 9 different jurisdictions.
general_20110718_1g	7182011	Wil C Wade	no				yes	Adopt the mapschanges recommended by AARC, CAPAFR, and MALDEF.
general_20110718_1g	7182011	unsigned	no				no	
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Don Schroeder	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	duplicate of comment 51a	no				no	
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Mark Indig	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Michael J Griffiths	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110718_1g	Sacramento	Sacramento	Sacramento Airport	no	no		
9yolo_20110718_1g	Yolo	Woodland		no	yes	Yolo county is a community of interest. It shares a commitment to diversity, open space, agriculture, slow growth policies, and habitat preservation.	
general_20110718_1g				no	no		
general_20110718_1g				no	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g				no	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110718_1g			no				
9yolo_20110718_1g			no				
general_20110718_1g			no				Adopting the maps proposed by the AARC, CAPAFR, and MALDEF organizations will protect African American, Latino, and Asian voters.
general_20110718_1g			no				Please reconsider the use of the term Black Americans.
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Richard J Caruso	no		SunlandShadow Hills	Los Angeles	no	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Scott Salmon	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Debbie Salmon	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Laurel Salmon	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Michael Gregory	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Suzanne Lewis	yes	Neighborhood Council Valley Village, Elected Board Member	Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	William L Hill	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Marlene A Hill	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Margaret A Hicks	no		Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Include Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank in the same district. They should not be with the mid-Valley flatland area.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	(signature illegible)	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose redistricting Valley Village into two separate areas. Move the boundary line to the 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Joseph Hart	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Los Angeles (Valley Village)	170 Freeway	yes	no		
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Juan Zermeno	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Nancy Castellanos	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Leo Gomez	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Joe Forge	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Jennifer Gomez	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Doris Felix	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Bryan Davis	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Viki Ornelas	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Linda Wilson	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Reginald Hughes	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Tresalyn King	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Al Austin	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Anna Soto	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
4langeles_20110719_1g	7192011	Floyd Livingston	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support the visualizations that place all of North Long Beach into the same CongressionalSentate districts as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton. Do not divide it into three Assem. Districts, as North Long Beach is everything north of Del Amo Blvd.
2riverside_20110720_1g	7202011	Georgia Branco	no		Sun City	Riverside	yes	Do not place Temecula with San Diego County. It should be in Southwest Riverside County. Corona should be placed with Northwest Riverside County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
4langeles_20110719_1g	Los Angeles	Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton	Del Amo Boulevard	no	yes	Placing North Long Beach with Carson, Rancho Dominguez, and Compton will unify African Americas, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and El Camino College, Compton Center communities and historic Dominguez Rancho.	
2riverside_20110720_1g	Riverside, San Diego	Temecula, Corona		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
4langeles_20110719_1g			no				
2riverside_20110720_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110720_2g	7202011	Henry J and Connie Coviello	no		Temecula	Riverside	yes	Temecula should be included in the Perris Congressional district in Southwest Riverside County. Remove and add Corona to the Northwestern Riverside Congressional District. Do not place it in San Diego, but keep it with its sister city of Murrieta.
2sbernardino_20110720_1g	7202011	Alan Swarm	no		Redlands	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split Redlands down the middle.
2sbernardino_20110720_2g	7202011	Steven Mrochek	no		Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernadino	yes	Concerned that the northwest portion of Rancho Cucamonga is placed with Los Angeles county cities.
2sbernardino_20110720_3g	7202011	Joanne Genis	no		Chino Hills	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split Chino Hills.
2sbernardino_20110720_4g	7202011	Viola Spagnolo	no		Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split Rancho Cucamonga.
2sbernardino_20110720_5g	7202011	Carol Rubb	no			San Bernadino	yes	Wrightwood should be placed with Victorville, Lancaster, and Palmdale - not Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernadino, Loma Linda, and Redlands.
2sbernardino_20110720_6g	7202011	James Vita	no		Chino Hills	San Bernadino	yes	Do not split Chino Hills. It should be placed with Orange County districts.
2sbernardino_20110720_7g	7202011	Lars Oldewage	no				no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110720_2g	Riverside, San Diego	Temecula, Corona, Murrieta		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_1g	San Bernadino	Redlands		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_2g	San Bernadino, Los Angeles	Rancho Cucamonga		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_3g	San Bernadino	Chino Hills		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_4g	San Bernadino	Rancho Cucamonga		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_5g	San Bernadino	Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernadino, Loma Linda, Redlands, Victorville, Lancaster, Palmdale		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_6g	San Bernadino, Orange	Chino Hills		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_7g				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110720_2g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_1g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_2g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_3g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_4g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_5g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_6g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_7g			no				Believes that the comments which contain the word supporter in its name are indicative of the corruption of the CRC by unions, politicians, and political correctness as the comment is often critical and NOT supportive.

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2sbernardino_20110720_8g	7202011	Dan Whalen	no			San Bernadino	yes	Do not split the desert community into two halves, as it is a small community and the representative will pay little attention to such a small community.
2sbernardino_20110720_9g	7202011	Seth Strongin	no		Tarzana	San Bernadino	yes	Urges the CRC to add the San Gabriel Mountains north of Rancho Cucamonga to the San Bernadino Congressional District and to reflect this change in the visualizations. The district lines should be LA county, I15, Rancho Cucamonganational forest boundary.
2sbernardino_20110720_10g	7202011	Richard Grubbs	no		Lake Arrowhead	San Bernadino	no	
5ventura_20110720_1g	7202011	Ronnetta Lawton	no			Ventura	yes	Do not redistrict Simi Valley into LA County.
5ventura_20110720_2g	7202011	Richard L Wilson	no			Ventura	yes	Do not move Simi Valley and Moorpark out of the Ventura Congressional District and into a new district comprised of Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley.q
5ventura_20110720_3g	7202011	Leigh Nixon	yes	City of Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce, President and CEO	Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not move Simi Valley out of the Ventura county district and into the Santa Clarita-Antelope Valley district.
5ventura_20110720_4g	7202011	Helen Conly	no			Ventura	yes	Allow Oxnard to stay as a whole district as demonstrated in the second draft maps.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2sbernardino_20110720_8g	San Bernadino			no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_9g	San Bernadino	Rancho Cucamonga	I15, San Gabriel Mountains	no	no		
2sbernardino_20110720_10g				no	no		
5ventura_20110720_1g	Los Angeles, Ventura	Simi Valley		no	no		
5ventura_20110720_2g	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	no		
5ventura_20110720_3g	Ventura	Simi Valley		no	yes	Simi Valley and Ventura County share city governments, transportation, judicial systems, county schools, social services, and economic development initiatives.	
5ventura_20110720_4g	Ventura	Oxnard		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2sbernardino_20110720_8g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_9g			no				
2sbernardino_20110720_10g			no				All districts should have commonalities within their boundaries. This will ensure equal and excellent representation.
5ventura_20110720_1g			no				
5ventura_20110720_2g			no				
5ventura_20110720_3g			no				
5ventura_20110720_4g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
6merced_20110720_1g	7202011	Mike Lynch	no		Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Turlock belongs with Merced or Stanislaus County, not with its current configuration with Death Valley.
6mono_20110720_1g	7212011	Carol Robb	no			Mono	yes	It does not make sense to put everything north of Mammoth with the cities on the eastern and western slopes of the Sierras. It make more sense to allow the district to follow the 395 freeway up to Alpine county.
6tulare_20110720_1g	7202011	Kathryn Black	no			Tulare	yes	Tulare county is oddly divided within the current maps. It is not logical to ignore the San Joaquin Valley and to not consider a separate and cohesive entity.
7monterey_20110720_1g	7202011	Phillip G Tabera	yes	Salinas Union High School District, Board of Trustees	Salinas	Monterey	yes	Request that the CRC develop a Tri-County State Senate District, which would allow the community to elect a state senator of their choice - not one chosen by Central Valley.
7scruz_20110720_1g	7202011	Melissa Whatley	yes		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Supports the Assembly and Senate lines for Santa Cruz. However, with respect to the Congressional districts, please do not split the city of Santa Cruz into two districts. There is no common sense in this move.
7scruz_20110720_2g	7202011	Rebecca J Garcia	yes	Watsonville City Redistricting Committee, Trustee of Cabrillo Community College	Watsonville	Santa Cruz	yes	Keep Watsonville and Salinas in the same senate district. It does not belong with San Luis Obispo.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
6merced_20110720_1g	Merced, Stanislaus	Turlock		no	no		
6mono_20110720_1g	Alpine, Mono		395 Freeway	no	no		
6tulare_20110720_1g	Tulare			no	no		
7monterey_20110720_1g	Monterey			no	no		
7scruz_20110720_1g	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110720_2g	Santa Cruz	Watsonville, San Luis Obispo		no	yes	Watsonville and Salinas share interests in farm labor, education, and health care. They are also represented by the same media market and local government.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
6merced_20110720_1g			no				
6mono_20110720_1g			no				
6tulare_20110720_1g			no				
7monterey_20110720_1g			no				
7scruz_20110720_1g			no				
7scruz_20110720_2g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8marin_20110720_1g	7202011	Peter Van Meter	no			Marin	yes	Rotating populations in the Assembly districts in Marin, such that Assembly district nesting in the coastal Senate district is possible, would allow Petaluma to be included in all three Marin-related districts. Please do this.
8smateo_20110720_1g	7212011	John F Quilter	no			San Mateo	no	
8sonoma_20110720_1g	7202011	J Grand	no		Petaluma	Sonoma	no	
9lake_20110720_1g	7202011	Suz-Anna Morandin	no			Lake	yes	Lake county should be kept with the north coastwine countrynorthern Coastal Range - not with Sacramento.
9lake_20110720_2g	7202011	Doreen J Del Testa	no		Loch Lomond	Lake	yes	Lake county should not be placed with the Central Valley. It should instead be placed with the North Coastwine countryNorthern Coastal Range region.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8marin_20110720_1g	Marin	Petaluma		no	no		
8smateo_20110720_1g				no	no		
8sonoma_20110720_1g				no	no		
9lake_20110720_1g	Lake, Sacramento	Sacramento		no	yes	Lake and Sacramento have little in common with respect to goals, viewpoints, residents, businesses, agriculture, etc.	
9lake_20110720_2g	Lake		Central Valley	no	yes	Lake county has recently been experiencing a boom with respect to the wine industry and deserves to be included in like-minded districts.	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8marin_20110720_1g			no				
8smateo_20110720_1g			no				The maps will not make a difference, as San Mateo is so heavily democratic that elections will never change.
8sonoma_20110720_1g			no				When drawing the lines, please make all the numbers the same for senate and assembly districts. It is difficult to remember them otherwise.
9lake_20110720_1g			no				
9lake_20110720_2g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9lake_20110720_3g	7202011	Paul Franke	no			Lake	yes	Do not split Lake county between Yuba and Napa. Clearlake has nothing in common with Lake and is a better fit with Yuba.
9lake_20110720_4g	7202011	Howard Glasser	no		Kelseyville	Lake	yes	Do not change the boundaries of Lake County. If it must be split, please do so East-West such that Kelseyville can be placed with Napa County as this is a more natural fit. It should not be tacked on to the Sacramento Valley
9lake_20110720_5g	7202011	Sherry Treppa	yes	Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake Tribe, Chairperson	Upper Lake	Lake	yes	Strongly opposed to the redistricting of Lake County. Keep it as part of the Napa-North Bay congressional district.
9lake_20110720_6g	7202011	John A Carlisi and Pally Nyberg	no		Cobb	Lake	yes	Lake county should not be placed with the Central Valley. It should instead be placed with the North Coastwine countryNorthern Coastal Range region.
9lake_20110720_7g	7202011	Donald F Macdonald	no			Lake	yes	Do not place Lake with Yolo.
9placer_20110720_1g	7152011	Laura Riedel	no			Placer	yes	Do not carve out Roseville from the rest of Placer County. It does not belong with the farming communities of northern Sacramento Valley. Redding should be included with the Sacramento Valley, while Roseville is with Southern Placer County.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9lake_20110720_3g	Lake, Yuba, Napa			no	no		
9lake_20110720_4g	Lake, Napa, Sacramento	Sacramento, Kelseyville		no	no		
9lake_20110720_5g	Lake, Napa	Upper Lake		no	no		
9lake_20110720_6g				no	yes	Lake county has recently been experiencing a boom with respect to the wine industry and deserves to be included in like-minded districts.	
9lake_20110720_7g	Lake, Yolo			no	yes	Do not place Lake with Yolo county, as Lake specializes in grape growing - not vegetable growing.	
9placer_20110720_1g	Sacramento, Placer	Redding, Roseville		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9lake_20110720_3g			no				
9lake_20110720_4g			no				
9lake_20110720_5g			no				
9lake_20110720_6g			no				
9lake_20110720_7g			no				
9placer_20110720_1g			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sjoaquin_20110720_1g	7202011	Paul O Akinjo	no		Lathrop	San Joaquin	yes	Do not place Lathrop with Stanislaus county - it should remain with Stockton Assembly district. The CRC should place Moraga Gardens and Linden with Lodi, and Tracy, Lathrop, and Stockton together.
9sjoaquin_20110720_2g	7202011	R Thomas Bacon	no			San Joaquin	yes	Do not place Bacon Island in the Pete Stark district. It has nothing to do with that side of the hills.
2riverside_20110714_3d	7132011	Dan Martinez, City Manager	yes	City of Indio	Indio	Riverside	yes	Allow Indio to remain as part of Coachella Valley in E Riverside. Indios economy is leisure-hospitality, not agriculture. Indio is Coachella Vallys center for business
2riverside_20110714_4d	7132011	Jacalyn Flax	no				yes	Impossible to get to meetings when there is insufficient notification, videos are not available in an appropriate time, so that public can let you know how they feel.
2riverside_20110714_5d	7132011	Peter Flax	no				yes	No timely notices are being issued to public, so our comments can carry weight. Provide minimum 30 days notice of each proposal.
2riverside_20110714_6d	7132011	Dennis Stratton, Retire USN	no				yes	You are not posting detailed meeting agendas so that the public can participate, nor are you putting videos up in timely fashion. Hinderance to public participation.
2riverside_20110714_7d	7132011	Anne Taylor	no				yes	Requests timely notification of specific meeting times. How can citizens participate in process when notification practices prevent it. Even meeting videos are not posted in timely fashion. Is unnaceptable

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sjoaquin_20110720_1g	San Joaquin, Stanislaus	Lathrop, Linden, Lodi, Moraga Gardens, Tracy, Stockton		no	yes		Tracy, Lathrop, and Stockton are connected economically.
9sjoaquin_20110720_2g	San Joaquin	Bacon Island		no	no		
2riverside_20110714_3d	Riverside	Indio, Coachella Valley		no	yes		tourism, leisure-hospitality
2riverside_20110714_4d				no	no		
2riverside_20110714_5d				no	no		
2riverside_20110714_6d				no	no		
2riverside_20110714_7d				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sjoaquin_20110720_1g			no				
9sjoaquin_20110720_2g			no				Bacon Island is comprised of capitalists and constitutional conservatives, and Mr. Pete Stark is a socialist.
2riverside_20110714_3d	education, public sector,		no			tourism, not agriculture	
2riverside_20110714_4d			no				
2riverside_20110714_5d			no				
2riverside_20110714_6d			no				
2riverside_20110714_7d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110714_8d	7132011	Mrs. Nancy K. Schneider	no				yes	Imperial should be included with Coachella Valley. Issues of areas are more similar than that of Temecula. Coachella Valley should remain intact.
2riverside_20110714_9d	7142011	Mary Boyce	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not split Jurupa Valley into 2 CDs and 2 counties. Put Jurupa Valley in RiversideMorenoEastvale CD. Have contracts with Riverside. Should remain in same district with Eastvale, Norco, Corona, Riverside and Moreno Valley, like earlier CD map.
2riverside_20110714_10d	7142011	Robert J. Westwood	no				yes	Visualization maps are impossible to pull up and acess, please do something.
2riverside_20110714_11d	7142011	Richard Leitz	no		San Jacinto Valley	Riverside	yes	Keep Hemet and San Jacinto together in same district, with Coachella Valley. 20 year association, similar demographics, history of agriculture
2riverside_20110714_12d	7142011	Amelia A. Hippert	no		Hemet	Riverside	yes	Retain first draft of proposed alignment of 45th CD. Would be detrimental to Hemet and San Jacinto to be represented by 2 county supervisors retirees, similar interests and concersn, homogeneous population best served by one voice. Hemet should be in CV
2riverside_20110714_13d	7142011	Bob Buster, Chairman	yes	Board of Supervisors		Riverside	yes	Keep W Riverside whole. Do not sever Eastvale, Jurupa Valley, Norco, Riverside, Moreno valley into two CDs. Do not split Jurupa Valley. Do not sever SB cities of Loma Linda, Highland, Redlands. Keep W Riverside whole

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110714_8d	Imperial	Coachella Valley, Temecula		no	yes		
2riverside_20110714_9d	Riverside, San Bernardino	Jurupa Valley, Eastvale, Norco, Corona, Riverside, Moreno Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110714_10d				no	no		
2riverside_20110714_11d		Hemet, San Jacinto, San Jacinto Valley, Coachella Valley		no	yes		history of agriculture
2riverside_20110714_12d		San Jacino, Hemet, Coachella Valley		no	yes		rich agricultural history, economic base, water resources, energy usage
2riverside_20110714_13d	Riverside, San Bernardino	Eastvale, Jurupa Valley, Norco, Riverside, Moreno Valley, Loma Linda, Highland, Redlands		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110714_8d	issues are similar		no			more similar than Temecula	
2riverside_20110714_9d	contracts with Riverside, fire, sherrif, code enforcement		no				
2riverside_20110714_10d			no				
2riverside_20110714_11d	similar demographics, 20 year association		no			any other plan would run counter to intent with which charged	
2riverside_20110714_12d	retirees, interests, concerns, housing,		no			would be devastating to dissociate	
2riverside_20110714_13d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110714_1d	7142011	Judy Klabouch, President	yes	Los Alamitos Chamber of Commerce	Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Do not place Los Alamitos in CD that inlcudes Long Beach. Suburban bedroom community, not large urban city with urban problems. Los Alamitos should be with cypress, Seal Beach, stanton, Garden Ggrove, La Palma, in businesses and associations. Keep COI.
3orange_20110714_2d	7142011	Keneth Stephens, Mayor	yes	City of Los Alamitos	Los Alamitos	Orange	yes	Putting Los Alamitos into coastal AD SD, CD with Long Beach would disenfranchise voters. Putting with Huntington Beach, Newport Beach, Costa Mesa would pull city away from COI katella corridor, development, JFTB. Do not place in CD with Long Beach
3orange_20110714_3d	7142011	Steven S. Choi, Ph.D, Councilmember	yes	Irvine	Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine is S Orange inland city with little in common with N Orange and Huntington Beach. Share COI with Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Laguna Hills, El Toro. Share opposition to airport. Supports map submitted by Shawn Dewane which puts Irvine back with S
3orange_20110714_4d	7142011	Benny Diaz, State Director	yes	CA LULAC	Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Keep Santa Ana and East of Garden Grove all the way up to Brookhurst together
3orange_20110714_5d	7142011	Kathy B Jew	no		Brea	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra in Orange County SD and AD, not LA county will no longer have representation in public affairs. Put in district with other North Orange County communities
3orange_20110714_6d	7142011	Janis Robinson, Architect	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habra should be with other OC cities in any redistricting plan. Putting with LA is inappropriate as city is seperated from cities to the North by a hillside terrain.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110714_1d	Orange	Los Alamitos, Long Beach, Seal Beach, Cypress, Stanton, Garden Grove, La Palma		no	yes		business retention programs, Chamber of Commerce
3orange_20110714_2d	Orange	Long Beach, Los Alamitos		no	yes		JFTB, water and wastewater concerns,
3orange_20110714_3d	Orange	Irvine, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Laguna Hills, El Toro, Huntington Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_4d		Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Brookhurst		no	no		
3orange_20110714_5d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_6d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110714_1d			no			small suburban city vs urbban problems, would split up COI	
3orange_20110714_2d	smart corridors,		no			Long beach would not care about small city concerns,	
3orange_20110714_3d	share opposition to airport, traditional COI		no				
3orange_20110714_4d			no				
3orange_20110714_5d	local vision, goals, objective		no			not part of LA county	
3orange_20110714_6d			no			seperated by hillside terrain	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110714_7d	7142011	Peter Douglas	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra in Orange County
3orange_20110714_8d	7142011	Barbara Priestley	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habra should be placed in district with other OC cities, putting with LA is unacceptabble
3orange_20110714_9d	7142011	Sped1944	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra in Orange County only. Moved from LA 40 years ago because taxes and insuurance were cheaper. Do not need an increase in them
3orange_20110714_10d	7142011		no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habra is Orange County, look at the map.
3orange_20110714_11d	7142011	Karlene Ellis	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra, Orange County into L.A. County districts. Pay taxes in OC, send kids to school in OC, donot want to vote for representatives in L.A county
3orange_20110714_12d	7142011	Glenn Hayes, President and CEO	yes	Neighborhood Housing Services of Orange County		Orange	yes	Do not ignore June 18th input of Santa Ana and Anaheim for CDs. There is longstanding COI between Santa Ana and Anaheim flatlands. If new maps are adopted it will dilute the voice of these communities.
3orange_20110714_13d	7142011	Alma Varela	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Oppose placing La Habra in LA county district different needs. Should be placed with other OC cities. Experiencing same difficulty in Lakewood. Placing with other cities with no similarities puts Lakewood at a disadvantage.
3orange_20110714_14d	7142011	Michael Mastuda	yes	OCAPICA		Orange	yes	Do not split Santa Ana from Anaheim. Communities have much in common, ethnically, socio-economically, education, jobs, urban hubs.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110714_7d	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110714_8d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110714_9d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110714_10d	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110714_11d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		taxes
3orange_20110714_12d	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_13d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra, Lakewood		no	no		
3orange_20110714_14d	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim		no	yes	ethnically, immigrant communities	socio-economics, types of jobs

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110714_7d			no				
3orange_20110714_8d			no				
3orange_20110714_9d			no			do not need tax increase	
3orange_20110714_10d			no				
3orange_20110714_11d	schools, representatives		no			do not want to vote for representatives in LA	
3orange_20110714_12d	historica area, longstanding COI		no			dilute voice of these communities	
3orange_20110714_13d			no			have different needs, puts at a disadvantage	
3orange_20110714_14d	urban hubs, gateway communities, education levels		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110714_15d	7142011	Michele Martinez, Council Member	yes	Santa Ana	Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Keep Santa Ana and Anaheim flatlands COI together. Supports Dewane Map which keeps Santa Ana with W and Central Anaheim, keeps Huntington Beach and Costa Mesa with Westminster and Garden Grove, Irvine with South County. Add newport Beach to coast.
3orange_20110714_16d	7142011	Christina Ciccarelli	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not district La Habra to LA county, keep with Orange. Would be terrible for families
3orange_20110714_17d	7142011	Amber Gould	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra with LA. Should not be in different district schools, housing authority, services received. Put back in OC.
3orange_20110714_18d	7142011	Ross Gould	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra with LA. Should not be in different district schools, housing authority, services received. Put back in OC.
3orange_20110714_19d	7142011	Gloria and John Bent	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Oppose excluding La Habra from Orange County. Pay taxes and do business in Orange county, want to be represented by legislators who work for our city, not LA
3orange_20110714_20d	7142011	Deby Eddy	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habras voice will be diluted if placed in SD with LA county cities. Negative impact on schools and children.
3orange_20110714_21d	7142011	Jason Park	no				yes	Irvine, Newport Beach and Laguna Beach must be kept together in single CD. Keep Asian population together, should be made more competative so as not to be republican dominated

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110714_15d	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Westminster, Irvine		no	yes	Latino District	
3orange_20110714_16d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110714_17d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_18d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_19d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		taxes, do business,
3orange_20110714_20d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110714_21d		Irvine, Newport Beach, Laguna Beach		no	yes	asian poulation	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110714_15d			no				supports dewane map
3orange_20110714_16d			no				
3orange_20110714_17d	schools, housing, interests, services, location, politics		no			should not be in another district than OC	
3orange_20110714_18d	schools, housing, interests, services, location, politics		no			should not be in another district than OC	
3orange_20110714_19d			no			not LA county	
3orange_20110714_20d			no			will impact schools and children, voice will be diluted	
3orange_20110714_21d	kept competitive,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110714_22d	7142011	Carolyn Cavecche, Mayor	yes	City of Orange	Orange	Orange	yes	Orange should not be partnerred with Santa ana in CD, are not like communities Orange is not dense urban environment. Align with Tustin and Anaheim Hills in housing stock, transport, pubblic safety. If you must use Orange to bridge communities, use 57.
3orange_20110714_23d	7142011	Patricia Burnes	no		Villa Park	Orange	yes	Do not include Orange and Villa Park with Santa Ana. Old town, college community, equestrian, shares trails and activities with Tustin, Anaheim, Anaheim Hils. Santa Ana is urban with distinct interests
3orange_20110714_24d	7142011	Patricia Burnes	no				yes	Do not include city of Orange with Santa Ana
3orange_20110714_25d	7142011	Patricia Burnes	no				yes	Do not inlcude OrangeVilla Park with Santa Ana. One is densely populated the other is collegeequestrian community more in common with Tustin, Anaheim, Yorba Linda
3orange_20110714_26d	7142011	Amos Cook	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra with Los Angeles district, keep in OC where we belong
3orange_20110714_27d	7142011	Nellie Caudillo Kaniski, Executive Director	yes	MANA de Orange County		Orange	yes	Pair Santa Ana with Anaheim flatlands COI in same CD historical connection. Pair SNANA and ANAFL AD s within SD that encompasses Santa Ana, Anaheim, Fullerton, Buena Park, Stanton
3orange_20110714_28d	7142011		no				yes	Leave La Habra alone, keep with Orange County, not LA County. Leave well enough alone, has always been with OC.
3orange_20110714_29d	7142011	Julie Valenzuela	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Object to redistricting of La Habra into LA county district. Should stay with Orange County to continue to have a voice on important issues

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110714_22d	Orange	Orange, Santa Ana, Anaheim Hills, Tustin	57 fwy	no	yes		housing stock
3orange_20110714_23d	Orange	Orange, Villa Park, Santa Ana, Tustin, Anaheim Hills, Anaheim		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_24d		Orange, Santa Ana		no	no		
3orange_20110714_25d		Orange, Villa Park, Santa Ana, Tustin, Anaheim Hills, Yorba Linda		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_26d	Los Angeles, Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110714_27d	Orange	Anaheim, Santa Ana, Fullerton, Buena Park, Stanton		no	yes	historical connection	
3orange_20110714_28d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_29d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110714_22d	small town, historic community, transportation issues, public safety concerns		no			not densely populated urban environment	
3orange_20110714_23d	old town, college, equestrian, schools		no			distincgt interests	
3orange_20110714_24d			no				
3orange_20110714_25d	college, equestrian, schools		no			two distinct communities	
3orange_20110714_26d			no				
3orange_20110714_27d	similar communities, school districts		no			avoid pairing dissimilar communities	
3orange_20110714_28d	has always been with OC		no				CRC is crazy
3orange_20110714_29d	voice on issues		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110714_30d	7142011	Alejandro E. Catalan	no		Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Do not tear Garden Grove from Santa Ana and Anaheim and place with Little Saigon and other S Orange Cities. Keep COI of East Garden Grove, Santa Ana and Anaheim together. Option 3 is better than 2.
3orange_20110714_31d	7142011	Ana Nogales	yes	Casa de la Familia	Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Create CD that connects Santa Ana to Anaheim, do not exclude key working class imigrant areas of Santa and and include Villa Park and Orange Hills, which have nothing to do with Santa AnaFlatlands Anaheim COI.
3orange_20110714_32d	7142011	Linda C. Di Massa	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not join La Habra with LA county legislation. Try other alternatives such as Fullerton Yorba Linda legislation. Schools, utilities, community atmosphere in Orange is superior to anything in LA county
3orange_20110714_33d	7142011	Chirag Gunvantbhai Bhakta	no		Anaheim	Orange	yes	Do not split Santa Ana from Anaheim into two different districts. Needs to be connected to Anaheim, esp. flatlands, with bridge through E Garden Grove. Anaheim, Santa Ana, E Garden grove are COI education outcomes, gang-prevention, bankruptcy, etc.
3orange_20110714_34d	7142011	Amalia Mireles	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Is unacceptable to place La Habra in SD and AD with LA county cities. Needs representation from area, issues such as education, transport, water, envrioment protection, public safety. Put La Habra in Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda or Anaheim Fullerton AD
3orange_20110714_35d	7142011	Robert Dale	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Put all of La Habra in OC district. Splitting with LA County district is not a good idea

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110714_30d	Orange	Garden Grove, Santa Ana, Anaheim, Little Saigon		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_31d	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim ,Villa Park, Orange Hills,		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_32d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_33d	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim, Garden Grove,		no	yes	cultural	bakruptcy and forclosure statistics, pverty rates
3orange_20110714_34d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_35d	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110714_30d			no				
3orange_20110714_31d	population equality needs		no			Nothing to do with Santa Ana, Flatlands Anaheim COI	
3orange_20110714_32d	schools, utilities, community atmosphere		no				
3orange_20110714_33d	education outcomes, gang-prevention, English language learners		no			would disenfranchise and tear down progress	
3orange_20110714_34d	education, transport, water, environmental protection, public safety		no			unacceptable to be with LA	
3orange_20110714_35d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110714_36d	7142011	Mary Anne Foo, Executive Director	yes	OCAPICA		Orange	yes	Keep North Orange County COI together in AD Fullerton, Brea, Buena Park, Cypress, La Palma, Cerritos, Artesia. Put Little Saigon with parts of W Anaheim in AD. Look at CAPAFR-MALDEF-AARC unity map. Do not split city of Irvine in AD and CD
3orange_20110714_37d	7142011	Claudio W. Gallegos	no				yes	Create CD that connects Santa Ana to Anaheim, do not exclude key working class imigrant areas of Santa and and include Villa Park and Orange Hills, which have nothing to do with Santa AnaFlatlands Anaheim COI. Attached map
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Joseph A. Vinatieri, Councilmember	yes	City of Whittier	Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Do not delete La Habra from SE LA CountyNW Orange and WhittierPuente Hills COI, do not add La Puente which is not connected. Put La Habra and Hacienda Heights back in SD to keep together COI, also in CD.
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	John McKenna	no				yes	Keep all of Long Beach in one district. Do not put with parts of OC for representation, would be nightmare, different people and political climate. Long beach has funding from Port, which OC does not. City servics are handled differently.
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Jose Miranda	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110714_36d	Orange	Irvine, Little Saigon, Fullerton, Brea, Buena Park, Cypress, La Palma, Cerritos, Artesia		no	yes		
3orange_20110714_37d	Orange	Santa Ana, Anaheim ,Villa Park, Orange Hills,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_1d	Orange	La Habra, Whittier La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, La Mirada		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_1d	Orange, Los Angeles	Long Beach, Port of Long Beach		no	yes		oil revenue
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110714_36d	Little Saigon, unified representation, low crime rates, education		no				
3orange_20110714_37d	population equality needs		no			Nothing to do with Santa Ana, Flatlands Anaheim COI	
4langeles_20110714_1d	core COI		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	city services		no			different services, needs priorities from suburban OC	
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Darlene Bloom	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Bryan Spragg	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Wayne Chaney	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Teresa Collins	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Alexis Cooper	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Roscoe Harvey	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Mary Harvey	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Erika Hill	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Christine Buckley	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Deliana Speights	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Kari Faithful	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Kakia Nichols	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Shante Skillern	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Malachi Neal	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Erika Neal	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Katonia Neal	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Stephen Neal	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_1d	7142011	Esmeralda Flanagan	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Supports visualizations that place all N Long Beach in same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton. Do not Divide N Long Beach into 3 Ads. Placea all into same AD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton; COI African Americans, Latinos, etc
4langeles_20110714_2d	7142011	Janet Vaughan	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Live in Wiseburn, does not approve new redistricting. Does all business in South Bay, including doctor, shopping, car repair. Put in South Bay area
4langeles_20110714_3d	7142011	Rhea Pollastrini	yes	SEandPA, NGAS	Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne and Wiseburne, Del-Aire have strong ties to South Bay Beach cities, and should be kept in same CD aerospace industry, shopping, home, work, pleasure. No affiliation with area East of 405 fwy.
4langeles_20110714_4d	7142011	Bill Shultz	no				yes	No redistricting for city of Hawthorne
4langeles_20110714_5d	7142011	Shavoda Webber-Christmas, MPH	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Include City of Hawthone in Beach CitiesSouth Bay legislative district to align with social, political and health needs of COI for data collection, planning areas, lifestyle, school districts, shopping, entertainment.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_1d		Carson, Long Beach, Rancho Dominguez, Compton		no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU
4langeles_20110714_2d		Wiseburn		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_3d		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire, El Segundo, South Bay Beach Cities	405 fwy	no	yes		aerospace industry,
4langeles_20110714_4d		Hawthorne		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_5d		Hawthorne, Beach Cities, South Bay		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_1d	Dominguez Hills, El Camino College, representation		no				
4langeles_20110714_2d	doctor, shopping, car repair		no				
4langeles_20110714_3d	shopping, home, work, pleasure		no			no COI with areas east of 405	
4langeles_20110714_4d			no				
4langeles_20110714_5d	lifestyle, work, school district, shopping, entertainment, parks		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_6d	7142011	Lynne Shapiro	no		Marina del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Monica Bay COI or group Marina del Rey and Venice with Inglewood disparate interests. Keep Santa Monica, Venice, Marina del Rey together; have recreation, tourism, urban run-off, fragile ecosystems, water quality, recreation interests
4langeles_20110714_7d	7142011	Rabbi Deborah Goldmann	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not exclude Hawthone from South Bay or Beach cities. Works, shops, participates with Torrance, Redondo Beach, Manahattan Beach.
4langeles_20110714_8d	7142011	Lorena Lori Rico	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not make Hawthone, Del Aire part of South Central LA. We are on W side of 405 fwy and are closter to beach cites, rarely go on east side of it. Kids go to El Segundo school, shop and work in Manhattan Beach and Redondo Beach
4langeles_20110714_9d	7142011	Joan and Randy Zisler	no		Marina del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Venice and MDR in coastal zone, are towns on water. What is happening in California politics?
4langeles_20110714_10d	7142011	Nathalia A. Jimenez	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Wiseburn with El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hawthorne in one contiguous CD live, shop, restaurants, movies together.
4langeles_20110714_11d	7142011	Mrs Harley Hoff	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Wiseburn with El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hawthorne in one contiguous CD live, shop, restaurants, movies together.
4langeles_20110714_12d	7142011	Maria Flores Acosta	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Put Wiseburn in district that includes rest of South Bay areas and cities grocery stores, shoppin mall, doctors, classes, activities. Keep in same district to have voice in CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_6d		Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey, Inglewood		no	yes		tourism, real estate
4langeles_20110714_7d		Hawthorne, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach		no	yes		shopping, work
4langeles_20110714_8d	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Del Aire, LA, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach	405 fwy	no	yes		shopping, work,
4langeles_20110714_9d		Venice, Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_10d		Wiseburn, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hawthorne		no	yes		shopping
4langeles_20110714_11d		Wiseburn, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hawthorne		no	yes		shopping
4langeles_20110714_12d		Wiseburn, South Bay		no	yes		shopping, activities

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_6d	recreation, tourism, run-off, ecosystems, water		no			do not want to be swallowed up by urban district of Inglewood	
4langeles_20110714_7d	colleges, temples, groups		no				
4langeles_20110714_8d	schools,		no			putting with LA would not be wise	
4langeles_20110714_9d	coastal towns on water		no				duh
4langeles_20110714_10d	live, restaurants, movies		no				
4langeles_20110714_11d	live, restaurants, movies		no				
4langeles_20110714_12d	adult school, stores, families		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_13d	7142011	Jo Craycraft	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Include Wiseburn area of Hawthorne with south bay District for schools, work, doctors
4langeles_20110714_14d	7142011	Beverly Sanford	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester in 35th CD, not Beach cities 36th where there is nothing in common. LA Intl airport is employment for Westchester, same Markets, dept stores, restaruants, worship, parks. Have COI with Inglewood.
4langeles_20110714_15d	7142011	Michael DeLeeuw	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	S Pasadena has nothing in common with Diamond Bar and Chino Hills. Put Pasadena, all of Burbank and Glendale in one CD, put little towns of E San Gabriel Valley together in another district. Also hard to figure out boundaries from puny maps.
4langeles_20110714_16d	7142011	Christopher G. Richert	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be in same district as South Bay Beach Cities, great deal in common economically, socially, geographically. Do not put with East LA cities
4langeles_20110714_17d	7142011	Regina Clark	no		Sunland-Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Put Sunland-Tujunga together with La Crescenta, La Canada, and other foothills communities much in common. Do not have much in common with SFV to the west
4langeles_20110714_18d	7142011	John Stammreich, Board Member	yes	NW San Pedro Neighborhood Council	San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Thaank you for July 9th visualizations for LA that put 3 neighborhood council districs of San Pedro together. Important to have unified representation

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_13d		Wiseburn, Hawthorne, South Bay		no	yes		shopping
4langeles_20110714_14d		Westchester, Beach Cities, Inglewood		no	yes		Los Angeles International Airport
4langeles_20110714_15d		Pasadena, Diamond Bar, Chino Hills, Glendale, Burbank, San Gabriel Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_16d		Hawthorne, Beach Cities		no	yes	socially	economically
4langeles_20110714_17d		Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada, San Fernando Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_18d	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, San Pedro		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_13d	doctors, schools, movies		no				
4langeles_20110714_14d	employment, markets, stores, restaurants, worship, parks		no			not much in common with Beach Cities	
4langeles_20110714_15d			no			nothing in common with Diamond Bar, Chino Hills	
4langeles_20110714_16d	geographically		no			nothing in common with Compton, East LA, South LA	
4langeles_20110714_17d	much in common, needs and concerns		no			not much in common with SFV	
4langeles_20110714_18d	unified represenatation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_19d	7142011	Rachel Johnson	no		Gardena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep lines re Gardena the way they are. Will lose valuable voices if grouped with cities that do not share interests, commonalities, demographics. Keep Gardena in current district.
4langeles_20110714_20d	7142011	Michele Hunt	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Palmdale and Lancaster together in High Desert. Sylmar and Palmdale are vastly different lifestyle and business practice. If proposal went through it would be devastating.
4langeles_20110714_21d	7142011	Susan Gardener	no		HawthorneDel Aire	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire in same CD with South Bay Beach Cities, have long time vital community relationships schools, businesses, shopping, eating, movies
4langeles_20110714_22d	7142011	Mark Zakrzewski	no		WiseburnHawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Include Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del aire in same district as rest of South Bay. Many things in common education, safe neighborhoods, employment homogeny, aerospace industry. Seperating would be severe mistake
4langeles_20110714_23d	7142011	Tiffany Wilson, Realtor	no				yes	Hawthorne, Wiseburn and Del Aire should be in South Bay cities district. Huge portion of residents conduct business and are employed in cities of South Bay, school districts, extracurricular activities, restarurants.
4langeles_20110714_24d	7142011	Nicholas Williams	no		WiseburnHawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not lump Hawthorne in CD with West Athens, Westmont, View Park-Windsor Hills where there is no connection. Personal, proffessional, medical ties to South Bay community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_19d		Gardena		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_20d		Palmdale, Lancaster, Sylmar		no	yes		hard hit by economy
4langeles_20110714_21d		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire, South Bay		no	yes		businesses
4langeles_20110714_22d		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire, South Bay		no	yes		employment homogeny, aerospace industry
4langeles_20110714_23d		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire, South Bay		no	yes		business
4langeles_20110714_24d		Hawthone, West Athens, Westmont, View Park-Windsor Hills,		no	yes		jobs

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_19d			no			will lose valuable voices if not grouped with similar interests	
4langeles_20110714_20d	High Desert		no			Sylmar, Palmdale vastly different	
4langeles_20110714_21d	shopping, eating, movies, strong ties		no				
4langeles_20110714_22d	educational institutions, neighborhoods		no				
4langeles_20110714_23d	school district, beaches, restaurants,		no				
4langeles_20110714_24d	parks, shopping, churches, restaurants, beaches		no			nothing in comon with other areas	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_25d	7142011	Diane R Cortina	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Wiseburn is part of Beach Cities CD, not West Athens, Westmont, View Park, Windsor Hills, Willowbrook. Shopping, hospitals, doctors, malls. Census should ask about primarly language spoken in home.
4langeles_20110714_26d	7142011	Susan Andriacchi, Controller	yes	Wiseburn School District	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Would be mistake to exclude Hawthorne from South Bay district, COI connections are shopping, work, schools
4langeles_20110714_27d	7142011	Karmen Mastin, CRS	yes	Big Valley Real Estate	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Palmdale and Lancaster or separate from Santa Clara, residents businesses and local economy are intrinsically connected. Keep SD as in first draft. Keep N LA County and High Desert neighbors together.
4langeles_20110714_28d	7142011	Gregory Laushine	no				yes	Re CA 36 CD Keep South Bay together as one district from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula, using straight lines
4langeles_20110714_29d	7142011	Janeth Angel	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Wiseburn with South Bay district, not with communities further east schools, churuches, hospital, grocery store, deep connection.
4langeles_20110714_30d	7142011	Carole Ness	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep WiseburnHawthorne with South Bay area due to close economic interaction.
4langeles_20110714_31d	7142011	Robert M. Ferrol	no		Marina del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Marina del Rey is part of Beach Community and Inglewood is not.
4langeles_20110714_32d	7142011	Marcia B Nuckolls	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Do not place portion of Antelope Valley with Sylmar and San Fernando. Are N LA county, part of High desert, wish to remain as such.
4langeles_20110714_33d	7142011		no				yes	Please keep Palmdale, Lancaster together, no changes please

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_25d		Beach Cities, Wiseburn, Hawthorne, West Athens, Westmont, View Park, Windsor Hills, Willowbrook		no	yes		work
4langeles_20110714_26d		Hawthorne, South Bay, Wiseburn		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_27d	Los Angeles	Palmdale, Lancaster		no	yes		businesses, local economy
4langeles_20110714_28d		South Bay, Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes Peninsula		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_29d		Wiseburn, South Bay, Hawthorene, Delaire		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_30d		Wiseburn, South Bay, Hawthorne		no	yes		close economic interaction
4langeles_20110714_31d		Marina Del Rey, Inglewood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_32d	Los Angeles	Palmdale, Antelope Valley, Sylmar, San Fernand		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_33d		Palmdale, Lancaster		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_25d	doctors, hospitals, shopping, malls		no			never heard of other areas.	
4langeles_20110714_26d	shopping, dining, schools		no				
4langeles_20110714_27d	residents, High Desert		no				
4langeles_20110714_28d			no				
4langeles_20110714_29d	schools, churches, hospitals, stores		no			no connection with further east communities	
4langeles_20110714_30d			no				
4langeles_20110714_31d	Beach community		no			Inglewood is not Beach Community	
4langeles_20110714_32d	High desert community		no			make no sense at all	
4langeles_20110714_33d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_34d	7142011	Shauna Lynn	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Lancaster and Palmdale, or place bulk of pop in SD with Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima. Makes no sense, affects ability to elect Antelope Valley resident to senate
4langeles_20110714_35d	7142011	Cecilia Santamaria, Realtor	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale together
4langeles_20110714_36d	7142011	Deise Montellano	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Wiseburn is connected to South Bay through work, schools, doctors, schools. Do not separate.
4langeles_20110714_37d	7142011	Ron Kinzie	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne and South bay together, struggle to keep schools and community safe. Do not join with inland cities with high crime rates and low test scores.
4langeles_20110714_38d	7142011	Concerned Citizen	no				yes	Supports Joseph M. Sanchez Memorial Plan for shared interests should have shared representation. Keep working class communities together, keep Latinos from being fragmented.
4langeles_20110714_39d	7142011	Carol Stewart	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Wiseburn should be included in South BayBeach Cities area in one continuous CD.
4langeles_20110714_40d	7142011	Bill Magoon	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Wiseburn should be included in South BayBeach Cities area in one continuous CD.
4langeles_20110714_41d	7142011	James D. Vose	no				yes	Keep LancasterPalmdale together in N LA County with East Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino in same SD. First draft was excellent.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_34d		Lancaster, Palmdale, San Fernando, Sylmar, Pacoima		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_35d		Lancaster, Palmdale		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_36d		Wiseburn, South Bay		no	yes		work
4langeles_20110714_37d		Hawtorne, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_38d	Los Angeles			no	yes	Latinos, working class comunities	
4langeles_20110714_39d		Wiseburn, South Bay, Hawthorne		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_40d		Wiseburn, South Bay, Hawthorne		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_41d	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Victor Valley, Palmdale, East Kern,		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_34d			no			affects ability to elect resident	
4langeles_20110714_35d			no				
4langeles_20110714_36d	shopping, schools, doctors		no				
4langeles_20110714_37d	schools and community		no			do not join with cities with high crime rates and low test scores	
4langeles_20110714_38d	socio-economic diversity		no				
4langeles_20110714_39d			no				
4langeles_20110714_40d			no				
4langeles_20110714_41d	High Desert community		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_42d	7142011	Diana Buckhantz	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Wilshire in half at Plymouth Blvd. Belong with LAMWS or LADNT, but entirety of Wilshire from La Brea ave to Western ave must be in one or other not both. Century old Neighborhood. No COI with East.
4langeles_20110714_43d	7142011	Guy J. Hocker Jr	yes	Guy Hocker Realtors	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Review boundaries of South Bay Association of Realtors. Hawthorne and entire South Bay will be best served by one congressperson from South Bay. No COI with Inglewood, different sphere of influence. Keep in CD with south bay schools, churches, clubs, etc
4langeles_20110714_44d	7142011	Hawthorne Resident	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Hawthone from its existent 35th CD comprised of Westchester, Playa del Rey, Inglewood, Lawndale, Hawthorne, Gardena. Gateway to South Bay cities in LA County. Do not undermine education, social services, medical services, youth programs.
4langeles_20110714_45d	7142011	Eddie Urenda	yes	Wiseburn Neighborhood Watch	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is COI should be included in Palos Verdes Est-Beach Cities CD contribues to commerce and labor pool of entertainment, high-tech, aerospace industries, beach cities, school districts, commercial and social traffic. Same commmunity interests.
4langeles_20110714_46d	7142011	Bill Bogaard, Mayor,	yes	City of Pasadena	Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Current AD boundaries recognize ethnic, social, economic, educational ties that bind Pasadena, Altadena, South Pasadena. Keep configuration, even if it requires grouping with other towns along San Gabriel Foothil

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_42d		Wilshire, Los Angeles, East	Plymouth Blvd, La Brea Ave, Western Ave	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110714_43d		Hawthorne, South Bay, Inglewood		no	yes		businesses, airport
4langeles_20110714_44d	Los Angeles	Inglewood, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale		no	yes		LAX, SPACE X
4langeles_20110714_45d		Hawthorne, Beach Cities		no	yes		commerce, entertainment industries, high-tech, aerospace,
4langeles_20110714_46d		Pasadena, Altadena, South Pasadena, San Gabriel		no	yes	ethnic	economic

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_42d	geographic integrity, century-old neighborhood		no			no COI with East	
4langeles_20110714_43d	schools,		no			Inglewood has different sphere of influence	
4langeles_20110714_44d	education, social services, safety, law enforcement		no				
4langeles_20110714_45d	school districts, commercial and social traffic		no			Do not put in Gardena-Compton district	
4langeles_20110714_46d	educational, cultural ties		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_47d	7142011	Sandra Perez Gonzalez	no		Diamond Bar	Los Angeles	yes	Diamond Bar belongs with LA County not Orange or San Bernardino. Diamond Bar and Walnut belong with West Covina and other SGV cities with whom share municipal, water, school districts.
4langeles_20110714_48d	7142011	Dr Irving Lebovics	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Jewish community is COI in Westside of Los Angeles. Do not divide cohesive community. Institutions, restaurants, schools.
4langeles_20110714_49d	7142011	MaryJo Farrell	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Group Hawthorne with other South Bay Cities, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Hermosa Beach. Across the street, shopping, work, school, recreation. Never go into Compton, South Central LA, West Athens, Westmont, View Park, Windsor
4langeles_20110714_50d	7142011	Brent Morgan	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is more associated with W and S neighbors. Live, work, Doctors, movies, dining, shopping in South Bay
2riverside_20110713_1c	7132011	Dan Martinez, City Manager	yes	City of Indio	Indio	Riverside	yes	Indio is second county seat for Riverside, Coachella Vallys cetner for business, government, entertainment. Exponential growth, doubling population. Key part of Coachella Valley economy, tourist destination. Agriculture is smallest part of base.
2riverside_20110713_2c	7132011	Hal Lutz	no		Hemet	Riverside	yes	Leave HemetSan Jacinto valley in Coachella Valley CD. Retired population faces federal issues such as Social Security, Medicare, Veterans Benefits.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_47d	LA, Orange, San Bernardino	Diamond Bar, Walnut, San Gabriel		no	yes		municipal, water districts
4langeles_20110714_48d	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	Jewish community	
4langeles_20110714_49d		Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Hermosa Beach, Compton, South Central LA, West Athens, Westmont, View Park, Windsor		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_50d		Hawthorne, South Bay Cities		no	yes		
2riverside_20110713_1c	Riverside	Indio, Coachella Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110713_2c	Riverside	Hemet, San Jacinto		no	yes		Federal Issues, social security, medicare, veterans benefits

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_47d	school districts		no			do not let OC districts steal voters from Diamond Bar	
4langeles_20110714_48d	schools, restaurants, stores		no				
4langeles_20110714_49d	shopping, work, schools recreation		no			nothing in common with other cities	
4langeles_20110714_50d	Live, work, Doctors, movies, dining, shopping in South Bay		no			infrequent contact with communities in proposed boundaries	
2riverside_20110713_1c			no				
2riverside_20110713_2c			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110713_3c	7132011	Marc Searl, Former Mayor	yes	Hemet	Hemet	Riverside	yes	Leave HemetSan Jacinto valley in Coachella Valley CD. Retired population faces federal issues such as Social Security, Medicare, Veterans Benefits. Entry was to Santa Rosa San Jacinto Mountain National Monument, attracts hikers from around the world.
4langeles_20110713_1c	7132011	Pastor William Monroe Campbell, Reverend Louis Chase	yes	Mount Gilead Missionary Baptist Church	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Adopt initial draft proposal. South LA is best served with status quo set of legislative and CDs. In 234 configuration, have opportunity to elect individuals sensitive to concerns in 2 SDs, 3 CDs, 4 Ads.
4langeles_20110713_2c	7132011		no				yes	Alternative proposal for West LA, make changes to maximize Jewish turnout in Westside District without reducing minority voices. Consolidates WestMid-City West Jewish Communities
4langeles_20110713_3c	7132011		no				yes	Alternative proposal for West LA, make changes to maximize Jewish turnout in Westside District without reducing minority voices. Consolidates WestMid-City West Jewish Communities. Proposal and maps attached
9sacramento_20110713_1c	7132011	Phil Serna, Supervisor,	yes	District 1	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Sacramento Intl Airport should be in same CD as downtown metro area. Does not have stronger connection to places like Glenn County. Governing body is Sacramento County Board of Supervisorts, contribues 4 billion to local economy. Relies on federal money
2riverside_20110714_1d	7132011	Linda Krupa, Member	yes	Hemet City Council	Hemet	Riverside	yes	Keep Hemet, San Jacinto in San Jacinto Valley and Idyllwild together in CD, remain in 45th CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110713_3c	Riverside	Hemet, San Jacinto		no	yes		Mountain, social security, medicare, veterans benefits
4langeles_20110713_1c	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	African-American community	
4langeles_20110713_2c	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	Jewish communities	
4langeles_20110713_3c	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	Jewish communities	
9sacramento_20110713_1c	Sacramento	Sacramento		no	yes		economic bond
2riverside_20110714_1d		Hemet, San Jacinto, Idyllwild		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110713_3c			no				
4langeles_20110713_1c	public service, private enterprise, religious communities, mass transit, education		no				
4langeles_20110713_2c			no				
4langeles_20110713_3c			no				proposal and maps attached
9sacramento_20110713_1c	Airport, governing body, federal resources		no			does not have more in common with Glenn County	
2riverside_20110714_1d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110714_2d	7132011	Ellen Swenson	no		Rancho Mirage	Riverside	yes	Coachella Valley economy is based in tourism not agriculture, latest statistics show. Should not be combined with Imperial Countys agricultural COI in any map
4langeles_20110714_51d	7142011	Marin Tondreau	no				yes	Do not group Lancaster and Palmdale with Pacoima, Sylmar, San Fernando, moved to get out of these districts.
4langeles_20110714_52d	7142011	Ayala Family	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Keep WiseburnHawthorne in South Bay with Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, etc. Small, united and commited community, keep in one contiguous CD.
4langeles_20110714_53d	7142011	Barbara McCarren	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Want Venice to be one CD
4langeles_20110714_54d	7142011	Edward Urenda	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Include WiseburnHawthorne in redistricting of Beach CitiesSouth Bay in one contiguous CD.
4langeles_20110714_55d	7142011	Ellen Bagelman	no				yes	Pleased that boundary line for W Valley SFV in LA County has been moved to natural divider of 405 Fwy.
4langeles_20110714_56d	7142011	Patricia J. Maduke, Esq, (Duplicate)	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Include Wiseburn in same CD as rest of Beach CitiesSouth Bay. Jogging, veteranarians, shopping. Rarely travel to areas in proposed CD.
4langeles_20110714_57d	7142011	Lori Erlendsson	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Do not place Westchester with Beach Cities CD south of El Segundo or north of Playa Vista. Westchester COI shares alliances, LAX. Does not share concerns with Beach Cities. Do not merge LAX, oil refineries, port into one CD. Combine Westchester, Inglewood

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110714_2d	Imperial	Coachella Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_51d		Lancaster, Palmdale, Pacoima, Sylmar, San Fernando		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_52d		Wiseburn, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_53d		Venice		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_54d		Wiseburn, Hawthorne, Los Angeles, South Bay, Beach Cities		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_55d	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley	405 Freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_56d		Wiseburn, Beach Cities, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_57d		Westchester, Beach Cities, El Segundo, Playa Vista		no	yes	multi-cultural, multi-ethnic	LAX, job training program

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110714_2d			no			tourism, not agriculture	
4langeles_20110714_51d			no			moved to get out of these districts	
4langeles_20110714_52d	small, united and committed community		no				
4langeles_20110714_53d			no				
4langeles_20110714_54d	contiguous		no				
4langeles_20110714_55d	existing communities working together		no				
4langeles_20110714_56d	doctors, bet, shopping		no			no ties to proposed CD	
4langeles_20110714_57d	colleges, problems, bonds,		no			no connection with Beach Cities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_59d	7142011	Michael Lofton	no				yes	Redistricting to remove incumbents is good. Citizens of 2nd LA County District, 8th and 10th district will have chance to elect official who is competent and will respect U.S. Constitution.
4langeles_20110714_60d	7142011	Michael Lofton	no				yes	Welcome redistricting of 2nd LA county distric and 8th 9th 10th districts
4langeles_20110714_61d	7142011	Mercia Brandon, Constituent,	yes	33rd CD			yes	Do not disenfranchise Leimart Park, Baldwin Hills, Ladera and Crenshaw District, Culver City with communities who have no historical relationship.
4langeles_20110714_62d	7142011	Kendall Hudson	no				yes	Drop inclusion of Santa Monica and Venice from Proposed 36th district and replace with Hawthorne, Lawndale, Westchester far more homogenous with beach cities. Historically have worked together
4langeles_20110714_63d	7142011	Bill and Cheryl Rex	no		Canyon County	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Santa Clarita into two separate CDs. Add Newhall to Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley CD
4langeles_20110714_64d	7142011	Buford Walker	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire should be connected with southern region rather than Malibu construction, theatres in Crenshaw, museums, Staples Center, LA forum
4langeles_20110714_65d	7142011	Stephanie Williams	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire relates more to South than Malibu and coastal areas and points west. Shopping, recreation, events, theatres, restaurants in fox Hills, Crenshaw, Leimert Park, etc.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_59d	Los Angeles			no	yes	Black community	
4langeles_20110714_60d	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110714_61d	Los Angeles	Culver City		no	yes	Communities of color	
4langeles_20110714_62d		Santa Monica, Venice, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Westchester, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Westchester		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_63d		Santa Clarita, Newhall, Antelope Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_64d		Crenshaw, Wilshire, Malibu		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_65d		Wilshire, Malibu, Fox Hills, Crenshaw, Leimert Park		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_59d			no				
4langeles_20110714_60d			no				
4langeles_20110714_61d	historical enclaves, collaborative relationship		no				
4langeles_20110714_62d	homogenous , history of working together		no			gerrymandered precinct	
4langeles_20110714_63d			no				
4langeles_20110714_64d	theatres, museums, Staples Center, LA Forum		no				
4langeles_20110714_65d	shopping, museums, recreation, events, worship, theatres, restaurants		no			more than to Malibbu	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_66d	7142011	R. Goldberg	no		Pico-Robertson	Los Angeles	yes	Pico Robertson, Cheviot Hills, and Century City should be in district with Miracle Mile, Beverly Hills, Beverly-Fairfax. Victoria Park, Lafayette Park, Mid-city are far different.
4langeles_20110714_67d	7142011	Stewart Kwoh, President and Exec Director	yes	APALC			yes	Each option poster for CD SGVP would pose challenges to residents to have fair represenatation on issues affecting their civil rights. Support CD LAWSG that combines West and East SGValley same socioeconomic concerns and asian-american population
4langeles_20110714_68d	7142011	David Trainer	no		Hancock Park	Los Angeles	yes	Hancock Park and Windsor Square are one of the most cohesive historical neighborhoods in LA. Division would devastate the neighborhood. Wilshire area between Western and La Brea is one community
4langeles_20110714_69d	7142011	Yahaira Ortiz	yes	Bellflower Medical Center		Los Angeles	yes	Keep entire LAPRW SD in LA County. Montebello belongs in district North of LAPRW is more SGV than gateway cities or SE. Rarely go for entertainment, shopping, etc. Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington park are more similar, as in CACAP 27 SD map.
4langeles_20110714_70d	7142011	Rodney Jacobson, Branch Manager	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together, in Northern LA County with East Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino in same SD. First draft was excellent.
4langeles_20110714_71d	7142011	Wendy Werris,	yes	West Coast Correspondent	Windsor Square	Los Angeles	yes	Do not cut Windsor Square in half at Plymouth ave. Use Western ave as cut off point and keep in appropriate district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_66d		Pico Robertson, Cheviot Hills, Century City, Miracle Mile, Beverly Hills, Beverly Fairfax. Victoria Park, Lafayette Park,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_67d		San Gabriel Valley		no	yes	Asian American population	socioeconomic concerns
4langeles_20110714_68d		Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Wilshire,	Western, La Brea	yes	yes	cohesive, unified, historical neighborhood	
4langeles_20110714_69d	Los Angeles	Montebello, San Gabriel Valley, Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington Park		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_70d	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	East Kern, Victor Valley, Lancaster, Palmdale		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_71d		Windsor Square	Plymouth, Western	yes	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_66d	interacts quite a bit		no			other areas are far different	
4langeles_20110714_67d			no			do not force to compete with residents of dissimilar areas for attention	
4langeles_20110714_68d			no			division is willfully destructive	
4langeles_20110714_69d	similarity of communities and geography		no			rarely go to Montebello	
4langeles_20110714_70d	High Desert		no			seperating would limit ability to have a voice	
4langeles_20110714_71d	together for several decades		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_72d	7142011	Michael L. Lofton	no				yes	Redistricting to remove incumbents is good. Citizens of 2nd LA County District, 8th and 10th district. Intend to vote against a number of incumbents.
4langeles_20110714_73d	7142011	Alexandre Moneiro	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Hawthorne from 35th CD comprised of Westchester, Playa del Rey, Inglewood, Lawndale, Hawthorne, Gardena. They are gateway to South Bay cities in LA County. Share Cultural, values, and demographics, collaborate in medical services, youth
4langeles_20110714_74d	7142011	Zachary I. Gonzales, Jr.	no		Diamond Bar	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Diamond Bar with LA County in all legislative seats, including CD. Not part of Orange County, issues are not those of Orange County. Schools, taxes, education, economy, transport. No COI in Orange County or San Bernardino County.
4langeles_20110714_75d	7142011	Jill Galloway	no		Hancock ParkWindsor Square	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Hancock ParkWindsor Square, 100 years intact. Do not make destruction of my neighborhood your legacy
4langeles_20110714_76d	7142011	Lisa Lubchansky	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Venice, great community , active in local politics. Does not make sense to divide community for small city of Venice
4langeles_20110714_77d	7142011	Kathleen Van Horn	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be in same CD as rest of South Bay Beach Cities. Most residents dine, shop, travel to South Bay, rarely go east or north
4langeles_20110714_78d	7142011	Joseph Rosendo	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not combine San Pedro with Malibu, split Venice in three, Topanga in two, or throw Calabasas into Topanga. Keep communities together.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_72d	Los Angeles			no	no		
4langeles_20110714_73d	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Westchester, Inglewood, Gardena, Lawndale, Lennox		no	yes		LAX, SPACE X corporation,
4langeles_20110714_74d	Los Angeles, Orange County, San Bernardino	Diamond Bar	60 fwys	no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_75d		Hancock Park, Windsor Square		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_76d		Venice,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_77d		Hawthorne, South Bay, Beach cities		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_78d		San Pedro, Malibu, Venice, Topanga, Calabasas		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_72d			no				
4langeles_20110714_73d	School districts, safety, health, mental issues, medical services, cultural values, demographics		no				
4langeles_20110714_74d	schools, taxes, water, utilities		no			no identitiy or COI with Orange County or San Bernardino County	
4langeles_20110714_75d	100 years intact		no				
4langeles_20110714_76d	great community, active in politics		no				
4langeles_20110714_77d	shop, dine, travel		no			residents rarely go east or north	
4langeles_20110714_78d	keep communities together		no			was not broke, do not try to fix	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_79d	7142011	Arlene Farinacci	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne and surrounding unincorporated areas of Wiseburn and Del Aire with South Bay cities
4langeles_20110714_80d	7142011	Bruce Striegel	no		Windsor Square	Los Angeles	yes	re Windsor Square quit messing with our neighborhoods, you idiots
4langeles_20110714_81d	7142011	Dr Jankovitz	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	No changes in Palmdale, Lancaster district please, should not be split, Mc Carthy should keep lancdaster part he has
4langeles_20110714_82d	7142011	Larry Guidi	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Return Hawthorne to where it rightfully exists, with long-standing neighboring partnerships of South Bay Cities
4langeles_20110714_83d	7142011	Donna Hernandez	no		Norwalk	Los Angeles	yes	Keep SD LAPRW. City of Montebello should be in district North of LAPRW. Is part of SGV, not gateway or SW cities. Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington Park are COI, as showin in CACA Proposed 27th SD map
4langeles_20110714_84d	7142011	Scott R. Abrahamson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not use Plymouth Boulvevard as boundary line to split Wilshire Ads, CDs, state tax districts.
4langeles_20110714_85d	7142011	Robert and Letty Rhodes	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne with Beach CitiesSouth Bay areas in same CD work, doctors, shopping, movies in South Bay
4langeles_20110714_86d	7142011	Alejandro B Vargas	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Include Hawthorne with South Bay cities Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, etc telephone directories, civil response, fire safety, crime fighting, school districts, medical groups, shopping, restaurants, theatres, bowling, decades of connection

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_79d		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, del Air, South Bay		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_80d		Windsor Square		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_81d		Lancaster, Palmdale		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_82d		Hawthorne, South Bay cities		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_83d	Los Angeles	Montebello, Lynwood, South Gate Huntington Park		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_84d	Los Angeles	Wilshire	Plymouth	no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_85d		Hawthorne, Beach Cities, South Bay		no	yes		work
4langeles_20110714_86d		Hawthorne, South Bbay, Beach Cities		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_79d			no				
4langeles_20110714_80d			no				
4langeles_20110714_81d			no				
4langeles_20110714_82d	neighboring partnerships		no				
4langeles_20110714_83d	similar communities		no			never go to Montebello to anything	
4langeles_20110714_84d	same community		no				
4langeles_20110714_85d	shopping, family, doctors, movies		no				
4langeles_20110714_86d	telephone directories, civil response, fire safety, crime fighting, school districts, medical groups, shopping, restaurants, theatres, bowling, decades of connection		no			Hawthorne belongs nowhere else	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_87d	7142011	Geoffrey Neigher	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not slice Wilshire into 2 parts, eastern border of Hancock Park should be redrwan to be Western ave not plymouth blvd.
4langeles_20110714_88d	7142011	Alex Vargas, Mayor Pro Tem	yes	City of Hawthorne	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Place Hawthorne in South Bay CD, AD, SDs Aerospace, councils, coalitions, South Bay Police task force, newpapers. South Bay does not include South LA, Watts, willowbrook, Compton, Athens, Florence
4langeles_20110714_89d	7142011	Martha Vargas, HR Manager	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is in South Bay, not South Central shopping, neighbboring cities, doctors at Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach
4langeles_20110714_90d	7142011	Olivia J. Valentine, Esq.	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	If Hawthorne cannot be in 36th CD, should be with South BayBeach Cities which lie south of 105, west of 110. Tied to aerospace industry, Spacex, airport, entertainment industry, arterials,
4langeles_20110714_91d	7142011	Tere Tereba	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	District should remain as it is, from Western ave to La Brea Ave. Part of WLADT and either one of LAMWS or LADNT
4langeles_20110714_92d	7142011	Sean Walsh, President	yes	Hollyglen Homeowners Association	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be in South Bay CD, homes are west of 405, south of 105. Lives are in Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Hawthorne aerospace, shopping, professional services
4langeles_20110714_93d	7142011	Linda Boyd	no		San Gabriel Foothills	Los Angeles	yes	San Gabriel foothills are strong COI do not carve out Glendora, Azusa and Duarte in AD. Keep together sister cities in AD. Glendora is not CIO with central and southern San Gabriel Valley

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_87d		Wilshire, Hancock Park		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_88d	Los Angeles	South Bay, Hawthorne, LA, Watts, Willowbrook, Compton, Athens, Florence	105, 110 fwys	no	yes		aerospace, coalitions, councils
4langeles_20110714_89d		Hawthorne, South Bay, South Central, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_90d		Hawthorne, South Bay, Beach Cities, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach	405, 110	no	yes		aerospace, airport, spacex, entertainment industry, CSI Miami,
4langeles_20110714_91d		Los Angeles	Western Ave, La Brea Ave	no	yes	100 years old	
4langeles_20110714_92d		Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Hawthorne	405, 110	no	yes		aerospace, professional services
4langeles_20110714_93d		San Gabriel, Glendora, Azusa, Duarte		no	yes		working conditions,

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_87d	traditional boundaries and affiliations		no				
4langeles_20110714_88d	police work, newspapers		no			South bay is not South LA	
4langeles_20110714_89d	shopping, beaches, doctors, Beach music		no			The beach boys were not from south Central	
4langeles_20110714_90d	arterials, thoroughfares		no				
4langeles_20110714_91d	important and historic district		no				
4langeles_20110714_92d	shoppinng		no				
4langeles_20110714_93d	sister cities, educational similarities		no			no COI with Central, Southern SGV	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_94d	7142011	Phyllis A. Fritz	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	San Gabriel foothills are strong COI do not carve out Glendora, Azusa and Duarte in AD. Keep together sister cities in AD. Glendora is not CIO with central and southern San Gabriel Valley
4langeles_20110714_95d	7142011	Sherril Alexander	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	Glendora is COI with Laverne, San Dimas, Claremont. Current map severs that relationship. Keep Glendora with its COI and with foothills
4langeles_20110714_96d	7142011	Pam and Ron Hilton	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	Glendora should be aligned with foothills. Do not put with Southern San Gabriel Valley, there is no COI. Put Glendora, Azusa, Monrovia, La Verne, Claremont. Common interests are 210 fwy, rail line, water, community issues
4langeles_20110714_97d	7142011	Tony Cruz	no		Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Antelope Valley whole. Current maps split up in SD and CD. Long way from Lancaster to Kern
4langeles_20110714_98d	7142011	Pastor Jacquelyn Swinney	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	Do not change boundaries of Glendorafoothills. More in common with San Dimas, La Verne, Duarte, Claremont than with South. Sister cities.
4langeles_20110714_99d	7142011	Art	no		Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Applauds decision to split the valley, staring to show love of country and compassion for fellow man. Vote yes.
4langeles_20110714_100d	7142011	Kyle Hamilton Orlemann	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be part of South Bay cities.
4langeles_20110714_101d	7142011	Joanne Sterling	yes	Keller Williams Realty	Antelope Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Do not combine Antelope Valley with parts of Sylmar and SFV. Keep Palmdale, Lancaster, parts of Kern together and separate from SFV. Hit hard by present economy

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_94d		San Gabriel, Glendora, Azusa, Duarte		no	yes		working conditions,
4langeles_20110714_95d		Glendora, LaVerne, San Dimas, Claremont		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_96d		Glendora, San Gabriel, Azusa, Monrovia, La Verne, Claremont	210	no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_97d		Antelope Valley, Lancaster, Kern		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_98d		Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Duarte, Claremont		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_99d		Antelope Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_100d		Hawthorne, South Bay		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_101d		Antelope Valley, Palmdale, Lancaster, Kern, SFV		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_94d	sister cities, educational similarities		no			no COI with Central, Southern SGV	
4langeles_20110714_95d	foothills, worked sucessfully in past		no				
4langeles_20110714_96d	210 fwy, rail line, water, community issues		no			not same issues as SGV	
4langeles_20110714_97d			no			long way from lancaster to kern	
4langeles_20110714_98d	foothills, sister cities for years		no			no similarities with neighbors from south	
4langeles_20110714_99d			no				
4langeles_20110714_100d			no				
4langeles_20110714_101d	population profile, hit hard by current economy		no			entirely different population profile and needs from SFV	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_102d	7142011	Sunriseyarns	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Include Hawthorne in same CD as rest of South Bay.
4langeles_20110714_103d	7142011	John Carlos Vargas, VP	yes	Hawthorne School District Board of Trustees	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Hawthorne from South Bay. Past is tied with South Bay, police dept, school districs, news, coalitions, aerospace, COG
4langeles_20110714_104d	7142011	Regina Chung	no		Windsor square	Los Angeles	yes	Do not cut Windsor Square in half on plymouth Blvd. Is center of LA, parks, should be in same district.
4langeles_20110714_105d	7142011	Robert Macias	no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale united and together in N LA county with East Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino in same SD. First draft was excellent
4langeles_20110714_106d	7142011	Robert Fager, Chief of Police	yes	Hawthorne PD	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	DO not remove Hawthorne from South Bay share consortiums, federal and state grants, police task forces, working relationships, employees live in south bay
4langeles_20110714_107d	7142011	Alan Cutter	no		Hancock Park	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hancock Park and Windsor Square neighborhoods intact. Stretches from La Brea to Western ave
4langeles_20110714_108d	7142011	Tere Tereba	no				yes	Do not want district of 100 years divided, are WLADT, with E boundaries at Western ave and W boundary at La Brea.
4langeles_20110714_109d	7142011	Carolyn L. Gonzales	no		Claremont	Los Angeles	yes	Glendora, Azusa, Duarte should be part of San Gabriel Foothill District share mutual interests and issues. Keep cities intact
4langeles_20110714_110d	7142011	Ken Brown	no				yes	Keep everyone in Santa Clarita Valley in one district, everybody wants it. CSCFR are republican front.
4langeles_20110714_111d	7142011	Raquel Amezquita	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Include Hawthorne with Beach Cities and South Bay share schools, shopping, taxes, LAX, aerospace, shield

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_102d		Hawthorne, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_103d		Hawthorne, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_104d		Windsor Square, Los Angeles		no	yes		economically
4langeles_20110714_105d	LA, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, East Kern, Victor Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_106d		Hawthorne, South Bay		no	yes		consortiums, federal and state grants, police task forces, working relationships, employees live in south bay
4langeles_20110714_107d		Hancock Park, Windsor Square	La Brea to Western ave	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110714_108d			western ave, la brea	no	yes	historic district of 100 years	
4langeles_20110714_109d		Glendora, Azusa, Duarte, San Gabriel		no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_110d	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110714_111d		Hawthorne, Beach Cities South Bay		no	yes		aerospace, LAX

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_102d	demographically, economically , socially		no				
4langeles_20110714_103d	police dept, school districs, news, coalitions, aerospace, COG		no			does nor share econ or social interests with other region	
4langeles_20110714_104d	politically, similar character, common ground		no				
4langeles_20110714_105d	unified High Desert		no				
4langeles_20110714_106d			no			not Athens, Windsor Hills	
4langeles_20110714_107d			no				
4langeles_20110714_108d			no				
4langeles_20110714_109d	foothills, mutual interests, issues		no				
4langeles_20110714_110d			no				
4langeles_20110714_111d	shopping, newspaper, schools		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110714_112d	7142011	Cara Robin	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Westchester should not be cut off from LA do not live in Inglewood, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Torrance share utilities, police, COI. Use 405 fwy as boundary, those west of 405 and N or LAX should be together in LA
4langeles_20110714_113d	7142011	Ralph V. Bozigian	no				yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale together in North LA with East Kern and San Bernardino cities of Victor Valley in SD. First Draft was good
5ventura_20110714_1d	7142011	Roy	no				yes	Do we really need to change where people move to live. Say you move to Ventura from LA to get out of LA and they change the maps. Put yourself in peoples place.
5ventura_20110714_2d	7142011	Linda Smith	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Do not put Simi Valley with Victorville, nothing in common. Belongs with Ventura county.
5ventura_20110714_3d	7142011	Carol Sherman	no				yes	Keep Simi Valley with Moorpark and other Ventura county cities in CD. Interests are in common with Ventura, not SFV or Antelope Valley. Continuous flow of 101 with Thousand Oaks in LA
5ventura_20110714_4d	7142011	Elena Saenz	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Put E Ventura County with Santa Clarita, not Malibu or Ventura blvd in SD. Historically linked in Senate
5ventura_20110714_5d	7142011	John Johnson	no		Ventura	Ventura	yes	Combine Simi Valley and Moorpark with other inland communities. Keep Oxnard in one district. Keep Thousand oaks in one district. Keep Ventura with Ventura county, not Santa Barbara. Keep upper and lower Ojai Valleys together

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110714_112d		Westchester, Los Angeles, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Torrance	405, LAX	no	yes		
4langeles_20110714_113d	LA, San Bernardino, Kern	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Village		no	yes		
5ventura_20110714_1d	Ventura, LA			no	no		
5ventura_20110714_2d	Ventura	Simi Valley, Victorville	101	no	yes		
5ventura_20110714_3d	LA, Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, San Fernando, Antelope Valley	101	no	yes		
5ventura_20110714_4d	Ventura	Santa Clarita, Malibu	Ventura blvd	no	yes		
5ventura_20110714_5d	Ventura, Santa Barbara	Ventura, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Oxnard, Thousand Oaks		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110714_112d	schools, police, council, COI, utilities		no			not inglewood, etc	
4langeles_20110714_113d	high desert		no				
5ventura_20110714_1d			no				
5ventura_20110714_2d	belongs in Ventura		no			nothing in common with Victorville	
5ventura_20110714_3d	101, much in common,		no			mountain ranges divide area	
5ventura_20110714_4d	historically together in senate		no			no COI with malibu, pac palisades	
5ventura_20110714_5d	inland communities		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110714_6d	7142011	Rob Williams	no			Ventura	yes	Thanks for keeping Eastern Ventura whole. Drive to San Fernando more often but have family in Santa Clarita. The big thing is to be kept whole
6kings_20110714_1d	7142011	Garry Pannett	no			Kings	yes	Thank you for keeping KINGS AD whole and farmworker communities together along 99 and I-5, including Weedpatch, Arvin, Lamont. Make this final map
6kings_20110714_2d	7142011	Doug Godinho	no		Hanford	Kings	yes	Thank you for AD Kings. Upholds spirit of law and joins like communities and gives us best chance for elected rep. Do not change it.
8ccosta_20110714_1d	7142011	Kareen G. Stepper, Mayor	yes	Town of Danville	Danville	Contra Costa	yes	Keep San Ramon valley and tri-valley together in single CD; share school district and fire district. Splitting would be illoggical and adversly impact residents
8sonoma_20110714_1c	7142011	Ernesto Olivares, Mayor	yes	City of Santa Rosa	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	yes	Keep Santa Rosa with North Bay counties of Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino, Marin COI. No COI with San Joaquin, Contra Costa, Yuba, Colusa, Glen
9sacramento_20110714_1d	7142011	William H. Edgar, City manager	yes	Sacramento	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	Pleased that CSU, UC Davis are in Sacramento city limits. Please Sacramento is in single CD. Want Sacramento Intl Airport in district
9sacramento_20110714_2d	7142011	Rick Salton	no		Galt	Sacramento	yes	Thank you for SACEG AD with Galt with Lodi, Elk Grove and Stockton
9sacramento_20110714_3d	7142011	Shirley Matracia	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not change citrus heights CD, want to stay the same
9sacramento_20110714_4d	7142011	Bob Pitvorec	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not break Citrus Heights into two districts. Values are not like Sacramentos, small tow, conservatism

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110714_6d	Ventura	Ventura, Santa Clarita		no	no		
6kings_20110714_1d	Kings	Weedpatch, Arvin, Lamont	99, I-5	no	yes		
6kings_20110714_2d	Kings			no	yes		
8ccosta_20110714_1d		San Ramon Valley, Tri-valley		no	yes		
8sonoma_20110714_1c	Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino, Marin COI. No COI with San Joaquin, Contra Costa, Yuba, Colusa, Glen	Santa Rosa		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110714_1d		Sacramento		no	yes		airport
9sacramento_20110714_2d		Galt, Lodi, Elk Grove, Stockton	Highway 99	no	no		
9sacramento_20110714_3d		Citrus Heights		no	no		
9sacramento_20110714_4d		Citrus Heights, Sacramento		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110714_6d			no				
6kings_20110714_1d	farmworker communities		no				
6kings_20110714_2d	like communities, representation	had a lot of challenges with my county being part of VRA	no				
8ccosta_20110714_1d	school districts, fire district		no				
8sonoma_20110714_1c	water, conservation, air quality, transportation, economic development, sustainability		no			no COI with San Joaquin, etc	
9sacramento_20110714_1d	schools		no				
9sacramento_20110714_2d	highway 99, news, big city		no			do not put with Rancho Cordova	
9sacramento_20110714_3d			no				
9sacramento_20110714_4d	small town, conservative		no			different values than Sacramento	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110714_5d	7142011	Stewart Sellers	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not meld Sacramento and Citrus heights in CD, different politics. Demographics, economics, lifestyle are more in line with north areas.
9sacramento_20110714_6d	7142011	Anthony V. Matracia	no		Citrus Heights	Sacramento	yes	Do not redistrict Citrus Heights area from Lungrens to Matruis district. Voters support Lungren
9shasta_20110714_1d	7142011	Stuart Busby	no			Shasta	yes	District is related to I-5. Do not combine shasta with coastal district
9shasta_20110714_2d	7142011	Patricia Adishian	no			Shasta	yes	Keep our district with I-5, not Humboldt on coast. Economy is more in line with I-5 corridor
9shasta_20110714_3d	7142011	Casey Scott	no				yes	June 20th visualizations for N CA were simpler, current districts are acceptable. Thank you.
9shasta_20110714_4d	7142011	Jim and Roberta Wright	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta should not be with coastal counties, nothing in common. There is a mountain range between
9siskiyou_20110714_1d	7142011	Maria Messing	no		Yrekea	Siskiyou	yes	Do not redistrict Siskiyou with coastal towns, entirely different, takes away rights, freedom of choice.
9yolo_20110714_1d	7142011	Susan Savage	no			Yolo	yes	Do not divide Yolo into multiple districts. County has dense web of connections and service delivery mechanisms. Abandon plans to fracture community
9yolo_20110714_2d	7142011	Glennda Campos	no			Yolo	yes	Redraw the maps so Yolo, Including W Sacramento, stay intact. Do not hack into 3 regions. County seat, rural interests, services, collective issues.
9yolo_20110714_3d	7142011	Cecilia Escamilla-Grenwald	no			Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo county into 9 legislators. Commited to open space and agricultural land.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110714_5d		Citrus Heights, Sacramento		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110714_6d		Citrus Heights, Sacramento		no	no		
9shasta_20110714_1d	Shasta		I-5	no	no		
9shasta_20110714_2d	Shasta, Humboldt		I-5	no	yes		economy
9shasta_20110714_3d				no	no		
9shasta_20110714_4d	Shasta			no	no		
9siskiyou_20110714_1d	Siskiyou			no	no		
9yolo_20110714_1d	Yolo			no	yes		
9yolo_20110714_2d	Yolo,	W. Sacramento		no	yes		
9yolo_20110714_3d	Yolo			no	yes		open space, ag land

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110714_5d	lifestyles, economics		no			different politics	
9sacramento_20110714_6d			no			voters support lungren	
9shasta_20110714_1d			no			do not combine	
9shasta_20110714_2d			no			not lumped with Humboldt	
9shasta_20110714_3d			no				
9shasta_20110714_4d			no			nothing in common, mountains between	
9siskiyou_20110714_1d			no			entirely different from coast	
9yolo_20110714_1d	interconnections, service delivery mechanisms		no				
9yolo_20110714_2d	common interests, issues, rural interests		no			will be swallowed by larger entities	
9yolo_20110714_3d			no			will have 9 legislators instead of solid support	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110714_4d	7142011	Artemio Pimenti, Mayor	yes	City of Woodland	Woodland	Yolo	yes	Oppose separating county of Yolo into 9 jurisdictions. Woodland is within Yolo COI, diversity, open space, ag, slow growth, habitat preservation
1sdiego_20110714_1d	7142011	Palma Hooper, President	yes	SWCAPAL	San Diego	San Diego	yes	Compare CAPAFR unity maps for San Diego with proposed visualizations. Unity maps paid attention to minority COI testimony. Do not draw eastwest districts, split filipino community. AD RCHMM should not include Fairbanks Ranch and Rancho Santa Fe
1sdiego_20110714_2d	7142011	Stewart Gage	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Use draft 1 SD AD map to unify Escondido and join with Valley Center, Pauma, Ramona and ag interests to East. Do not split cities. Do not split Riverside and San Diego
1sdiego_20110714_3d	7142011	Val Sanfilippo	no		San Diego	San Diego	yes	Do not use 163805 interstate between Claremont and Serra Mesa as dagger to slash San Diego and dilute middle and low income voters. Do not tear Linda Vista do not put with North, East, West. DO not want to be overshadowed by richer neighborhoods
6fresno_20110714_1d	7142011	Sara Mirhadi	no			Fresno	yes	Both Fresno Ads are in valley, neighborhoods are intact, and each N and S havve own representative in FRSNO and FSEC2. Done a great job
6fresno_20110714_2d	7142011	Marvin Nakagawa	no		Fresno	Fresno	yes	Lives in FSEC2, job well done, divided Fresno correctly while keeping diverse COIs together and honoring neighborhoods like Orange Cove

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110714_4d	Yolo	Woodland		no	yes		open space, ag,
1sdiego_20110714_1d	San Diego	San Diego, Rancho Santa Fe		no	yes	Minority populations, filipino, API community	
1sdiego_20110714_2d	San Diego, Riverside	Escondido, Valley Center, Pauma, Ramona		no	yes		agricultural interests
1sdiego_20110714_3d	San Diego	San Diego,	163805	yes	yes		
6fresno_20110714_1d	Fresno	Fresno		no	no		
6fresno_20110714_2d	Fresno	Fresno	Shields	yes	yes	diverse communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110714_4d	slow growth, habitat preservation		no				
1sdiego_20110714_1d			no			no COI with Rancho Santa Fe	
1sdiego_20110714_2d			no			do not split cities	
1sdiego_20110714_3d	represenative district, low and middle income		no			do not want competative district	
6fresno_20110714_1d			no				
6fresno_20110714_2d			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110714_1d	7142011	Ramon Martinez	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	San Jose AD and SD maps discriminate against latinos, dilute leadership in East San Jose. Maintain 23rd AD as it is, nest to form SD COI with Santa Clara, Monterey, San Benito
7sclara_20110714_2d	7142011	Barbara Biehl	no		Mt Pleasant	Santa Clara	yes	Keep Mt Pleasant in same AD, keep SD lines with Evergreen, district 8 combines both. Keep in Santa Clara County district, not monterey, Hollister, Salinas
7sclara_20110714_3d	7142011	Minh Pham	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	San Jose AD and SD maps discriminate against minorities, dilute leadership in East San Jose. Maintain 23rd AD as it is, nest to form SD COI with Santa Clara, Monterey, San Benito
4langeles_20110715_27e	7152011	Leonard Hill	no		Hancock Park	Los Angeles	yes	Greater Wilshire neighborhood, from La Brea to Western should be in one district and not split; Plymouth blvd split does not recognize unique history of neighborhood
4langeles_20110715_28e	7152011	Herb Child	no		Playa del ReyWestchester	Los Angeles	yes	Do not remove Hawthorne from Beach cities and place in S central LA hawthorne is gateway to beach, rosecrans corridor, restaurants begins in Hawthorne, joins El Segundo and Manhattan beach, ends at beach
4langeles_20110715_29e	7152011	Randall Waters	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne with South Bay CD with sister cities Lawndale, Torrance, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa, Redondo, Hawthorne one community. Share nothing in common with area to north. Never even been there

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110714_1d	Santa Clara, Montery, San Benito	San Jose		no	yes	Latino communities	
7sclara_20110714_2d	Santa Clara, Monterey, Hollister, Salinas	San Jose, Evergreen, Mt. Pleasant	story and clayton rds	no	yes	small community	
7sclara_20110714_3d	Santa Clara, Montery, San Benito	San Jose		no	yes	minority community	
4langeles_20110715_27e		Wilshire	La Brea, Western, Plymouth	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_28e	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Beach Cities, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach	Rosecrans corridor	no	yes		infrastructure, econ development
4langeles_20110715_29e	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, Beach Cities, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Lawndale, Torrance, Hermosa		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110714_1d	educational needs, income levels, cultural similarities, transport corridor		no				
7sclara_20110714_2d	community associations		no			no COI with monterey, etc	
7sclara_20110714_3d	educational needs, income levels, cultural similarities, transport corridor		no				
4langeles_20110715_27e	historic community		no				
4langeles_20110715_28e	schools, housing, rosecrans corridor		no				
4langeles_20110715_29e	one community, sister cities		no			never even been to Athens, etc	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_30e	7152011	Susan Banner	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne in Same CD as other South Bay cities, Hawthorne, Torrance, Redondo, Manhattan, El Segundo, etc were together during riots, CVS, water, doctors, family, stores, restuarants, carnival, parades.
4langeles_20110715_31e	7152011	Giannina Meidav, Home Owner	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is part of Beach Cities, do not change boundaries businesses, camp, dinner, shopping, activities, beaches
4langeles_20110715_32e	7152011	Robbie Warner	no		Mt Baldy	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Mt Baldy together, draw boundaries with foothills to the south , nor High Desert and E Sierra communities far away; share school district, PO, town hall, events, pancakes, small town, neighbors, disasters. Identify with Upland, Claremont, etc
4langeles_20110715_33e	7152011	Lisa Dortch	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not use Plymouth Blvd as boundary line. E and W are same community, should be in samd CD, AD, state tax districts. Western is better boundary
4langeles_20110715_34e	7152011	Shirley Porter	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Do not lump E SFV with flatlands. Sunland is aligned with cities East, in foothills, closer in economic interest, and concerns of environment, should remain foothill, not flatland
4langeles_20110715_35e	7152011	Laura Molina	no		West Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	W Lancaster (22nd CD) should not be seperated from LA County. Divide should be N of ave A, E of Sierra Highway ecoomically this area is Antelope Valley and should stay in CD with rest of LA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_30e		Hawthorne, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Hermosa, Manhattan, El Segundo		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_31e		Hawthorne, Manahattan beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_32e		Mt Baldy, Foothills, Upland, Claremont, Rancho Cucamonga	County line	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_33e			Plymouth, Western	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_34e		Sunland, SFV		no	yes		economic interest
4langeles_20110715_35e	Los Angeles	Lancaster, Antelope Valley	Avenue A, Sierra Highway	no	yes		economically and locally Antelope Valley

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_30e	together during riots, CVS, water, doctors, family, stores, restuarants, carnival, parades.		no				
4langeles_20110715_31e	businesses, camp, dinner, shopping, activities, beaches		no				
4langeles_20110715_32e	share school district, PO, town hall, events, pancakes, small town, neighbors, disasters.		no			E Sierra is hundreds of miles away	
4langeles_20110715_33e	same community, common ground		no			current line makes no sense	
4langeles_20110715_34e	environment, natural resources, representatives		no			not part of flatlands	
4langeles_20110715_35e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_36e	7152011	Judy Citrin	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Westchester and Inglewood should stay in same CD. Has more in common with Playa del Rey and El Segundo airport issues, multi-community interest. Not part of wealthy areas of Palos Verdes and Manhattan Beach
4langeles_20110715_37e	7152011	Jerry and Judy Suszczynski	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	Do not Eliminate Glendora, Azusa and Duarte from Foothill communities, always worked closely with San Dimas, La Verne and Claremont as sister cities. Add to foothill.
4langeles_20110715_38e	7152011	Jean Strauber, Chair of Education	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Encino in W SFV CD, boundaries are Victory blvd, Mulholland Dr, I-405, Lindley Ave. Put Calabasas and Agoura Hills in CD. Do not put with Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood
4langeles_20110715_39e	7152011	Kathy Moghimi-Patterson	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Encino in W SFV CD, boundaries are Victory blvd, Mulholland Dr, I-405, Lindley Ave. Put Calabasas and Agoura Hills in CD. Do not put with Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood
4langeles_20110715_40e	7152011	Victoria Paul	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Glendora and Azuza, Duarte with foothills sister cities. Do not share common bonds socio-economically with Southern cities
4langeles_20110715_41e	7152011	Vlastislav Haman	no				yes	Glendora, Azusa, Duarte should be joined in AD with La Verne, San Dimas, Claremont, a lot in common and are foothill cities
4langeles_20110715_42e	7152011	Diana Nave	yes	NW San Pedro Neighborhood Council			yes	Do not divide NW San Pedro in two, have Western boundary follow City Boundary or Western Ave; consistency with Neighborhood Council, School District, city boundaries

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_36e		Westchester, Inglewood, Playa del Rey, El Segundo, Palos Verdes, Manhattan Beach		no	yes		airport issues,
4langeles_20110715_37e		Glendora, Azusa, Duarte, Foothills, San Dimas, La Verne, Claremont		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_38e		Encino, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood, SFV	Victory, Mulholland, I-405, Lindley	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_39e		Encino, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood, SFV	Victory, Mulholland, I-405, Lindley	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_40e		Glendora, Azusa, Duarte, Foothills		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_41e		Glendora, Azusa, Duarte, La Verne, San Dimas, Claremont		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_42e		San Pedro	City Boundary, Western Ave	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_36e	multi-community COI		no			not wealthy areas of Palos Verdes, Manhattan Beach	
4langeles_20110715_37e	sister cities, worked closely together		no				
4langeles_20110715_38e	valley communities		no			do not hand over control to Bel Air, etc	
4langeles_20110715_39e	valley communities		no			do not hand over control to Bel Air, etc	
4langeles_20110715_40e	sister cities		no			do not share bonds to the south	
4langeles_20110715_41e	a lot in common, foothills		no				
4langeles_20110715_42e	neighborhood council, school district, city boundary		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_43e	7152011	Mark Nestor	no		Burbank	Los Angeles	yes	Pair Burbank with North Hollywood, Studio City, Hollywood is an entertainment oriented city. Traffic goes in and out of Burbank and none goes toward Glendale or Pasadena. All traffic is going west. Burbank residents work in Beverly Hills, not Glendale
4langeles_20110715_44e	7152011	F. Milton Condon	no		Marina del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Do not take Marina del Rey, Venice out of coastal district. Many issues and problems which are unique and should not be joined with inland communities
4langeles_20110715_45e	7152011	Marie Whittington	no		La Habra	Los Angeles	yes	Do not take La Habra out of OC SD and AD. Are OC city, have own issues. Are not LA county, range of hills seperates.
4langeles_20110715_46e	7152011	Joy Bliss	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is in South Bay, should be in 36th CD and 53 AD, do not have anything in common with Compton, Inglewood, Athens, South L.A. South Bay children, shopping.
4langeles_20110715_47e	7152011	Andrew Murr	no			Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Hancock ParkWindsor Square in two unified since 1910s. Proposed line of Plymouth would divide Wilshire, use Western Ave instead so can be represented by one Congressperson, one Assembly member
4langeles_20110715_48e	7152011	Ashley Roddan and Drew Roddan	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne as a South Bay city share doctors, dining, parks, in Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes, El Segundo
4langeles_20110715_49e	7152011	James O Grady, President	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Incorporate Hawthorne with other South Bay cities, dramatic shift in demographics, young families, housing developments, businesses, SpaceX, aerospace, engineering community.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_43e		Burbank, Hollywood, Studio City, North Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Glendale, Pasadena	Barbam pass	no	yes		entertainment industry, employment
4langeles_20110715_44e		Marina del Rey, Venice		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_45e	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra	range of hills	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_46e		Hawthorne, South Bay, Inglewood, Torrance, Redondo, Compton, Athens, South LA		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_47e		Hancock Park, Windsor Square	Plymouth, Western	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_48e		Hawthorne, South Bay, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes, Redondo, Hermosa		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_49e		Hawthorne, South Bay, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach		no	yes		aerospace, housing developments, SpaceX, Hotels, engineering

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_43e	traffic, airport		no			Do not work in or drive to Glendale, Pasadena	
4langeles_20110715_44e	coastal, issues, problems		no			do not join with inland communities	
4langeles_20110715_45e	identity, issues, unique,		no			range of hills, issues, seperates from LA county	
4langeles_20110715_46e	living, shopping		no			nothing in common with Compton, etc	
4langeles_20110715_47e	together since 1910s		no				
4langeles_20110715_48e	shopping, parks, malls, doctors		no				
4langeles_20110715_49e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_50e	7152011	Letitia Quinn	no				yes	We like Venice and Marina del rey districts the way they are, oppose redistricting in any form
4langeles_20110715_51e	7152011	Laura Silagi	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Venice and Beach cities should be represented by one congressperson. Shares concerns with Santa Monica Bay communities. Venice works on issues through neighborhood council and would be difficult to be represented by more than one rep.
4langeles_20110715_52e	7152011	Tom Haney	no		Santa Monica Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Monica Bay must remain with Coastal communities in SD and AD, issues are different than those of inland cities
4langeles_20110715_53e	7152011	Robert Bookman	no		Hancock Park	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Wilshire in half at Plymouth, use Western ave. Century old community of 50,000 residents.
4langeles_20110715_54e	7152011	Amy R. Forbes	no		Windor Square	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Windsor Square and Hancock park in two at Plymouth. Line should be Western, as neighborhoods are one district and should be represented bby same people.
4langeles_20110715_55e	7152011	Garbis Der-Yeghiayan, President	yes	Mashdots College	Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Support new visualization which keep Armenian communities in Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena as one voting block. Keep Glendale in one CD, including Burbank, Foothills of Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada, Western Pasadena, Altadena

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_50e		Venice, Marina del Rey		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_51e		Venice, Santa Monica Bay, Beach cities		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_52e		Santa Monica Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_53e		Wilshire,	Plymouth, Western ave	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_54e		Wilshire, Windor Square, Hancock Park	Plymouth, Western ave	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110715_55e		Glendale, Burbank, Foothills of Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada, Western Pasadena, Altadena		no	yes	Armenian communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_50e			no				
4langeles_20110715_51e	Neighborhood Council, concerns,		no				
4langeles_20110715_52e	issues with coastal communities		no			different from inland cities	
4langeles_20110715_53e	century old community		no				
4langeles_20110715_54e	historic neighborhoods, for more than a century		no				
4langeles_20110715_55e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_56e	7152011	Joe Halper	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Include entire City of Santa Monica, Brentwood, in COI with Pacific Palisades SD. Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Malibu, Topanga, Agoura Hills, Calabasas have COI with Santa Monica; health, hospital, commercial, entertainment services. Remove Simi Valley
4langeles_20110715_57e	7152011	Patrick Frank	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Venice in two at California Street for AD. Do not have Abbot Kinney represented by different Assembly members. Keep Venice whole
4langeles_20110715_58e	7152011	Marge Nichols	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Version 1 map is better for Pasadena area. Keeps Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre together, comunities with similar interests. Work from Version 1
4langeles_20110715_59e	7152011	Karine Armen	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Supports july 14th Congressional visualization which keeps Armenian communities in Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena in one voting block
4langeles_20110715_60e	7152011	Alfred Mendoza	no				yes	Montebello should be in district North of LAPRW. More SGV than gateway Cities or SE cities. Rarely go to montebello for entertainment, shopping, dinin. Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington park are COI, as recognized by CACA proposed map for 27th district
4langeles_20110715_61e	7152011	Tony Ruiz	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be in South Bay CD, vital community relationships work, aerospace, shopping, restaurants, doctors in El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo, Segundo, Torrance

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_56e		Santa Monica, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades, Topanga, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Simi Valley		no	yes		commericial services
4langeles_20110715_57e		Venice	California st. Abbott Kinney	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_58e		Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre		no	yes	similar interests	
4langeles_20110715_59e		Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena		no	yes	armenian communities	
4langeles_20110715_60e		Montebello, San Gabriel Valley, Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington Park		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_61e		Hawthorne, South Bay, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance		no	yes		aerospace, work

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_56e	health, hospital, entertainment services, gateway to LA		no			no COI with Simi Valley	
4langeles_20110715_57e			no				what are you guys smoking
4langeles_20110715_58e			no				
4langeles_20110715_59e			no				
4langeles_20110715_60e			no			rarely go to Montebello	
4langeles_20110715_61e	shopping, restaurants, doctors		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_62e	7152011	Richard Bloom, Mayor	yes	City of Santa Monica	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Entire city of Santa Monica, with Malibu, adjacent cities and communities within Santa Monica Mountains, Brentwood and Pacific Palisades should all be included in same SD historic institutions, political history, think tanks, beach, pier, school district
4langeles_20110715_63e	7152011	Bobbiejean Anderson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not go east in 48th AD have USC as hub, do not draw into LA county as if communities are not worthy of being together. Share football, movies, parks. New map denies southern part of district in W part of city exists
4langeles_20110715_64e	7152011	Bobbiejean Anderson	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Torrance has never been connected to Inglewood and should be connected to beach cities in 35th CD. Do not share COI. Would cut out African American strongholds of political power.
4langeles_20110715_65e	7152011	Rafael Aguirre,	yes	U.S. Tow Inc	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not remove Hawthorne from South Bay Community police garage, lunches, equipment, family hood. Can count on El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Gardena. South Central may shun Hawthorne.
4langeles_20110715_66e	7152011	Ben Alvillar	no				yes	Santa Ana and flatlands Anaheim should remain in one CD. Ignoring this puts in violation of VRA. Leave two areas together
4langeles_20110715_67e	7152011	Debbie Wastling	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne belongs with South Bay not central LA freeways in south bay, shop in torrance, banks in Redondo Beach, never north, taxes paid to district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_62e		Santa Monica, Malibu, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		historic institutions, political history, think tanks, beach, pier, school district
4langeles_20110715_63e	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes	multi-cultural	USC
4langeles_20110715_64e		Torrance, Inglewood		no	yes	african american population	
4langeles_20110715_65e		Hawthorne, South Bay, El Segundo, Redondo Beach, Gardena, South Central		no	yes		police garage,
4langeles_20110715_66e		Santa Ana, Anaheim		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_67e		Hawthorne, South Bay, LA, Torrance, Redondo Beach	Rosecrans 405	no	yes		work, banks, businesses

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_62e			no			should not be with communities that share little in common	
4langeles_20110715_63e	football, parks, movies		no				
4langeles_20110715_64e	always more with beach cities		no			no COI between Torrance, Inglewood	
4langeles_20110715_65e	parks,recreation, equipment, family hood		no			cannot count on South Central	
4langeles_20110715_66e		ignoring input puts in violation of VRA	no				
4langeles_20110715_67e	schools, freeways		no			never go North	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_68e	7152011	O Dell Johnson	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne with South Bay. Work in El Segundo, shopping in Torrannce, neighborhoods, festivals. Does not go to South Central, would cause rift in community.
4langeles_20110715_69e	7152011	Donna Hoebink, Voter	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is part of South Bay, not South Central. Location is closer to Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, El Segundo, Lawndale, than Athens, Etc.
4langeles_20110715_70e	7152011	Jason Levin	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village in two. Redraw line to follow 170 freeway and keep stakeholders in one CD
4langeles_20110715_71e	7152011	Sarah Daniels	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is South Bay, not South Central, everything we do is in Southbay. Will lose value to homes, 3 milees to beach, most of stores in Hawthorne are Southbay.
4langeles_20110715_72e	7152011	Larry Cooper	no				yes	Corridor from Malibu to Palos Verdes Peninsula is not COI. Keep South Bay together, redondo Beach, Torrance, El Segundo have more in common than part of Redondo and Malibu
4langeles_20110715_73e	7152011	Rex Richardson	no		Long Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Support putting N Long Beach in Same CD and SD as Carson, Rancho Dominguez and Compton. Place all N Long Beach into same AD with Carson, etc, not Lakewood, Paramount, would unify COI of African Americans, Latinos ,etc
4langeles_20110715_74e	7152011	Anthony Braswell, President	yes	Valley Village Neighbborhood Council	Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Valley Village into two CDs, redraw line along 170 fwy to incorporate all stakeholders into one CD.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_68e		Hawthorne, South Bay, El Segundo, Torrance, South Central		yes	yes		work
4langeles_20110715_69e		Hawthorne, South Bay, South Central, El Segundo, Lawndale, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_70e		Valley Village	170	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_71e		Hawthorne, South Bay, South Central		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_72e		Malibu, Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, South Bay, Torrance, El Segundo		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_73e		Long Beach, Carson, Rancho Dominguez, Compton, Lakewood Paramount	San Antonio Dr.	no	yes	African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders,	CSU, colleges
4langeles_20110715_74e		Valley Village	170 freeway	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_68e	shopping, festivals, activities,		no			never go to South Central	
4langeles_20110715_69e	right next door		no			Athens, South Cental further away	
4langeles_20110715_70e			no				
4langeles_20110715_71e	beach, neighbors, stores		no			not south central	
4langeles_20110715_72e	South Bay community		no			no COI in long, skinny corridor	
4langeles_20110715_73e	Compton center communities, historic communities		no			not Lakewood, paramount	
4langeles_20110715_74e	community		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_75e	7152011	Judith Mintz	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in CD, is heart of South Bay. Do not exclude North Redondo. Current maps annihilate COI. Nothing to do with Beverly Hills or Santa Monica. Remove North end and replace with Torrance, San Pedro, Gardena. Put El Segundo back in AD
4langeles_20110715_76e	7152011	Jefferey C. Walker	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Change CD map, do not divide Valley Village, keep in one district, follow 170 Freeway.
4langeles_20110715_77e	7152011	Michael Gregory	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Change dividing line for Valley Village from Colfax to 170. Do not move part of community to another CD.
4langeles_20110715_78e	7152011	Christine Vinquist	no		Westchester- Playa del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester-Playa del Rey together, do not put with inland district. Have common Neighborhod Council, businesses, schools, churches, service orgs, housing issues, transportation
4langeles_20110715_79e	7152011	Linda Burgess	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Venice up into two or more districts unique community of artists, professionals, families, non professionals, lifestyle. Opposed to having more than one Congressional Leader.
4langeles_20110715_80e	7152011	Steve Ajalat	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to 170 freeway to keep stakeholders in one CD
4langeles_20110715_81e	7152011	J.L. Neal	no				yes	San Gabriel Mtn Foothills should not be divided from Duarte, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Claremont. Have helped each other for decades.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_75e		Torrance, Redondo Beach, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, San Pedro, Gardena, El Segundo		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_76e		Valley Village	170 Freeway	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_77e		Valley Village	170	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_78e		Westchester, Playa del Rey		no	yes		business service area
4langeles_20110715_79e		Venice		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_80e		Valley Village	170	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_81e		San Gabriel Foothills, Duarte, Azusa, Glendora, La Verne, San Dimas, Claremont		no	yes		worked together for decades

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_75e	heart of South Bay, beach cities, socio-demographic concerns		no			AD is physically untraversable	
4langeles_20110715_76e			no				
4langeles_20110715_77e			no				
4langeles_20110715_78e	Neighborhood Council, schools, churches, service organizations, housing isisues		no			do not put with inland district	
4langeles_20110715_79e	unified voice and lifestyle, artists, families, professionals		no				
4langeles_20110715_80e			no				
4langeles_20110715_81e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_82e	7152011	Ofelia Gomez	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not cut coast of Santa Monica Bay into three districts. By including large portion of inland area, you reduce coastal priorities, evironment. Do not add Inglewood. Share issues of planning, zoning, clean water, maintenance, tsunami and earthquakes
4langeles_20110715_83e	7152011	Eric Andrist	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Valley Village, move boundary back to 170 fwy to keep community together
4langeles_20110715_84e	7152011	James Peace	no		North Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep north Hollywood with Valley Village, Toluca Lake, Studio City sister cities. Do not put NoHo Arts district with Pacoima, Panorama City, Sun valley
4langeles_20110715_85e	7152011	Jean Jeunet	no		North Hollywood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep North Hollywood 91601 with 91602 and 91607. Part of N Hollywood core, not West Valley and seperating would do more harm than good.
4langeles_20110715_86e	7152011	Adela Reneria	no				yes	North Hollywood has closer ties to Toluca Lake and should not be seperated, same Valley Village. Not West Valley. Toluca Lake is E of N Hollywood.
4langeles_20110715_87e	7152011	Sue Herbers	no				yes	Torrance should not be divided because of Beach Access, would leave small area underserved.
4langeles_20110715_88e	7152011	Vanessa Safoyen	no				yes	Follow COI testimony, keep SCV whole in East Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD
4langeles_20110715_89e	7152011	Scott Wilk	no				yes	Reject division of SCV into two Senate seats, where one goes to Victorville, Keep Undivided SCV linked to E Ventura

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_82e		South Bay, Santa Monica Bay, LA, Inglewood		no	yes		planning, zoning, clean water, maintenance, tsunami and earthquakes
4langeles_20110715_83e		Valley Village	170	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_84e		Hollywood, Valley Village, Toluca Lake, Studio City, Pacoima, Panorama City, Sun Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_85e		Hollywood, West Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_86e		N Hollywood, Toluca Lake, West Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_87e		Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_88e	Ventura,	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_89e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Victorville		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_82e	environment		no			makes no sense to add Inglewood	
4langeles_20110715_83e	natural boundary line		no				
4langeles_20110715_84e	Arts district		no			countering neighborhoods	
4langeles_20110715_85e	N Hollywood core		no			not part of West Valley	
4langeles_20110715_86e	closer ties		no			not West valley	
4langeles_20110715_87e	small area		no			would leave small area underserved	
4langeles_20110715_88e			no				
4langeles_20110715_89e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_90e	7152011	Connie Hafner Edwards	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, follow 170 freeway so area has one rep
4langeles_20110715_91e	7152011	Tim Goodrich	no				yes	Keep Torrance with Beach cities, similar in many ways, more in common than Inglewood, Hawthorne
4langeles_20110715_92e	7152011	Joe Messina	no				yes	Follow COI testimony, keep SCV whole in East Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD
4langeles_20110715_93e	7152011	Alice Khosravy	no				yes	Follow COI testimony, keep SCV whole in East Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD
4langeles_20110715_94e	7152011	Laura Craig	no				yes	Do not divide Valley Village in 2 districts, border should be 170 fwy
4langeles_20110715_95e	7152011	Ron Atlas	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should not be lumped in with S LA in CD. More aligned with South Bay, Lawndale share schools in south bay CD, not anywhere near other area.
4langeles_20110715_96e	7152011	Jonathan Joseph Ha nousek	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Support Changed to maps by Greater Wilshire Neighbors. Keep neighbborhoods intact, do not divide in half. Shift borders to Western ave and La Brea ave
4langeles_20110715_97e	7152011	Marjorie J. Miller, Clifford L. Howell	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Oppose seperation of Windsor Square at Plymouth blvd. Historic neighborhood, GWNC, should not be in area with no connection. Should remain intact.
4langeles_20110715_98e	7152011	Paul Balaschak	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is in South Bay, proximity to beach, do not remove, keep in South Bay
4langeles_20110715_99e	7152011	Steven A Ochoa, National Redistricting Coordinator	yes	MALDEF	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Revised MALDEF congressional plan, significant input from Unity map partners AARC, APALC. Gibson-Dunns interpretation of section 2 of VRA.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_90e		Valley Village	170	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_91e		Torrance, Beach Cities, Inglewood, Hawthorne		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_92e	Ventura	SCV		no	yes	testimony	
4langeles_20110715_93e	Ventura	SCV		no	yes	testimony	
4langeles_20110715_94e		Valley Village	170	no	no		
4langeles_20110715_95e		Hawthorne, LA, South Bay, El Segundo, Lawndale		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_96e		Wilshire,	Western ave, La brea	yes	yes	historic neighborhoods	
4langeles_20110715_97e		Windsor square	Plymouth blvd	yes	yes	historic neighborhoods	
4langeles_20110715_98e		Hawthorne, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_99e				no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_90e	one representative		no				
4langeles_20110715_91e	much in common, similar		no				
4langeles_20110715_92e			no				
4langeles_20110715_93e			no				
4langeles_20110715_94e			no				
4langeles_20110715_95e	schools, South Bay		no			not associated with LA	
4langeles_20110715_96e			no				
4langeles_20110715_97e			no			should not be in area with no community connection	
4langeles_20110715_98e	affordable homes, proximity to beach, identity		no				
4langeles_20110715_99e		interpretation of section 2 of VRA	no				map attached

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_100e	7152011	Barbara S. Stone, Ph.D	no		Whittier	Los Angeles	yes	Produce AD that combines COI of Whittier, La Mirada, La Habra Heights, La habra, as well as CD of SE LA County cities in one entity. Whittier has nothing in common with La Puente, or East LA. Trash everything you have done after July 2, focus on COIs
4langeles_20110715_101e	7152011	Margaret Granado	no				no	Montebello should be in district North of LAPRW. More SGV than gateway Cities or SE cities. Rarely go to montebello for entertainment, shopping, dinin. Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington park are COI, as recognized by CACA proposed map for 27th district
4langeles_20110715_102e	7152011	Dawson Family	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not change district that Hawthorne is in, everything we do is in Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, live, work, shopping, movies, doctors, dentists. No association with other areas
supporters_antelope_20110715_1e	7152011	Holly Hopkins	yes	Exit Realty SCV			yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale toegether in N LA County with E Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino SD. First draft was excellent
supporters_antelope_20110715_2e	7152011	Marian Allen, GRI	yes	Keller Williams Realty A.V.	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale toegether in N LA County with E Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino SD. First draft was excellent
supporters_antelope_20110715_3e	7152011	Marvin Himlin, GRI	yes	Himlin Realty and Investments	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Lancaster and Palmdale toegether in N LA County with E Kern and Victor Valley cities in San Bernardino SD. First draft was excellent

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_100e		Whittier, La Mirada, La Habra Heights, La habra, LA, La Puente		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_101e		Montebello, San Gabriel Valley, Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington Park		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_102e		Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach		no	yes		live, work
supporters_antelope_20110715_1e	LA, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110715_2e	LA, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		
supporters_antelope_20110715_3e	LA, Kern, San Bernardino	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_100e			no			nothing in common with East LA or La Puente	
4langeles_20110715_101e			no			rarely go to Montebello	
4langeles_20110715_102e	shopping, movies, doctors		no			no association with other area	
supporters_antelope_20110715_1e	High Desert communities		no				
supporters_antelope_20110715_2e	High Desert communities		no				
supporters_antelope_20110715_3e	High Desert communities		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_1e	7152011	Dick Hamilton	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_2e	7152011	Pauline Yaralian	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_3e	7152011	David Mandel	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_4e	7152011	Barbara MacDonald, Property Specialist	yes	ColdWell Banker Residential	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_1e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_2e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_3e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_4e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_1e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_2e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_3e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_4e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_5e	7152011	Stanley Isaacs	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_6e	7152011	Katie Jones-Badami	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_7e	7152011	Frank Badami	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_8e	7152011	Suzanne Chase	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_9e	7152011	Suzanne Chase	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Windsor Square is absolute area from Arden to Irving, Western. Do not belong to East in any way. Look at the demographics

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_5e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_6e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_7e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_8e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_9e		Windsor Square	Arden, Irving, Western	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_5e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_6e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_7e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_8e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_9e	residential associations		no			do not belong East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_10e	7152011	Owen Smith	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_11e	7152011	Thomas N. Specker, Principal	yes	Lee and Associates	Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_12e	7152011	June and Paul Bilgore	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_13e	7152011	Gabriella Choussy	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_10e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_11e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_12e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_13e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_10e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_11e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_12e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_13e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_14e	7152011	Drlrb	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_15e	7152011	Renee Rousselot	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_16e	7152011	Stephanie Striegel	yes	Identity Films	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_17e	7152011	Margaret Giffen	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_14e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_15e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_16e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_17e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_14e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_15e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_16e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_17e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_18e	7152011		no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_19e	7152011	Rebel Roy Steiner, Jr, Partner	yes	Loeb and Loeb	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_20e	7152011	Gerry and Sylvia Stickells	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_21e	7152011	Jill Remez	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_18e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_19e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_20e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_21e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_18e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_19e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_20e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_21e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_22e	7152011	Kira Meers and Chris Kuklinski	no		Windsor Square	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_23e	7152011	John Huntington	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_24e	7152011	Drs. Howie and Susan Mandel, Spencer Mandel, Mallory Mandel, Blanca Salonga-Reyes	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_25e	7152011	Kent Alterman	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_22e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_23e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_24e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_25e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_22e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_23e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_24e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_25e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_26e	7152011	Esther Spector Candace Anderson	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_27e	7152011	Dennis Smith	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_28e	7152011	Jack Humphreville	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_29e	7152011	Owen Smith	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_26e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_27e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_28e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_29e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_26e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_27e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_28e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_29e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_30e	7152011	Patricia Henry Yeomans	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_31e	7152011	Pamela Reed, Sandy Smolan	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_32e	7152011	Renee Mochkatel, Esq	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_33e	7152011	Judy Scheer	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_30e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_31e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_32e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_33e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_30e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_31e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_32e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_33e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_34e	7152011	Barbara MacDonald	yes	Coldwell Banker Residential	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_35e	7152011	Robert Scot Clifford	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_36e	7152011	Esther Spector	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_37e	7152011	Michael Avery CLU	yes	Muirfield Financial Group	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_34e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_35e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_36e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_37e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_34e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_35e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_36e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_37e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_38e	7152011	Kathleen Smalley	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_39e	7152011	Sunita Param-Olazabal	yes	SendOutCards	Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_40e	7152011	Ben Tysch	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_41e	7152011	Arianna Eisenberg	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_38e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea AvePlymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_39e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_40e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea AvePlymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_41e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_38e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_39e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_40e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_41e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_42e	7152011	Robert G. Badal	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_43e	7152011	Graciela Schulze	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_44e	7152011	John Welborne	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_45e	7152011	Renee Rousselot	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_42e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_43e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_44e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_45e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_42e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_43e	residential associations		no			no COI with Eastno COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_44e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_45e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110715_46e	7152011	Nick and Marlene Shammas	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110715_47e	7152011	Serena and Gary Duff	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
4langeles_20110715_49e	7152011	Patrice L. Howard - Broker	yes	1st property Real Estate	Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Palmdale and Lancaster as part of Antelope Valley in North County with Kern and Victor Valley cities of San Bernardino in same Senate District. First draft was excellent.
4langeles_20110715_18e	7152011	Diane Carlton	no				yes	Keep Palmdale and Lancaster as part of Antelope Valley in North County with Kern and Victor Valley cities of San Bernardino in same Senate District. First draft was excellent; face different constraints living in desert, aerospace, housing,
4langeles_20110715_19e	7152011	Manuel and Herminia Balba	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne should be moved from current district and into district with South BayBeach cities
4langeles_20110715_20e	7152011	Mason D. Rothort	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne with South Bay and Beach Cities, not Central LA. Communities meet at Manhattan, Redondo, Lawndale, Hawthorne; access points, shopping, school districts, postal, cleaners, fitness, community center

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110715_46e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_47e		Wilshire	Plymouth blvd, Western ave, La brea Ave	yes	yes	100 year history	
4langeles_20110715_49e	Kern, San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Palmdale, Lancaster, Antelope Valley, Victor Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_18e	Kern, San Bernardino, Los Angeles	Palmdale, Lancaster, Antelope Valley, Victor Valley		no	yes		aerospace, affordable housing, renewable energy
4langeles_20110715_19e		Hawthorne, South Bay Beach cities		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_20e	Los Angeles	Hawthorne, South Bay, Manhattan, Redondo		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110715_46e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110715_47e	residential associations		no			no COI with East	
4langeles_20110715_49e			no				
4langeles_20110715_18e	common resources and constraints		no				
4langeles_20110715_19e			no				
4langeles_20110715_20e	access points, shopping, school districts, postal, cleaners, fitness, community center		no			nothing in common with central LA	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110715_21e	7152011		no		Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Palmdale and Lancaster, do not place in district with reps we have nothing to do with
4langeles_20110715_22e	7152011	Shannon DeLong	yes	City of Downey	Downey	Los Angeles	yes	Keep City of Downey whole in new state and congressional legislative districts police and fire depts, water, parks, public transport, school district, newspaper
4langeles_20110715_23e	7152011	Heidi Maerker, CEO	yes	Herald Publications, Inc	Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not move Hawthorne out of South Bay home of the Beach Boys, newspapers, lots of history, Northrop Aircraft
4langeles_20110715_24e	7152011	Kathy Moghimi-Patterson, Rep at Large	yes	Encino Neighborhood Council	Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Encino in W SFV CD, boundaries are Victory blvd, Mulholland Dr, I-405, Lindley Ave. Put Calabasas and Agoura Hills in CD. Do not put with Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood
4langeles_20110715_25e	7152011	Jean Strauber (duplicate)	no		Encino	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Encino in W SFV CD, boundaries are Victory blvd, Mulholland Dr, I-405, Lindley Ave. Put Calabasas and Agoura Hills in CD. Do not put with Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood
supporters_gwnc_20110716_10e	7162011		no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_11e	7162011	Ruth Silveira	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110715_21e		Palmdale, Lancaster		no	no		
4langeles_20110715_22e	Los Angeles	Downey	Rio Hondo, San Gabriel rivers, i-5, I-710, 605, 105	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_23e		Hawthorne, South Bay, El Segundo		no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_24e		Encino, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood, SFV	Victory, Mulholland, I-405, Lindley	no	yes		
4langeles_20110715_25e		Encino, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Brentwood, SFV	Victory, Mulholland, I-405, Lindley	no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110716_10e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_11e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110715_21e			no				
4langeles_20110715_22e	police and fire depts, water, parks, public transport, school district, newspaper, COG		no			no COI with Inglewood , etc	
4langeles_20110715_23e	Beach Boys, newspapers, businesses, history		no				
4langeles_20110715_24e	valley communities		no			do not hand over control to Bel Air, etc	
4langeles_20110715_25e	valley communities		no			do not hand over control to Bel Air, etc	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_10e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_11e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110716_12e	7162011	Hilary Kimblin	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_13e	7162011	Abbi Waxman	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_14e	7162011	Susan Sazer	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_15e	7162011	Alan Platt	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110716_12e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_13e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_14e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	no	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_15e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110716_12e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_13e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_14e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_15e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110716_16e	7162011	John Scoles	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_17e	7162011	Samuel R. Tarica	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_18e	7162011	Jessica Gresham	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_19e	7162011	Matthew A	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_lhabra_20110716_1e	7162011	Randall J Rivera	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habra should not be in LA county district,should be placed with other N Orange cities instead.
supporters_vvillage_20110716_1e	7162011	Glenn Cote	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110716_16e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_17e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_18e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_19e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_lhabra_20110716_1e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_1e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110716_16e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_17e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_18e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_19e			no				
supporters_lhabra_20110716_1e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_1e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_vvillage_20110716_2e	7162011	Tracey K	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_3e	7162011	Lawrence Butler	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_4e	7162011	Abbe Murray-Cote	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_5e	7162011	Melanie Harrison Gragnani	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_6e	7162011	P.L. Smith	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_7e	7162011	Nickie Bryar	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_8e	7162011	Glenn Block	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_9e	7162011	Douglas Penty	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_10e	7162011	Judith E. Ames	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_11e	7162011	Melinda Johnson	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_12e	7162011	Michele Karpel	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_vvillage_20110716_2e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_3e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_4e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_5e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_6e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_7e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_8e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_9e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_10e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_11e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_12e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_vvillage_20110716_2e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_3e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_4e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_5e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_6e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_7e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_8e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_9e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_10e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_11e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_12e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_vvillage_20110716_13e	7162011	Freddie Goldberg	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_14e	7162011	Madelon Kranz	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_15e	7162011	Susan Kovinsky	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_16e	7162011	Lawrence Butler	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_17e	7162011	Tracy	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
supporters_vvillage_20110716_18e	7162011	Robert Ramsey	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD
3orange_20110716_5e	7162011	Terri Zarow	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra with other OC cities. Not part of LA County, different issues and concerns, needs will not be met in LA district.
3orange_20110716_6e	7162011	Larry	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not redistrict La Habra to LA, is in Orange County
3orange_20110716_7e	7162011	Scott R. Dutenhoefer	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Do not include Santa Ana with Orange in redistricting map. Santa Ana is large city, all urban, not like small town, rural, equestrian Orange. No COI. Orange should be with Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hills, Orange Park Acres.
3orange_20110716_8e	7162011	Leigh Ann Brannon	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Maintain proper representation of La Habra with Orange County Representatives. Reps from LA county know nothing of cities in Orange

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_vvillage_20110716_13e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_14e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_15e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_16e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_17e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110716_18e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		
3orange_20110716_5e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110716_6e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110716_7e	Orange	Orange, Santa Ana, Anaeim Hills, Tustin Hills, OPA, Garden Grove, Anaheim		no	yes	Hispanic community	
3orange_20110716_8e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_vvillage_20110716_13e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_14e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_15e			no			would cut off families that go to same school	
supporters_vvillage_20110716_16e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_17e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_18e			no				
3orange_20110716_5e	needs, representatives		no			different issues and concerns	
3orange_20110716_6e			no			orange not LA	
3orange_20110716_7e	churches, shopping, colleges		no			not dense urban areas like Santa Ana	
3orange_20110716_8e			no			reps from LA know nothing of Orange	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110716_9e	7162011	Claudio W. Gallegos	no				yes	Do not take Buena Park out of WSTAN SD and replace with La Habra. Tim shaw is trying to further carreer. Lines for OC AD and SD are terrific
3orange_20110716_10e	7162011	Susan Freeze	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	City council has been telling La Habra residents they will no longer be part of OC if paired with Whittier and South Bay cities. La habra has more in common with Whittier than Diamond Bar or even Brea and Fullerton
3orange_20110716_11e	7162011	Mary Jo Tezak	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habra needs to stay with OC cities. Putting with LA County will put us on bottom of list of meeting needs of education, safety, land use, tranport
3orange_20110716_12e	7162011	Judith S O Neill, Retired Educator	no			Orange	yes	Do not put La Habra with LA county. Worked hard to get out of LA. Will affect property values, lose out on educational and community resources.
3orange_20110716_13e	7162011	SRDCLU	no				yes	Do not include Santa Ana with Orange in redistricting map. Santa Ana is large city, all urban, not like small town, rural, equestrian Orange. No COI. Orange should be with Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hills, Orange Park Acres.
4langeles_20110716_1e	7162011	Melanie Gragnani	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village in two. Redraw line to follow 170 FWY to keep stakeholders in one CD
4langeles_20110716_2e	7162011	Steven Stokes	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village in two. Redraw line to follow 170 FWY to keep stakeholders in one CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110716_9e	Orange	Buena Park, La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110716_10e	Orange	La Habra, Whittier, Diamond Bar, Brea, Fullerton		no	yes		
3orange_20110716_11e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110716_12e	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110716_13e	Orange	Orange, Santa Ana, Anaeim Hills, Tustin Hills, OPA, Garden Grove, Anaheim		no	yes	Hispanic community	
4langeles_20110716_1e		Valley Village	170	no	no		
4langeles_20110716_2e		Valley Village	170	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110716_9e			no			Tim Shaw is trying to further own career	
3orange_20110716_10e	more in common with whittier		no			Tim shaw wants to run for Bob Huffs Senate seat	
3orange_20110716_11e	education, public safety, land use, transportation		no			will put us on bottom of list	
3orange_20110716_12e			no			affect property values, and lose out on educational resources	
3orange_20110716_13e	churches, shopping, colleges		no			not dense urban areas like Santa Ana	
4langeles_20110716_1e			no				see attached map
4langeles_20110716_2e			no				see attached map

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_3e	7162011	Alexander T. Harashevsky	no		Sunland	Los Angeles	yes	Keep in same voting district Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Cresenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank, for similar demographics and interests.
4langeles_20110716_4e	7162011	Albert Olson, Chair,	yes	Mar Vista Community Council Board of Directors	Mar Vista	Los Angeles	yes	Keep MVCC entirely in single CD, do not sever MVCC in SD and AD. Opposes splitting of any neighborhood of LA into different districts, respect geographic integrity of MVCC.
4langeles_20110716_5e	7162011	Chad Jones	no		Granada Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up San Fernando Valley, keep in own districts, common interests development, Transportation, housing, funding, 405 widening, VPAC.
4langeles_20110716_6e	7162011	Tom Houg	no		South Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Pasadena intact in CD, disconnect remote Eastern cities like La Verne, Claremont. AD Make Arcadia part of district, not San Dimas, Upland. SD Include Alhambra, Temple City, San Gabriel before attaching eastern cities.
4langeles_20110716_7e	7162011	Connye Thomas	no			Los Angeles	yes	What is diversity ratio among beach residents? What is diversity ratio for ethnicity pockets when compared to other districts? What about districts with industrial base compares to other areas with little industry or employment?

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_3e		Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Cresenta, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, Glendale, Burbank		no	yes		Income, housing, transport, colleges, 210 Freeway
4langeles_20110716_4e		Mar Vista		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_5e		San Fernando Valley		no	yes		development, housing
4langeles_20110716_6e		Pasadena, Alhambra, Temple City, San Gabriel, La Verne, Claremont, South Pasadena, San Dimas, Upland, San Marino, Arcadia		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_7e				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_3e	Historic Preservation, Environment, Open Space, Rim of Valley, Angeles NF, SG Mountains, Verdugo Hills, Wildlife, Watershed, Hiking, Trails, education, medical, shopping, jobs, entertainment		no			little in common with mid-Valley flatland area	
4langeles_20110716_4e	geographical integrity		no				
4langeles_20110716_5e	transportation, PAC		no			would be difficult for officials to champin particular interests	
4langeles_20110716_6e	contiguous,	VRA is not intended to establish affirmative action style racial preferences	no			unrelated Eastern cities	
4langeles_20110716_7e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_8e	7162011	Joseph T. Edmiston, FAICP	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Exclude NW LA County area north of 118 Fwy and along I-5. Splitting Santa Clarita and Stevenson ranch does not make sense, residents do not want to be excluded from SCV. EVENT SD should include malibu, Pacific Palisades, SM, SMM W of 405 fwy
4langeles_20110716_9e	7162011	Ted Grose	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Do not Include LAX in Inglewood District lines airport is part of Beach cities. AirportWestchester are not part of Inglewood, are contiguous community with Playa del Rey because schools, traffic patters run NS, business, community issues, grants
4langeles_20110716_10e	7162011	Linda R. Cowan	no				yes	Gwnc cut in half
4langeles_20110716_11e	7162011	Damian Carroll	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Supports Valley Industry And Commerce proposal for redistricting San Fernando Valley area COI with common geography, commercial, cultural features. Do not split into multiple districts. Incorporate parts of East Ventura county if necessary
4langeles_20110716_12e	7162011	Judy Reidel	no		Gramercy Place	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Wilshire at Plymouth but at Western ave. keep historic district together.
4langeles_20110716_13e	7162011	Michiko Baltazar	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not exclude Hawthorne from South Bay District. Would be disastrous for image, property values. Share businesses, doctors, markets, malls, entertainment, restaurants,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_8e	Los Angeles	Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica, Mountains	405 ,118, I-5	no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_9e		Inglewood, Westchester, Playa del Rey, Marina		no	yes		LAX
4langeles_20110716_10e				no	no		
4langeles_20110716_11e	Ventura	San Fernando Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_12e		Wilshire	Plymouth, Western Ave	no	yes	historic district	
4langeles_20110716_13e		Hawthorne, South Bay		no	yes		businesses

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_8e	school district, PCH corridor, brush fire issues, common issues, parks		no			Santa Clarita does not share COI with Topanga	
4langeles_20110716_9e	traffic, schools, beach cities		no			not part of Ingle wood, business is different, community issues are not shared, gerrymandering	
4langeles_20110716_10e			no				
4langeles_20110716_11e	geography, commercial, cultural features		no				
4langeles_20110716_12e			no				
4langeles_20110716_13e	doctors, markets, malls, entertainment, restaurants, etc.		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_14e	7162011	Brian Campbell, Councilman	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Include 36th CD boundaries to be E of South Bay coastal cities, toward 110 FWY, 405 FWY, and South of 91 FWY 110 is natural border, little in common with areas North of 91 and LAX, would make sense to connect with LA than Santa Monica, More connected E
4langeles_20110716_15e	7162011	Bob Gutierrez	no				yes	Take coastal areas out and Encino out of SD EVENT and put in all of Santa Clarita. Will fix coastal area and stop a city split.
4langeles_20110716_16e	7162011	Denny Schneider	yes	LAX Community Noise Roundtable			yes	LAX is part of Westchester-Playa Del Rey Community plan, major noise issues in El Segundo ans Westchester Playa del Rey
4langeles_20110716_17e	7162011	Chris Garcia	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Take coastal areas out and Encino out of SD EVENT and put in all of Santa Clarita. Will fix coastal area and stop a city split.
4langeles_20110716_18e	7162011	Meghry Chopurian, President, GCC ASA	yes	GCC ASA	Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Glendale. Map that excludes sections of Foothills, Burbank, Pasadena that have large concentrations of Armenians. Happy with option two which would keep Glendale together with surrounding areas with large Armenian populations. Adopt it.
4langeles_20110716_19e	7162011	Tauby Lynn Ross	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley together after redistricting. If additional areas need to be added, use E Ventura County, where I spend considerable time
4langeles_20110716_20e	7162011	Cyndi Hench, President	yes	Neighborhood Council of Westchester, Playa del Rey, Playa Vista	Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Westchester belongs with Coastal communities, esp. Playa del Rey and Playa Vista. Shares little with communities in East. Reach the correct and productive solution

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_14e		Torrance, Rancho Palos Verdes, South Bay, Los Angeles, Santa Monica	110, 91, 405	no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_15e		Malibu, Encino, Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_16e		Westchester, Playa del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_17e		Malibu, Encino, Simi Valley, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_18e		Glendale, Foothills, Burbank, Pasadena		no	yes	Large Armenian populations, community votes	
4langeles_20110716_19e	Ventura	San Fernando Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_20e		Westchester, Playa del Rey, Playa Vista		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_14e	110 border, transportation, business, commute		no			no COI with points further than Marina del Rey	
4langeles_20110716_15e			no			surrounding Malibu coastal areas are linked to coast, not Simi Valley	
4langeles_20110716_16e	LAX noise issues		no				
4langeles_20110716_17e			no			surrounding Malibu coastal areas are linked to coast, not Simi Valley	
4langeles_20110716_18e			no				
4langeles_20110716_19e	demographics		no				
4langeles_20110716_20e	coastal communities		no			little shared with communities to the East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_21e	7162011	Jay Werner	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not draw Valley Village into two separate CDs use 170 freeway, not Colfax AveRiverside; green community
4langeles_20110716_22e	7162011	Evan Chase	no				yes	Do not take Torrance and Lomita out of 36th district. Torrance is heart of community, Lomita is little brother. Keep COIs together with fairly regular shape, return to something similar to first map.
4langeles_20110716_23e	7162011	Roger Seaver	no				yes	July 9 visualization of E Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD divides COI into two SDs. Present a SD that keeps SCV whole
4langeles_20110716_24e	7162011	Matthew Hicks	no				yes	July 9 visualization of E Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD divides COI into two SDs. Present a SD that keeps SCV whole in single SD with E Ventura
4langeles_20110716_25e	7162011	Teri Knafla	no				yes	July 9 visualization of E Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD divides COI into two SDs. Present a SD that keeps SCV whole in single SD with E Ventura
4langeles_20110716_26e	7162011	Mark Horowitz	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Option 1.2 for CD is the worst. Will create a non-representative area around Redondo Beach. Choose an option that keeps beach areas of LA together, reflect reality of LA political thinking
4langeles_20110716_27e	7162011	Hunt Braly, VP	yes	Santa Clarita Chamber	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Have your consultants prepare the SD you have directed including entire Santa Clarita Valley and Eastern Ventura

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_21e		Valley Village	170 fwy, Colfax Ave, Riverside	no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_22e		Torrance, Lomita,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_23e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_24e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_25e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_26e	Los Angeles	Redondo Beach, LA, Beach areas		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_27e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_21e	great neighborhood, green community best voting		no				
4langeles_20110716_22e	regular shape, heart of community		no				
4langeles_20110716_23e			no				
4langeles_20110716_24e			no				
4langeles_20110716_25e			no				
4langeles_20110716_26e	political thinking		no			create area that is non-representative	
4langeles_20110716_27e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_28e	7162011	Judith Mintz	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	South Bay is own community, has nothing to do with Inglewood, Malibu, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills. Keep Torrance, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Lomita, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, WestchesterPlaya Del Rey together in all district
4langeles_20110716_29e	7162011	Judy Mintz	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Go back to 1st craft for South Bay; maintains COI.Keep Torrance, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Lomita, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, WestchesterPlaya Del Rey together
4langeles_20110716_30e	7162011	Carol Kiernan Convey	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Valley Village must include residents to 170 fwy; do not divide into two parts, keep in one CD share school inclusions, Neighborhood council reps, homeowner volunteers
4langeles_20110716_31e	7162011	Adele	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Change CD map boundary which divides Valley Village
4langeles_20110716_32e	7162011	Karen Saranita	no				yes	Congress LA opt 1.2 is most sensible district lines. Area has shared dependence on aerospace industry for tens of thousands of jobs.
4langeles_20110716_34e	7162011	Alvin J. Fletcher	no				yes	Beach Cities South of LAX have common interests and should be grouped together in various districts. Wrong to gerrymander 36th district to excluse PV Peninsula and include with Orange County

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_28e		South Bay, Inglewood, Malibu, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, Torrance, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan, El Segundo, WestchsterPlaya del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_29e		Torrance, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Lomita, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, WestchesterPlaya Del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_30e		Valley Village, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_31e		Valley Village		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_32e				no	yes		aerospace industry jobs
4langeles_20110716_34e	Orange	Beach Cities, PV Peninsula		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_28e	is its own community		no			nothing to do with Inglewood, etc	
4langeles_20110716_29e			no				
4langeles_20110716_30e	school inclusions, Neighborhood council reps, homeowner volunteers		no				
4langeles_20110716_31e			no				
4langeles_20110716_32e			no				
4langeles_20110716_34e	common interests		no			no COI with OC	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_36e	7162011	Holly Harpham	no				yes	July 8 visualization of Antelope ValleySCVNE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony. Connect SCV to East Ventura
4langeles_20110716_37e	7162011	Richard Fernandez	no				yes	July 8 visualization of Antelope ValleySCVNE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony. Connect SCV to East Ventura
4langeles_20110716_38e	7162011	Danielle Smith	no				yes	July 9 visualization of E Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD divides COI into two SDs. Present a SD that keeps SCV whole in single SD with E Ventura
4langeles_20110716_39e	7162011	Michael Goldeen	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	LA Congressional option 3 is the only one which will preserve integrity of San Pedro. Do not divide community between South Bay and Long Beach.
4langeles_20110716_40e	7162011	Nick Garzillil	no				yes	Keep South Bay together, do not split up. Is very different from rest of surrounding areas, deserves own district and representative
4langeles_20110716_41e	7162011	George Memmert	no		Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Silver Lake does not belong with East LA, is West of the river and very different socioeconomically. Belons with Los Feliz and Hollywood Hills share shopping, newspaper, outlook, schools. Must address in Assembly maps
4langeles_20110716_42e	7162011	William Chenault	no		Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Silver Lake with Glendale and Burbank, together for 40 years. Do not put Silver Lake in one district, Los Feliz in another. Atwater Village, E of LA river, is not in East LA district, but Silver Lake is, ironically. Respect natural boundaries

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_36e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes	connected in SD since 1982	
4langeles_20110716_37e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, SFV		no	yes	connected in SD since 1982	
4langeles_20110716_38e	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_39e		San Pedro, South Bay, Long Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_40e		South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_41e		Los Angeles, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills		no	yes	outlook	
4langeles_20110716_42e		Silver Lake, Glendale, Burbank, Los Feliz, Atwater Village	LA River	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_36e			no				
4langeles_20110716_37e			no				
4langeles_20110716_38e			no				
4langeles_20110716_39e	integrity of San Pedro		no			do not divide between South Bay and Long Beach	
4langeles_20110716_40e	different from rest of surrounding areas		no			different from rest of surrounding areas	
4langeles_20110716_41e	share shopping, newspaper, outlook, schools		no			West of River, very different socioeconomically from East LA	
4langeles_20110716_42e	connected for 40 years, natural boundaries		no			LA river boundary	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_43e	7162011	Gene McCarthy	no				yes	Keep Beach communities together. Include all four cities on Palos Verdes Peninsula, Torrance and Beach Cities.
4langeles_20110716_44e	7162011	Kristina Smith	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of San Pedro United when drawing district maps that affect my business and residence
4langeles_20110716_45e	7162011	Jaime Rojas Jr	no				yes	Overall alignment in 2nd draft including Koreatown and Downtown LA looks great, but exclusion of Echo Park from CD34 maks no sense. 2 FWY is natural border to the west and its definitely part of fabric of CD 34
4langeles_20110716_46e	7162011	Susan Picascia	no				yes	restore CD map for so Valley Village is preserved as single unit in district. Use Eastern boundary as 170 fwy, not Colfax Blvd as proposed
4langeles_20110716_47e	7162011	Joe Buscaino	no				yes	San Pedro should be in one CD, not two.
4langeles_20110716_48e	7162011	James R. Smith	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Proposed maps for 53th AD would cut Venice in two. Keep together. Venice is politically active, would falter if divided. 36th CD would lop off Oxford Triangle, part of Silver Triange, and Penmar District, which are part of Venice since 1905.
4langeles_20110716_49e	7162011	Dan Davids	no				yes	Boundary lines for 36th CD need to be drawn along city lines including Palos Verdes Peninsula Cities Palos Verdes Estates, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes. Carving district to eliminate cities in close proximity makes no sense.
4langeles_20110716_50e	7162011	Al Lay	no		Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Proposals for CA 36 are awful. Do not split Beach Cities in half with 405 as dividing line. South Bay has nothing to do with North End (Topanga, Calabasas).

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_43e		Palos Verdes Peninsula, Torrance, Beach Cities		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_44e		San Pedro		no	yes		businesses
4langeles_20110716_45e		Koreatown, Echo Park, LA,	2 freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_46e		Valley Village	170 fwy, Colfax Blvd	no	no		
4langeles_20110716_47e		San Pedro		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_48e		Venice	Oxford Triangle, Washington blvd, Venice blvd	yes	yes	part of Venice since 1905	
4langeles_20110716_49e		Palos Verdes Estates, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_50e		Beach Cities, South Bay, Topanga, Calabasas	405	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_43e			no				
4langeles_20110716_44e	residences		no				
4langeles_20110716_45e	Echo Park is part of fabric of CD		no				
4langeles_20110716_46e			no				
4langeles_20110716_47e			no				
4langeles_20110716_48e	linked politically, geographically, culturally, activism		no				
4langeles_20110716_49e	geographical proximity		no			do not exclude cities in districts	
4langeles_20110716_50e	peoples lives		no			South Bay has nothing to do with North End	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_51e	7162011		no				yes	Recent map of 35th CD is illogical and not geared toward cohesive African American Community. Torrance and Inglewood are strong communities with nothing in common. Would dissolve African American Political Influence
4langeles_20110716_52e	7162011	Stewart Oscars	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Venice as an entiry in one CD. Do not split up town into different districts.
4langeles_20110716_53e	7162011	Meyer Bendavid	no		San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley together as a whole district, please use district lines recommended by Vica.
4langeles_20110716_54e	7162011	Daniel Tamm	no		Van Nuys	Los Angeles	yes	Keep the San Fernando Vally intact. Districts that wander out of Valley make no sense. Geography of SFV is COI, also education, transportation, environment, business concerns, common problems. Keep SFV whole in AD, SD, CD.
4langeles_20110716_55e	7162011	Sherman Kadish	no		Sherman Oaks	Los Angeles	yes	Keeping San Fernando Valley together is important. Supporrts VICA maps. If they leave some districts too light in population, E Ventura is compatible
4langeles_20110716_56e	7162011	Resident of Littlerock	no		Littlerock	Los Angeles	yes	Littlerock should not be part of San Fernando Vally, keep East Kern and Victor Valley in same SD
4langeles_20110716_57e	7162011	Cecile Bendavid	no		San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley together as whole district. Use district recommended by VICA
4langeles_20110716_58e	7162011	Beverly Godwin	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not segregate Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire from current South Bay Congressional District, there is a strong attachment shopping, doctors, yacht club, tourism, business income. Different interests from Athens, Westmont, View Park, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_51e		Torrance, Inglewood		no	yes	African American Community	
4langeles_20110716_52e		Venice		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_53e		San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_54e		San Fernando Valley		no	yes		business concerns
4langeles_20110716_55e	Ventura	San Fernando Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_56e	Kern	San Fernando Valley, Victor Valley, Littlerock, Antelope Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_57e		San Fernando Valley		no	no		
4langeles_20110716_58e		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire, South Bay, Athens, Westmont, View Park		no	yes		tourism, business income

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_51e	political influence		no			Torrance and Inglewood have nothing in common	
4langeles_20110716_52e			no				
4langeles_20110716_53e			no				
4langeles_20110716_54e	Geography of SFV is COI, also education, transportation, environment, business concerns, common problem		no			districts that wander out of Valley make no sense	
4langeles_20110716_55e	contiguous		no				
4langeles_20110716_56e	way it has been		no			not part of SFV	
4langeles_20110716_57e			no				
4langeles_20110716_58e	shopping, doctors, yacht club,		no			different interests from Athens, etc	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_59e	7162011	Ruben Valdez	no				yes	Montebello should be in SD north of LAPRW. Is part of SGV rather than Gateway or SE cities. Rarely go to Montebello for entertainment, shopping, dining, recreation. Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington park are more similar, as shown in CACA Proposed 27th SD
4langeles_20110716_60e	7162011		no				yes	Montebello should be in SD north of LAPRW. Is part of SGV rather than Gateway or SE cities. Rarely go to Montebello for entertainment, shopping, dining, recreation. Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington park are more similar, as shown in CACA Proposed 27th SD
4langeles_20110716_61e	7162011	Kess Kessler	no		Woodland Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Keep San Fernando Valley COI together. Use VICA maps. If you need more people, use E Ventura, like Thousand Oaks, Westlake, makes sense
4langeles_20110716_62e	7162011	Thom G.P O Shaughnessy	no		Burbank	Los Angeles	yes	San Fernando Valley is its own COI. Is 13 of LA, linked to Ventura fwy to E Ventura. If additional population is needed for districts, use Thousand Oaks into E Ventura, Conejo Valley. Keep Burbank and Glendale in same districts share Airport, services
4langeles_20110716_63e	7162011	David Shapiro	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Topanga with adjacent communities in Santa Monica mountains. Do not connect with Kern County, community is tethered to coastal district, not inland weather, schools, shopping, work. Do not isolate community

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_59e		Montebello, San Gabriel Valley, Gateway, Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington Park		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_60e		Montebello, San Gabriel Valley, Gateway, Lynwood, South Gate, Huntington Park		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_61e	Ventura	San Fernando Valley, Thousand Oaks, Westlake		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_62e	Ventura	San Fernando Valley, Thousand Oaks, Glendale, Burbank	Ventura Fwy, 210 fwy	no	yes		business, airport
4langeles_20110716_63e	Kern	Topanga, Santa Monica Mountains, Malibu, Pacific Palisades		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_59e	similarities, geography		no			do not go to Montebello	
4langeles_20110716_60e	similarities, geography		no			do not go to Montebello	
4langeles_20110716_61e	Valley		no				
4langeles_20110716_62e	emergency services, leisure, freeway,		no				
4langeles_20110716_63e	weather, schools, shopping, work		no			not tethered inland	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_64e	7162011	Carol Kiernan Convey	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Valley Village must include residents up to 170 FWY in SFV of LA. Do not divide into two parts, keep in one CD thriving neighborhood, volunteers, schools, Neighborhood council, Homeowner Association. Do not split at Colfax
4langeles_20110716_65e	7162011	Jacques Brun	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not dissect Hawthorne out of South Bay district and into South Central LA. All economic ties are in South Bay banks, stores, doctors, services, church, PO in Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Lawndale
4langeles_20110716_66e	7162011	Carolyn Fowler	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne, Westchester, Inglewood, Lawndale, Gardena, ElSegundo and Playa Del Rey have no COI with Torrance and Carson. Common intersts LAX noise, SCAG, LMU programs, MTA, job training, Ballona Wetlands, diversity. Preserve communities.
4langeles_20110716_67e	7162011	Dana Haycock	no		Lancaster	Los Angeles	yes	Rethink 17th SD. Lancaster and Palmdale do not want unique communities of High Desert placed with Vally communities of SFV. Keep 17th CD the way it is now.
4langeles_20110716_68e	7162011	Levon Marashlian	no		La Crescenta	Los Angeles	yes	Adopt option 2 for Glendale Area. Do not divide into two districts, would dilute voting strength of Armenian American community. Include Foothills, Burbank, Pasadena, surrounding Armenian American concentrations. Choose option 2

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_64e		Valley Village	170 Fwy, Colfax	no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_65e		South Bay, LA, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Lawndale		no	yes		banks, stores, doctors, services, church, PO
4langeles_20110716_66e		Hawthorne, Westchester, Inglewood, Lawndale, Gardena, ElSegundo and Playa Del Rey, Torrance, Carson		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_67e		Lancaster, Palmdale, SFV		no	yes		
4langeles_20110716_68e		Glendale, Foothills, Burbank, Pasadena		no	yes	Armenian American concentration and voting strength	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_64e	thriving neighborhood, volunteers, schools, Neighborhood council, Homeowner Association.		no				
4langeles_20110716_65e			no			no economic ties	
4langeles_20110716_66e	LAX noise, SCAG, LMU programs, MTA, job training, Ballona Wetlands, diversity.		no			Torrance nor Carson have never been involved	
4langeles_20110716_67e	unique communities of High Desert		no			High Desert vs. Valley	
4langeles_20110716_68e	important concerns		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110716_69e	7162011	Ruben Hovhannisyan	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Encourage option 2 map. Do not split Glendale, or Sever GCC from rest of city. Heart of Armenian community. Keep churches, cultural centers, schools, collges, family together.
5ventura_20110716_1e	7162011	Tim Snipes	no				yes	Thank you for attention to EVENT SD, removing Malibu, including part of Santa Clarita. Remove surrounding coastal areas from district, and include entire city of Santa Clarita.
6stanislaus_20110716_1e	7162011	Connie Slusser	no		Turlock	Stanislaus	yes	Thank you for MRCED AD map from last week. Keep Turlock with N Modesto and areas East of HWY99, rather than in S Modesto or Ceres, so are able to sstay with communities like ours and address needs effectively. Do not make changes
6stanislaus_20110716_2e	7162011	Rosemary Fernandes	no		Escalon	Stanislaus	yes	Thank you for not changing MERCED AD map. Appreciates keeping Sierra communities and valley communities in different districts, hope this is final map
7sclara_20110716_1e	7162011	Ivonica A. Santas	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Joins Ash Kalra and other reps who endorsed Tri-Cities congressional plan which unites COIs in San Jose. Do not split into districts to make surrounding areas more blue
7sclara_20110716_2e	7162011	Richard Abarca	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	Put Richmond in with Contra Costa, San Ramon with Alameda County Valley down to Gilroy or optionally San Jose population, draws together minorities.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110716_69e		Glendale		no	yes	Armenian population	GCC
5ventura_20110716_1e		Santa Clarita, Malibu		no	no		
6stanislaus_20110716_1e	Modesto, Stanislaus, Ceres	Turlock	Highway 99	no	yes		work
6stanislaus_20110716_2e	Stanislaus	Escalon, Ceres		no	no		
7sclara_20110716_1e		San Jose		no	yes		
7sclara_20110716_2e	Contra Costa, Alameda	Richmond, San Ramon, Gilroy, San Jose		no	yes	Minority communities	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110716_69e	churches, cultural centers, schools, extended family		no				
5ventura_20110716_1e			no			coastal districts are inappropriate	
6stanislaus_20110716_1e	commuting, like communities		no			, not S Modesto or Ceres	
6stanislaus_20110716_2e			no			Sierra vs. valley	
7sclara_20110716_1e	unified representation		no				
7sclara_20110716_2e	population		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
7sclara_20110716_3e	7162011	Juan Estrada, President	yes	Lyndale Neighborhood Association	Lyndale	Santa Clara	yes	San Jose AD and SD maps discriminate against Latino community. Dilute political leadership in east San Jose. Maintain 23rd AD, 28th AD compact. 23rd and 28th Ads should be nested to form SD for COIs in Santa Clara, Monterey, San Benito income, poverty
7scruz_20110716_1e	7162011	Joseph Cosentino	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Disappointed in CD lines that will split Santa Cruz, split common interests. Realizes there is concern with diluting Latino voting power in monterey, bu that should be decide by a court, not a commission.
7scruz_20110716_2e	7162011	Anna Abend	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Santa Cruz should be kept whole small town in small county, no divisions
7scruz_20110716_3e	7162011	Stephen Hauskins	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz County, leave under one representative
7scruz_20110716_4e	7162011	Sarah J. Wilson, Editor	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Santa Cruz has little in common with cities over the hill rural v. urban, with different newspapers, school districts, cultures, etc. Set Upper boundary along HWY 35Skyline Blvd cohesive community
8alameda_20110716_1e	7162011	Debra Person	no			Alameda	yes	Tri-Cities needs to be represented as one, keep Fremont, Newark, Union City whole. Tri-City Map protects COIs in Fremont Newark, Union City. Do not ignore testimony, community activists
8alameda_20110716_2e	7162011	Jean Holmes	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont whole in one CD, and one AD, keep Tri cities together. Fremont is largest city in Southern Alameda. Use Visioning map, listen to citizens

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
7sclara_20110716_3e	Santa Clara, Monnterey, San Benito	San Jose		no	yes	Latino community and political leadership	income and poverty levels
7scruz_20110716_1e	Monterey	Santa Cruz		no	no		
7scruz_20110716_2e		Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110716_3e	Santa Cruz			no	no		
7scruz_20110716_4e	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	Highway 35Skyline Blvd	no	yes		
8alameda_20110716_1e		Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		
8alameda_20110716_2e	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
7sclara_20110716_3e	Latino population growth		no				
7scruz_20110716_1e			no			will do harm to Santa cruz, reduce to secondary status	
7scruz_20110716_2e	small town and county		no				
7scruz_20110716_3e			no				
7scruz_20110716_4e	more cohesive community, culture		no			little in common with Mountain View, Cupertino, etc, different newpapers, school districts, cultures	
8alameda_20110716_1e			no				
8alameda_20110716_2e	largest city in S Alameda		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110716_3e	7162011	Michelle Snowden	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Tri-Cities needs to be represented as one, keep Fremont, Newark, Union City whole. Tri-City Map protects COIs in Fremont Newark, Union City. Do not ignore testimony, community activists.
8alameda_20110716_4e	7162011	Ruel and Mavis Brown	no				yes	Tri-Cities needs to be represented as one, keep Fremont, Newark, Union City whole. Tri-City Map protects COIs in Fremont Newark, Union City. Do not ignore testimony, community activists.
8alameda_20110716_5e	7162011	Drag Dutina	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Tri-Cities, Fremont and Union city are truly a unit. Work, move together, behave as group. Why split up?
8alameda_20110716_6e	7162011		no				yes	Revisit plans until you find one that keeps Fremont intact for representation. To separate needs and goals of fourth largest city in Bay Area is travesty
8alameda_20110716_7e	7162011	Carol-Ann Koch-Weser	no		Fremont	Alameda	yes	Keep Tri-Cities of Fremont, Newark, Union City whole. Fremont is 4th largest city in Bay, needs to be represented as whole. Please listen to concerns of communities.
8alameda_20110716_8e	7162011	Richard Watters	no		Newark	Alameda	yes	You ignored Tri-City communities wishes for Tri-City CD and AD. Needs to be whole, keep Fremont, Newark, Union City whole. Tri Cities map protects COI.
8solano_20110716_1e	7162011	Christina Arrostuto	no		Vallejo	Solano	yes	Keep Vallejo and Benicia with more of Contra Costa County, are SF Bay area, not Sacramento residents have ethnic, water, tranport, economic interest in common with bay, not Solano. Ferry services, buses, BART, shopping, environment.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110716_3e	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		
8alameda_20110716_4e	Alameda	Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		
8alameda_20110716_5e		Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		
8alameda_20110716_6e		Fremont		no	yes		
8alameda_20110716_7e		Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		
8alameda_20110716_8e		Fremont, Newark, Union City		no	yes		
8solano_20110716_1e	Contra Costa, San Francisco, Solano	Vallejo and Benicia, San Francisco		no	yes	ethnic interests	economic interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110716_3e	community college, cultural events, special education studetns, SELPA		no				
8alameda_20110716_4e	represented as one, largest city in S Alameda		no				
8alameda_20110716_5e	move, work, behave as unit		no				
8alameda_20110716_6e	needs, goals, fourth largest in Bay Area		no				
8alameda_20110716_7e	4th largest city in bay, needs rep as whole		no				
8alameda_20110716_8e	4th largest city in bay, needs rep as whole		no				
8solano_20110716_1e	transportation, BART, water, shopping, environmental issues, ABAG, BCDC		no			not Sacramento Valley	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110716_2e	7162011	Susan Beeson	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_3e	7162011	Laura Foti Cohen	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_4e	7162011	Dena Bloom	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_5e	7162011	Staney Isaacs	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110716_2e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_3e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_4e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_5e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	Diversified in respect to race, religion, sexual preference	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110716_2e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_3e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_4e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_5e	shared values		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110716_6e	7162011	Ronald and Nancy Sakall	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_7e	7162011	Suzanne Chase	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_8e	7162011	Kathy Saldana	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_gwnc_20110716_9e	7162011	Frances Hoge	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
supporters_vvillage_20110716_19e	7162011	P.L. Smith	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110716_6e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_7e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_8e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_gwnc_20110716_9e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
supporters_vvillage_20110716_19e		Valley Village	170 Fwy	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110716_6e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_7e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_8e			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_9e			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110716_19e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9dnorte_20110716_1e	7162011	Wendy Bertrand	no				yes	Keep all communities along coast together in one district to steward use of coast. Does not matter rural or not, what maters is that political districts respect natural setting
9shasta_20110716_1e	7162011	Frank Janson	no			Shasta	yes	Shasta should be with Yuba district, I-5 community, North State, not Sacramento or El Dorado. Ad should include Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba. SD should be Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, etc. Tehama has nothing in common with Rancho Cordova.
9shasta_20110716_2e	7162011	Linda G. White	no			Shasta	yes	Objects to AD and SDs change from I-5 corridor, will compromise representation. Propose no change to district, needs well served in areas presently drawn
9yolo_20110716_1e	7162011	David Pratt	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Preserve COI in Yolo, Woodland, Davis, Winters, farmland in SD and AD. Please see if there is a better way to fix Vallejos community than to rip apart WoodlandDavisWinters COI
9yolo_20110716_2e	7162011	Jim Brewer	no			Yolo	yes	Do not re-draw SD and AD maps for Yolo County, is in oppostion to testimony, and in opposition to spirit of committee.
9yolo_20110716_3e	7162011	Joan M. Moses	no			Yolo	yes	Keep Yolo agricultural COI united not divided among several SD and Ads where ag interests would not be paramount. Recent maps fragment voice on local interests

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9dnorte_20110716_1e				no	no		
9shasta_20110716_1e	Shasta, Yuba, El Dorado, Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Siskiyou, Butte,	Rancho Cordova	I-5, 101, 395	no	yes		agricultural interests,
9shasta_20110716_2e			I-5 corridor	no	no		
9yolo_20110716_1e	Yolo	Vallejo, Woodland, Davis, Winters		no	yes		
9yolo_20110716_2e	Yolo			no	no		
9yolo_20110716_3e	Yolo			no	yes		agricultural interests

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9dnorte_20110716_1e			no				
9shasta_20110716_1e	traffic corridors.		no			keep away from nuts and dope smokers on the coast	
9shasta_20110716_2e			no				
9yolo_20110716_1e	farmland		no			breaking Vallejo from rural areas scrambled Yolo	
9yolo_20110716_2e			no				
9yolo_20110716_3e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9yolo_20110716_4e	7162011	Jean Jackman	no			Yolo	yes	Yolo County needs one voice, do not divide into 3 districts, needs strong ag voice and open space voice. Issues food, pollution, contamination, tranportation costs. Pay attention to wise public comments to keep Yolo whole and keep county seat in area.
9yolo_20110716_5e	7162011	Dick and Carol Holdstock	no			Yolo	yes	Do not divide Yolo county into 3 districts, keep united in one AD. Stay together.
9yolo_20110716_6e	7162011	Lynne Nittler	no			Yolo	yes	Keep County as whole as possible share open space, ag land, levee upkeep, water usage. Do not split up into nine representatives, no one will have time to pay attention to Yolo. Do not let votes lose effectiveness
9yolo_20110716_7e	7162011	Richard McAdam	no			Yolo	yes	Yolo needs to have one representative at each level of office. Important rural issues, water and land preservation. Dividing will weaken chances of keeping county resiliant as we strive to adapt to climate change
9yolo_20110716_8e	7162011	Catherine Portman	no			Yolo	yes	Do not split up Yolo into insignificant pieces of districts whose interests are unrelated to agriculture and open space
9yolo_20110716_9e	7162011	Kary Joseph Shender	no		Davis	Yolo	yes	Do not split Yolo into nine separate offices to communicate with one another for business. Please do not allow re-districting to result in splitting of Yolo into 3 districts.
general_20110716_1e	7162011	David Salaverry	yes	CCAG			no	

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9yolo_20110716_4e	Yolo			no	yes		strong agricultural voice
9yolo_20110716_5e	Yolo			no	no		
9yolo_20110716_6e	Yolo			no	yes		agricultural land, levee upkeep
9yolo_20110716_7e	Yolo			no	yes		levees, water and land preservation, climate change
9yolo_20110716_8e	Yolo			no	yes		agriculture
9yolo_20110716_9e	Yolo			no	no		
general_20110716_1e				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9yolo_20110716_4e	food, pollution, contamination, transportation costs		no				
9yolo_20110716_5e			no				
9yolo_20110716_6e	water usage, open space, representation, interests		no				
9yolo_20110716_7e	open space, ability to thrive		no				
9yolo_20110716_8e	open space		no			other districts interests are unrelated	
9yolo_20110716_9e			no				
general_20110716_1e			no				attached maps and plan from CCAG

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110716_2e	7162011	David Salaverry	yes	CCAG			yes	Response to dismissal of accusation of citzen that staffer was surfing on laptop, Commission is protecting its institutional credibility at expense of citizens.
general_20110716_3e	7162011	Richard Rowe	no				yes	Can you produce Simple maps in PDF or JPG format? Would be a lot easier for all to see, increasing ability of public to participate in process
supporters_antelope_20110716_1e	7162011	Victoria Erfle	yes	Select Service Realty	Palmdale	Los Angeles	yes	Keep High Desert cities of LancasterPalmdale in N LA County together with E Kern and Victor Valley Cities in San Bernardino in same SD. First draft was excellent, unified COI, keep SD in first draft
supporters_gwnc_20110716_1e	7162011	Etta Devine	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split century old Wilshire in half. Proposed boundary line of Plymouth blvd cannot stand, E boundary should be Western ave, W, La Brea ave. Return to LA district, no COI with East. Belong with LDAT in CD, Belong with LAMWS or LADNT in AD, one.
2riverside_20110716_1e	7162011	Tami Wilhelm	no		Hemet	Riverside	yes	Retain first draft of 45th CD, yields primary commonality land use, endangered species, water, housing, political competitive balance
2riverside_20110716_2e	7162011	Deborah Tucker	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not split Jurupa Valley, leave where are now. Baca has never been in our city. Leav us alone
2riverside_20110716_3e	7162011	Arthur and Rita Bee	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not split Jurupa Valley into two CDs, one in Riverside, one San Bernardino. Is not good for city. Keep intact and put into Riverside County CD

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110716_2e				no	no		
general_20110716_3e				no	no		
supporters_antelope_20110716_1e	San Bernardino, LA Kern	Lancaster, Palmdale, Victor Village		no	yes		
supporters_gwnc_20110716_1e		Wilshire, Hancock Park, Windsor Square, Los Angeles	Plymouth, La Brea, Western ave	no	yes	historical community for 100 years	
2riverside_20110716_1e		Hemet		no	yes		
2riverside_20110716_2e		Jurupa Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110716_3e	Riverside, San Bernardino	Jurupa Valley		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110716_2e			no				
general_20110716_3e			no				
supporters_antelope_20110716_1e	High desert		no				
supporters_gwnc_20110716_1e			no				
2riverside_20110716_1e	land use, endangered species, water, roads, senior housing		no			new district creates unreasonable competition	
2riverside_20110716_2e			no			Baca has never been	
2riverside_20110716_3e			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110716_4e	7162011	Barbara Slater	no		San Jacinto	Riverside	yes	San Jacinto, Hemet, have nothing in common with Coachella Valley, do not change boundaries. Real estate, colleges in district
2riverside_20110716_5e	7162011	Eileen D. Brunzell	no		Hemet	Riverside	yes	First draft maps were better, keep Hemet in Coachella Valley CD. Hemet is entry way to Santa Rosa San Jacinto Mountain National Moumennt, encompasses valley. First draft was right.
3orange_20110716_1e	7162011	Charles Kin, President	yes	iCAN		Orange	yes	Include La Habra as part of Orange county, not LA, due to increase of asian population
3orange_20110716_2e	7162011	Leigh Ann Brannon	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Maintain proper representation of La Habra with Orange County Representatives. Reps from LA county know nothing of cities in Orange
3orange_20110716_3e	7162011	Edward Guzman	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Oppose putting La Habra with LA County cities, are Orange county city, need to be represented as such.
3orange_20110716_4e	7162011	Myron T. Bantrell and Genevieve B. Bantrell	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habra voting districts should be part of OC not LA county. Making part of LA negates political say in either county
2riverside_20110718_7f	7182011	Luciano Mendez	no		Coachella	Riverside	yes	Keep Eastern Coachella Valley in same district as Imperial Valley, very similar. Keep together in AD, SD, CD
2riverside_20110718_8f	7182011	Briana Burt	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	clear COI issues that combine Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley. Link together in SD and CD
2riverside_20110718_10f	7182011	Joan Jordan	no			Riverside	yes	Do not remap Riverside County to San Bernardino. Like representatives, and Joe Baca cannot handle his own district

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110716_4e		San Jacinto, Coachella Valley, Hemet,		no	yes		businesses
2riverside_20110716_5e		Hemet, Coachella Valley		no	yes		
3orange_20110716_1e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	yes	increase in Asian Population	
3orange_20110716_2e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110716_3e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110716_4e	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_7f	imperial	Coachella, Imperial Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_8f		Coachella, Imperial Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_10f	Riverside, San Bernardino	Jurupa Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110716_4e	real estate, college		no			nothing in common with Coachella Valley	
2riverside_20110716_5e	entry way to Mountain Monument		no				
3orange_20110716_1e			no				
3orange_20110716_2e			no			reps in LA know nothing of orange	
3orange_20110716_3e	representation		no			not LA County	
3orange_20110716_4e	political say		no			negates political say	
2riverside_20110718_7f	similar valleys		no				
2riverside_20110718_8f	clear COI issues		no				
2riverside_20110718_10f	representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
2riverside_20110718_11f	7192011	Leslie Liles	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	Keep all of Jurupa Valley in Riverside County with Calvert. New city, should remain whole in CDs.
2riverside_20110718_12f	7192011	Lorraine Reese	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not split Jurupa Valley, is in Riverside not San Bernardino. Will move if rezoned
2riverside_20110718_13f	7192011	Ricki Brodie	no				yes	Coachella, Mecca, Thermal have similarity to Brawley, El Centro, Imperial in terms of language, ethnicity, between Riverside and Imperial
2riverside_20110718_14f	7182011	Steven Hernandez, Mayor Pro Tem	yes	Coachella	Coachella	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley linked in AD, do so in SD and CD as well lower income, young, unemployed, Latino, green energy, agriculture, salton sea
2riverside_20110718_15f	7182011	Arturo Aviles., Councilman	yes	Coachella	Coachella	Riverside	yes	Keep Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley linked in AD, do so in SD and CD as well Native American tribes and renewable energy
2sbernardino_20110718_1f	7182011	Nona Yerbiz	no				yes	Do not connect narrow strip of Rancho Cucamonga with San Bernardino, gerrymandering. Create districts based on population
2sbernardino_20110718_2f	7192011	Alicia Smith	no		Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	yes	Keep Rancho Cucumonga entirely under one AD and SD within San Bernardino, not SFV, or LA. Strong ties, identity
2sbernardino_20110718_3f	7192011	Cherise Kuzminski	yes	City of Rancho Cucamonga	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	yes	Keep AD and SD maps that keep Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino. Population would be disenfranchised otherwise. No COI with LA
3orange_20110718_1f	7182011	David Little	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills together to preserve lifestyle of rural, hill areas of OC. No COI with urban area of Santa Ana.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
2riverside_20110718_11f	Riverside	Jurupa Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_12f	Riverside, San Bernardino	Jurupa Valley		no	no		
2riverside_20110718_13f	Riverside, Imperial	Coachella, Mecca, Thermal, Brawley, El Centro		no	yes	languages spoken, ethnicity	
2riverside_20110718_14f	Imperial	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_15f		Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley		no	yes	native american tribes	
2sbernardino_20110718_1f	San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga		no	no		
2sbernardino_20110718_2f	San Bernardino, LA	Rancho Cucamonga, SFV		no	yes		
2sbernardino_20110718_3f	San Bernardino, LA	Rancho Cucamonga		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_1f	Orange	Santa Ana, Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
2riverside_20110718_11f	new city, prosper		no				
2riverside_20110718_12f			no				
2riverside_20110718_13f			no				
2riverside_20110718_14f	lower income, young, unemployed, Latino, green energy, agriculture, salton sea		no				
2riverside_20110718_15f	energy		no				
2sbernardino_20110718_1f			no				
2sbernardino_20110718_2f	strong ties, sense of identity		no				
2sbernardino_20110718_3f	shared interests		no			no COI with LA	
3orange_20110718_1f	rural, hill areas, recreation, work, equestrian, colleges		no			no COI with Santa Ana	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_2f	7182011	George Cervantes	no				yes	LA County has no business in La Habra
3orange_20110718_3f	7182011	Rachelle Hoffman	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Do not split Irvine and Newport Beach into two separate CDs. They are a COI, closely connected, business hub, schools, work, UC Irvine, shopping,
3orange_20110718_4f	7182011		no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Do not split Irvine and Newport Beach into two separate CDs. They are a COI, closely connected, business hub, schools, work, UC Irvine, shopping,
3orange_20110718_5f	7182011		no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Do not split Irvine and Newport Beach into two separate CDs. They are a COI, closely connected, business hub, schools, work, UC Irvine, shopping,
3orange_20110718_6f	7192011		no		Tustin Hills	Orange	yes	Ladera Ranch, Rancho Santa Margarita, Tustin Hills, share way of life, different from Santa Ana. Rural vs. Urban. Do not separate rural, Hill, COI
3orange_20110718_7f	7182011	Rozzana and Ray Luna	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Oppose placing La Habra in LA county, keep in Orange, for representation in SD and AD, education, public safety, transport, land use
3orange_20110718_9f	7182011	Craig W. Olson	yes	Concordia University Irvine	Irvine	Orange	yes	Identity and city of Irvine is tied to Orange County. Share community with Newport Beach and Coast. UC Irvine is on coast as well
3orange_20110718_10f	7182011	Craig W. Olson	yes	Concordia University Irvine	Irvine	Orange	yes	Identity and city of Irvine is tied to Orange County. Share community with Newport Beach and Coast. UC Irvine is on coast as well
3orange_20110718_11f	7182011	Rosemary Medel	yes	City of La Habra	La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not allow La Habra to be part of LA county. Voting process, will not be beneficial to citizens.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_2f	LA	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110718_3f	Orange	Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_4f	Orange	Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_5f	Orange	Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_6f	Orange	Ladera Ranch, Rancho Santa Margarita, Tustin Hills, Santa Ana		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_7f	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_9f	Orange	Irvine		no	yes		UC Irvine , Concordia U,
3orange_20110718_10f	Orange	Irvine		no	yes		UC Irvine , Concordia U,
3orange_20110718_11f	Orange, LA	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_2f			no			no business	
3orange_20110718_3f	closely connected, business hub, schools, work, UC Irvine, shopping,		no				
3orange_20110718_4f	closely connected, business hub, schools, work, UC Irvine, shopping,		no				
3orange_20110718_5f	closely connected, business hub, schools, work, UC Irvine, shopping,		no				
3orange_20110718_6f	share way of life		no			no COI with Santa Ana	
3orange_20110718_7f	education, public safety, land use, transportation, representation		no			effective representation	
3orange_20110718_9f	culture, community, recreation		no				
3orange_20110718_10f	culture, community, recreation		no				
3orange_20110718_11f			no			makes no sense, voting process	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_12f	7182011	Bradley D. Schoenleben	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Orange is no COI with Santa Ana. Dense, urban area more like flats of Anaheim. Orange should be with Orange Hills, Tustin, etc, with more rural, canyon, equestrian communities in OC. Keep Orange in CD maps with these, not Santa Ana
3orange_20110718_13f	7182011	Angelo Rodriguez	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Do not put Irvine and Newport Beach in separate CDs. Related by coast, business districts, citizens, university, jobs, dependent
3orange_20110718_14f	7182011	Rod McDermott, Managing Director	yes	McDermott and Bull executive search	Irvine	Orange	yes	Put Irvine with coastal community with Newport beach in CD boundaries, COI work, recreate,restaruants, parks, business, interests
3orange_20110718_15f	7192011		no		Newport Beach	Orange	yes	Newport Beach and Irvine are closely linked, should be kept together in same CD
3orange_20110718_16f	7192011	Rod Douglass	no				yes	Newport Beach and Irvine must be kept together in CD
3orange_20110718_17f	7192011	Mary Aileen Matheis	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine, Newport, Costa Mesa, Orange, Lake Forest, Tustin must be kept together in a CD Coastal COI, service areas, water districts
3orange_20110718_18f	7182011	Paul and Diana Camaur	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine and coastal communities should be districted together relate to each other, shopping, dining, friends, planning, activities, physical location, recreation
3orange_20110718_19f	7182011	Tamara Gurierrez	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Irvine and Newport beach have strong communities and are linked by strong ties. Do not break into separate districts.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_12f	Orange	Orange, Santa Ana, Orange Hills, Tustin		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_13f		Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_14f		Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_15f		Newport Beach, Irvine		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_16f		Newport Beach, Irvine		no	no		
3orange_20110718_17f		Irvine, Newport, Costa Mesa, Orange, Lake Forest, Tustin		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_18f		Irvine, Newport Coast		no	yes	recreation, social interaction	
3orange_20110718_19f		Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_12f	rural, equestrian, canyons		no			not like dense, urban areas	
3orange_20110718_13f	coast, business districts, citizens, university, jobs, dependent		no				
3orange_20110718_14f	work, recreate,restaruants, parks, business, interests		no				
3orange_20110718_15f	closely linked		no				
3orange_20110718_16f			no				
3orange_20110718_17f	water district, coastal area		no				
3orange_20110718_18f	physical location, shopping, dining, planning, schooling		no				
3orange_20110718_19f	strong, linked together		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_20f	7182011	Karen Lord	no		Ladera Ranch	Orange	yes	Ladera Ranch, Rancho Santa Margarita, Tustin Hills, share a lot in common, hill areas, different from Santa Ana. Keep whole, in rural, hill areas of OC lifestyle COI.
3orange_20110718_21f	7182011	Ida Macmurray	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	La Habra should be matched up with Whittier, Buena Park, Fullerton, because of 50 percent middle-class Hispanic residents, fire departments, animal shelter, school districts
3orange_20110718_22f	7182011	Chris Hernandez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Opposes putting La Habra in LA County district, should be with other N Orange County cities.
3orange_20110718_23f	7182011	Sandra Carrillo	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Do not redistrict La Habra, disregards citizens, will be watering down voice, hurt community
3orange_20110718_24f	7182011	Art Carillo	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Oppose resdistricring La Habra with LA, voice will be taken away from OC, diversity of city will be minimized.
3orange_20110718_25f	7182011	Kim Lee	no		Newport Beach	Orange	yes	Do not split up Newport Beach, Irvine. Share residents and transportation thoroughfares.
3orange_20110718_26f	7182011	Gordon Roberts	no				yes	Connect Irvine to Newport Beach on coast when considering COIs. Share recreation, shopping, residents, commuters
3orange_20110718_27f	7182011	Jorge Aguilar	no		Newport Beach		yes	Do not split Irvine, Newport Beach, share businesses, jobs, education, UC Irvine.
3orange_20110718_28f	7182011	Meghan Schoenleben	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Orange is not COI with Santa Ana, keep with Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills, rural, canyon, equestrian areas in CD. Not dense, urban area.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_20f	Orange	Ladera Ranch, Rancho Santa Margarita, Tustin Hills, Santa Ana		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_21f	Orange, Los Angeles	Whittier, Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra		no	yes	middle-class Hispanic residents	
3orange_20110718_22f	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110718_23f		La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110718_24f	Orange, Los Angeles	La Habra		no	yes	diversity	
3orange_20110718_25f		Newport Beach, Irvine		no	no		
3orange_20110718_26f		Newport Beach, Irvine		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_27f		Newport Beach, Irvine		no	yes		businesses, UC Irvine
3orange_20110718_28f	Orange	Orange, Santa Ana, Orange Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_20f	secluded, culture, hills, rural		no			not busy city area	
3orange_20110718_21f	school districts, fire dept, police, dept		no				
3orange_20110718_22f			no				
3orange_20110718_23f			no			will only hurt community	
3orange_20110718_24f			no			will only bring lack of stability	
3orange_20110718_25f	residents, transportation		no				
3orange_20110718_26f	recreation, shopping, residents, commuters		no				
3orange_20110718_27f	education		no				
3orange_20110718_28f	rural, canyon, equestrian		no			not dense, urban area	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_29f	7182011	Hector Catalan	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills together to preserve rural, hill areas of OC quiet, secluded recreational interests, community college vs dense, urbban areas of Santa Ana.
3orange_20110718_30f	7182011	Hector Catalan	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills together to preserve rural, hill areas of OC quiet, secluded recreational interests, community college vs dense, urbban areas of Santa Ana.
3orange_20110718_31f	7182011	Heidi Larkin-Reed	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Put Orange back with Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hill, OPA, etc, in CD share churches, shopping community colleges, charm. Has nothing in common with Santa Ana
3orange_20110718_32f	7182011	Scott R. Dutenhoefer, CLU	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Put Orange back with Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hill, OPA, etc, in CD share churches, shopping community colleges, charm. Has nothing in common with Santa Ana
3orange_20110718_33f	7192011	Gary Remland	no		Orange	Orange	yes	Put Orange back with Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hill, OPA, etc, in CD share churches, shopping community colleges, charm. Has nothing in common with Santa Ana
3orange_20110718_34f	7192011	Matt Holder	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Place Irvine in coastal CD. Greater COI with Newport beach than inland OC shopping, recreating, sports, activities, parks, transportation on MacArthur, 405
3orange_20110718_35f	7192011	Michael V	no				yes	Understand you are trying to make La Habra part of Los Angeles, please give more information on this

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_29f	Orange	Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_30f	Orange	Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_31f	Orange	Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills, Santa Ana		no	yes		rural, equestrian
3orange_20110718_32f	Orange	Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills, Santa Ana		no	yes		rural, equestrian
3orange_20110718_33f	Orange	Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills, Santa Ana		no	yes		rural, equestrian
3orange_20110718_34f	Orange	Irvine, Newport Beach	405	no	yes		
3orange_20110718_35f	Los Angeles	La Habra		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_29f	terrain, recreation, equestrian, community college, rural, hills		no			not dense, urban area	
3orange_20110718_30f	terrain, recreation, equestrian, community college, rural, hills		no			nothing in common with Santa Ana	
3orange_20110718_31f	church, shopping, community college, charm		no			no COI with Santa Ana	
3orange_20110718_32f	church, shopping, community college, charm		no			no COI with Santa Ana	
3orange_20110718_33f	church, shopping, community college, charm		no			no COI with Santa Ana	
3orange_20110718_34f	shopping, recreating, sports, activities, parks, transportation on MacArthur, 405		no			little in common with inland OC	
3orange_20110718_35f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_36f	7182011	Jonathan West	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra in current district with other OC cities. Thank you
3orange_20110718_37f	7192011	James J. Mahoney	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Do not split Irvine from coastal communities, or combine with inland communities like Tustin, Orange. Spends time in Irvine, Newport Beach, etc, rarely goes inland. Keep Intact COI
3orange_20110718_38f	7182011	Virginia C. Sullivan	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Do not split Irvine from coastal communities, or combine with inland communities like Tustin, Orange. Spends time in Irvine, Newport Beach, etc, rarely goes inland. Keep Intact COI
3orange_20110718_39f	7182011	Gary W. Remland	yes	Remland Insurance Services	Orange	Orange	yes	Santa Ana is large city, all urban, not like Orange small town charm. Orange, Orange Hills, OPA are COI with other NE parts of OC, share churches, shopping community college districts. Put Orange back with communities of Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hills, OPA,
3orange_20110718_40f	7182011	Martha Carmack	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Keep COI whole, do not split central coastal OC in CD, Irvine, Newport Beach. Irvine is unique, business hub, work together, schools, UC Irvine, Hoag Hospital.
3orange_20110718_41f	7182011	Anthony Gaitan	no		Irvine	Orange	yes	Keep COI whole, do not split central coastal OC in CD, Irvine, Newport Beach. Irvine is unique, business hub, work together, schools, UC Irvine, Hoag Hospital.
3orange_20110718_42f	7182011	Rosa Rojas	no		Garden Grove	Orange	yes	Keep whole Anaheim, Garden Grove, Santa Ana COI in CDL share schools, residents. Orange has nothing in common with Santa Ana

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_36f	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110718_37f	Orange	Irvine, Orange, Tustin, Newport Beach		no	yes		businesses
3orange_20110718_38f	Orange	Irvine, Orange, Tustin, Newport Beach		no	yes		businesses
3orange_20110718_39f	Orange	Santa Ana, Orange, Orange Hills, OPA, Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hills		no	yes		community college, shopping areas
3orange_20110718_40f	Orange	Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		UC Irvine, Hoag Hospital
3orange_20110718_41f	Orange	Irvine, Newport Beach		no	yes		UC Irvine, Hoag Hospital
3orange_20110718_42f	Orange	Orange, Santa Ana, Anaheim, Garden Grove,		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_36f			no				
3orange_20110718_37f	spends time in coastal cities		no			rarely goes inland	
3orange_20110718_38f	spends time in coastal cities		no			rarely goes inland	
3orange_20110718_39f	rural, equestrian, church,		no			nothing in common with Santa Ana	
3orange_20110718_40f	proximity to coast, closely connected, work, shopping		no				
3orange_20110718_41f	proximity to coast, closely connected, work, shopping		no				
3orange_20110718_42f	schools, live, work		no			Orange nothing like Santa Ana	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
3orange_20110718_43f	7182011	Kenneth Nash	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Keep La Habra on map as Orange County, leave as we are
3orange_20110718_44f	7182011	Ann Rommel	no		Coto De Caza	Orange	yes	Coto De Caza should remain intact in CD and with like communities in OC, has country feel, equestrian, canyon COI with Fullerton, Orange Park Acres, Tustin Hills, Orange Hills.
3orange_20110718_45f	7182011	Matthew Jacquot	no			Orange	yes	Keep Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills together to preserve rural, hill areas of OC quiet, secluded recreational interests, community college vs dense, urbban areas of Santa Ana.
3orange_20110718_46f	7182011	Ann Romano	yes	Ann Romano Associates	Capistrano Beach	Orange	yes	Thank you for listening to Dana Points needs. Maintain city boundaries and COIs in S OC with respect to watersheds, water quality, utilites, transportation
3orange_20110718_47f	7182011	Alan Woo	no		Santa Ana	Orange	yes	Keep Santa Ana, Westminster, Garden Grove, Anaheim intact; share poverty, unemployment, lost homes, lost jobs, etc. Villa Park and Orange caused economic downturn. Give voice to populations of Latinos and Asians
4langeles_20110718_1f	7182011	Warren Adler	no		Venice	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Venice among 3 Ads. Heterogeneous, strong identity in LA, redistricting would diminish voice
4langeles_20110718_2f	7182011	John D Shepard	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Create Beach Cities district that includes all of beach cites from Westchester to San Pedro, El Segundo, Harbor City, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Marina del Rey, Torrance, etc geographically continuous, no COI with Compton, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
3orange_20110718_43f	Orange	La Habra		no	no		
3orange_20110718_44f	Orange	Fullerton, Orange Park Acres, Tustin Hills, Orange Hills, Coto De Caza		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_45f	Orange	Orange, Orange Hills, Anaheim Hills, Tustin, Tustin Hills		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_46f	Orange	Dana Point		no	yes		
3orange_20110718_47f	Orange	Santa Ana, Westminster, Garden Grove, Anaheim, Villa Park, Orange		no	yes		unemployment, lost jobs, lost homes,
4langeles_20110718_1f	Los Angeles	Venice		no	yes	ethnically heterogeneous	economically heterogeneous
4langeles_20110718_2f	Los Angeles	Westchester to San Pedro, El Segundo, Harbor City, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Marina del Rey, Torrance, Compton, LA, Santa Monica		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
3orange_20110718_43f			no				
3orange_20110718_44f	canyon, equestrian area, country feel		no				
3orange_20110718_45f	terrain, recreation, equestrian, community college, rural, hills		no			nothing in common with Santa Ana	
3orange_20110718_46f	watersheds, water quality, utilities, transportation		no				
3orange_20110718_47f	representation		no			do not share values with Villa Park, Orange	
4langeles_20110718_1f	strong community identity in Los Angeles		no				
4langeles_20110718_2f	geographically continuous beach cities		no			nothing in common with Compton, etc	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_3f	7182011	Chris Simmons	no		West Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Why is Simi Valley not part of SFV district, instead of lancaster? Why not part of Ventura county district. Skewed toward creating republican districts. Enormous swath of land.
4langeles_20110718_4f	7182011	Damon Aldrich	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Beach Cities together for redistricting, include torrance in AD, CD should go from Weschester to San Pedro. Santa Monica is not part of the district. Do not carve out any areas, or toss in distant areas
4langeles_20110718_5f	7182011	Peter Glusac	no				yes	CD should include Torrance, Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, El Segundo, Harbor City, Lomita, San Pedro
4langeles_20110718_6f	7182011		no				yes	Please keep beach cities attached to Santa Monica
4langeles_20110718_7f	7182011	Elizabeth Dawson	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back into Beach Cities AD, put Beach Cities CD back together
4langeles_20110718_8f	7182011	Laurie Kaufman	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Return Wilshire to LA District, do not split in half at Plymouth Blvd. No COI with East district. Belong with WLADT. Westernmost Boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Ave
4langeles_20110718_9f	7182011	Gail M. Cooper	no		Ranchos Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Group coastal Beach Cities together in Same CD for consistent representation. Do not move Torance to another district.
4langeles_20110718_10f	7182011	Kimela Santifer-Berry	yes	Polypeptide Laboratories, Inc	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Include 8th district, Crenshaw Community in Los Angeles. Do not minimize or compromise representation share Leimart park, leaders, immigrants, childrens futures

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_3f	Los Angeles	Simi Valley, SFV, Lancaster		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_4f	Los Angeles	Beach Cities, Torrance, Westchester, San Pedro, Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_5f	Los Angeles	Torrance, Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, El Segundo, Harbor City, Lomita, San Pedro		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_6f		Beach Cities, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_7f		Beach Cities, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_8f	Los Angeles	Wilshire	Plymouth, Western	yes	yes		
4langeles_20110718_9f	Los Angeles	Beach Cities, Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_10f	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_3f			no				
4langeles_20110718_4f	Beach cities,		no			Santa Monica not part of Beach Cities	
4langeles_20110718_5f			no				
4langeles_20110718_6f			no				
4langeles_20110718_7f			no				
4langeles_20110718_8f	long standing boundaries		no			would marginalize community	
4langeles_20110718_9f	fair and consistent representation		no				
4langeles_20110718_10f	representation, cultural experiences		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_11f	7182011	Dinora Changa	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne must be part of South Bay CD living, shopping, family doctors, COI
4langeles_20110718_12f	7182011	Bruce Benson	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not take apart Santa Monica Mountains need representation by people who live in east-west corridor who will fight to keep development pressures awway. Do not add inland communities with nothing in common.
4langeles_20110718_13f	7182011	John Monsen,	yes	Citizens for the San Gabriel Mountains	Tujunga	Los Angeles	yes	Excellent Job in LA County, uniting foothill residents with federal public lands in LA CD. Place remaining section of San Gabriel Mountains to the N or Rancho Cucamonga in same San Bernardino CD as Rancho Cucamonga. Eliminate choke point at I15.
4langeles_20110718_14f	7182011	Aaron Jackson	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not combine South Bay and Westside of LA in any district. Assembly la opt 1 and assembly la opt 2 are reasonable interpretations of South Bay communities. Senate la is unreasonable lacks compactness, have little in common
4langeles_20110718_15f	7182011	Nicholas Joy	no				yes	Most recent proposal for LA is best so far, but Culver City and Inglewood can be shifted Northward and Torrance put with beach communities. La Brea, Beverly Hills, E of 405 could be added to Culver city, creating West LA district.
4langeles_20110718_16f	7182011	Jennifer Cody	no				yes	Keep South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula with Straight Lines

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_11f		Hawthorne, South Bay		no	yes	living, shopping, friends, family	
4langeles_20110718_12f		Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_13f	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga, San Gabriel Mountains	I15	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_14f	Los Angeles	South Bay, Los Angeles.	Western Ave, Ocean, Imperial Highway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_15f	Los Angeles	Torrance, Culver City, Inglewood, La Brea, Beverly Hills, Culver City	405	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_16f		South Bay, Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes Peninsula		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_11f	movies, doctors		no				
4langeles_20110718_12f	contiguous geographic features, commited peoples, development pressues		no			inland communities will not fight for mountains	
4langeles_20110718_13f	very intimate relationship with the range, park and trail system, gateway area, public saftey issues		no			less in common with destern and Sierra public lands in Inyo and Mono Counties	
4langeles_20110718_14f	South Bay		no			little in common with West LA	
4langeles_20110718_15f	Beach Cities		no			little in common with Beverly Hills, La Brea	
4langeles_20110718_16f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_17f	7182011	Anthony Crump, Treasurer	yes	Silver Lake Neighborhood Council	Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Silver Lake along Sunset in AD, CD, would split business district in two. Use US 101 on south, or LA River on North. Keeps community united and whole
4langeles_20110718_18f	7182011	Ellen and Lee Klein	no		Westchester	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Westchester and LAX along with other LAX COIs in same CD, do not put with Beach Cities south of El Segundo or North of Playa del Rey. Economic engine of LAX, bonds, Loyola Marymount University, high schools
4langeles_20110718_19f	7182011	Roberta Ritz	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Fix boundaries to maintain integrity of long standing boundaries of Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council
4langeles_20110718_20f	7182011	Bill Wong LLC	yes	Asian American Education Institute	Sacramento	Sacramento	yes	July 14 visualization for CD SGVP would pose barriers to residents of West San Gabriel Valley to have fair representation. Do not add dissimilar communities of Claremont, La Verne, etc. AAEI supports combine W and E San Gabriel Valley COI. Supports unity
4langeles_20110718_21f	7182011	Brendan Dooley	no		San Fernando Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Likes Draft 2 maps for SFV. Please reinsert Porter Ranch into the valley in Congressional LA Opt 1.2
4langeles_20110718_22f	7182011	Chris Fall	no		Santa Clarita Valley	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Clarita Valley SD, keep whole. Present an E Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD that keeps SCV whole
4langeles_20110718_23f	7182011	Edward E. Ted Vaill	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Mailbu in SD, CD, AD in LA County Coastal and Santa Monica Mountains districts. Place with Santa Monica for school district intact. Do not place with Ventura county. In SD, Malibu N of city limits hsould be placed with Malibu.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_17f	Los Angeles	Silver Lake, Los Angeles	US101, LA River	yes	yes		main business thoroughfare, gateway to community
4langeles_20110718_18f	Los Angeles	Westchester, LA, El Segundo, Playa del Rey		no	yes		LAX, bonds, Loyola Marymount University, high schools
4langeles_20110718_19f	Los Angeles	Wilshire		yes	yes	long standing boundaries	
4langeles_20110718_20f		San Gabriel Valley, Claremont, La Verne		no	yes	ethnic similarities, Asian American voters	economic similarities
4langeles_20110718_21f	Los Angeles	SFV, Porter Ranch		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_22f	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_23f	Ventura, Los Angeles	Santa Monica, Malibu		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_17f	diverse, unique, creative community		no				see attached map
4langeles_20110718_18f			no			do not share COI with other cities	
4langeles_20110718_19f			no				
4langeles_20110718_20f	representation, latinos		no			dissimilar communities of Claremont, La Verne	supports Unity map
4langeles_20110718_21f			no				
4langeles_20110718_22f			no				
4langeles_20110718_23f	school districts, residents north of city limits		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_24f	7182011	Lynn Brennan, Commissioner	yes	City of Torrance	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not cut city of Torrance in half, city is united entity. Palos Verdes Peninsula cities must be included in 36th district. Torrance and P.V. Peninsula belong in 36th District
4langeles_20110718_25f	7182011	Luis Alvarado	no		Pico Rivera	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Downey, Pico Rivera, Whittier together. Rosemead blvd runs through heart of cities. Whittier sports, dining, shopping. Keep Tri-Cities together.
4langeles_20110718_26f	7182011	Virginia Hatfield	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide SFV, Valley Village into two CDs need to remain a viable political community
4langeles_20110718_27f	7182011	Kari Foler	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two CDs. Eastern Boundary should be moved east from Colfax to 170 freeway, which it has always been
4langeles_20110718_28f	7182011	Michael A Otinsky	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Clarita area has nothing in common with High Desert, oil and water in all areas of regulation
4langeles_20110718_29f	7182011	Edwin C. Schmidtke	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Include area bounded by 170 fwy on E and N, Colfax Avenue on the west, Riverside Drive on South in Valley Village, instead of North Hollywood, which is geographically seperated with a dissimilar character
4langeles_20110718_30f	7182011	Mikie Maloney, Director of Community Relations	yes	Oakwood School	Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not move a small piece of Valley Village to a different district. People have stronger voice when they can speak from one community. Your boundary makes it difficult for contitutents to have a good relationship with their reps

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_24f		Palos Verdes Peninsula, Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_25f		Downey, Pico Rivera, Whittier	Rosemead Blvd	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_26f		SFV, Valley Village		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_27f		Valley Village	Colfax, 170 freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_28f		Santa Clarita, High Desert		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_29f		Valley Village, North Hollywood	Colfax, 170 freeway, Riverside drive	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_30f		Valley Village		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_24f	united entity		no				
4langeles_20110718_25f	shopping, sports leagues, dining, border cities		no				
4langeles_20110718_26f	need to remain a viable political community		no				
4langeles_20110718_27f			no				
4langeles_20110718_28f			no			nothing in common with high desert, oil and water	
4langeles_20110718_29f	geographically contiguous Valley Village		no			geographically seperated, different character	
4langeles_20110718_30f	representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_31f	7182011	Rodney Burgoyne	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village. 170 is natural boundary. Put those on West side of 170 back with 91607 neighbors. Nothing to do with community on other side of Freeway
4langeles_20110718_32f	7182011	Anthony Crump	no		Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Silver Lake in one CD. Use 101 as boundary for COI.
4langeles_20110718_33f	7182011	Richard Whorton	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Valley Village CD. All should have same representation, effects close to 25,000 residents. Include 91601s located West of 170 inn same as those west of Colfax ave
4langeles_20110718_34f	7182011	Ben Allanoff	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Topanga connected to communities that touch its boundaries in SD and Ads to ensure stability in shared projects, programs, environment, livelihood, safety, education. Do not split or tie to Santa Clarita to whom are not connected
4langeles_20110718_35f	7182011	JoAnn Bishop	no		Glendora	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Glendora, Azusa, San Dimas together in foothills. Little in common with Southern areas. Is pride of the foothills
4langeles_20110718_36f	7182011	R. Eventoff	no				yes	Cannot figure out site, concerned about CD. Elated with Karen Bass as new congresswoman. Do not eliminate diversity. Make site easier to navigate.
4langeles_20110718_37f	7182011	Carrie Baltin	no		Monte Nido	Los Angeles	yes	Leave line in Monte Nido where they are now as we have similar issues as those areas aligned with
4langeles_20110718_38f	7182011	Joan Wallace	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back into the district with PV, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_31f		Valley Village	170 freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_32f		Silver Lake	101 Freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_33f		Valley Village	170 freeway, Colfax ave	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_34f		Topanga, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_35f		Glendora, Azusa, San Dimas, foothills		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_36f				no	no		
4langeles_20110718_37f		Monte Nido		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_38f		Torrance, Palos Verdes		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_31f	natural boundary		no			nothing to do with community on other side of Freeway	
4langeles_20110718_32f	silver lake		no				
4langeles_20110718_33f	effects residents		no				
4langeles_20110718_34f	shared projects and programs, lifestyle, environment, livelihood, safety, education		no			not connected to Santa Clarita	
4langeles_20110718_35f	always been foothills, share base of foothills		no			very little in common with southern areas	
4langeles_20110718_36f			no				
4langeles_20110718_37f	similar issues		no				
4langeles_20110718_38f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_39f	7182011	Scott and Pat Hachiya	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Hawthorne is more aligned with Western and Southern neighbors than those to E and North as in July 9 vis living, working in Redondo Beach, schools in venice, grocery shopping and leisure in redondo, Manhattan Beach, Torrance, El Segundo, member of SBCG
4langeles_20110718_40f	7182011	Barbara Coe	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Unhappy with maps for 36th CD and 54th AD. Put Torrance back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together startign with Westchester, ending with Palos Verdes Peninsula, San Pedro. Live play, shop in these areas. Nothing in common with Venice
4langeles_20110718_41f	7182011	Richard and Jan Kern	no		Rolling Hills Estates,	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together startign with Westchester, ending with Palos Verdes Peninsula, San Pedro.
4langeles_20110718_42f	7182011	Sara Jane and George Bettge	no		Rolling Hills Estates,	Los Angeles	yes	CD and SLD lines do not represent people in areas. Beach Cities, Palos Verdes, San Pedro, and Torrance havve much in common work, shopping, recreation. Include Westchester on north down to San Pedro, Wilmington to the south. Same geographical location.
4langeles_20110718_43f	7182011	Sharon Yarber	no				yes	Redraw lines for Beach Cities AD to include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_39f		Hawthorne, Redondo Beach, El Segundo, Venice, Manhattan Beach, Torrance		no	yes	shopping and leisure activities	
4langeles_20110718_40f		Torrance, Westchester, Palos Verdes Peninsula, San Pedro, Venice, santa Monica,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_41f		Torrance, Westchester, Palos Verdes Peninsula, San Pedro,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_42f		Beach Cities, Palos Verdes, San Pedro, Torrance, Westchester, Wilmington, Venice, Santa Monica		no	yes		work
4langeles_20110718_43f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_39f	schools, churches, work, land use planning, SBCG, transportation, middle class		no			less associated with E and N neighbors	
4langeles_20110718_40f	live, play, shop in Beach Cities		no			little in common with Venice, etc	
4langeles_20110718_41f	conservative values, voting		no				
4langeles_20110718_42f	shopping, recreation		no			no reason to be with Santa Monica and points North	
4langeles_20110718_43f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_44f	7182011	Karen and George Vion	no		Lake Hughes	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Antelope Valley together, Palmdale and Lancaster with High Desert communities in same SD. Do not divide and put with Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima, not much in common, different lifestlye. Keep COIs together
4langeles_20110718_45f	7182011	Gene Allen	no		Rolling Hills Estate	Los Angeles	yes	Ideal AD for South Bay would include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, San Pedro, Wilmington. AD should not include Santa Monica, Venice
4langeles_20110718_46f	7182011	Carol Hunt	no		Palos Verdes Peninsula	Los Angeles	yes	Do not take Torrance out of South Bay, goes hand in hand with Torrance on everything. Southwest Selpa has existed for 20 years, and is natural division of South Bay. Otherwise is gerrymandering
4langeles_20110718_47f	7182011	David Hadley	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Create districts that keep Beach Cities, Torrance, Palos Verdex peninsula together. Do not separate Torrance from Beach Cities. Respect COIs, geographically compact lines
4langeles_20110718_48f	7182011	Steve Hassoldt	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not lump Torrance with Gardena, Inglewood. Is Beach City, belongs in Beach Cities District, from Westchester to Torrance, including El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_44f		Antelope Valley, Palmdale, Lancaster, High Desert, Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_45f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Palos Verdes, San Pedro, Wilmington, Santa Monica, Venice		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_46f		Torrance, South Bay, Palos Verdes		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_47f		Beach Cities, Torrance, palos Verdes Peninsula		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_48f		Beach Cities, Torrance, Gardena, Inglewood, Westchester, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Gardena, Inglewood, Redondo Beach		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_44f	Antelope Valley and High Desert		no			not much in common with Sylmar, etc	
4langeles_20110718_45f	South Bay cities		no			do not include Santa Monica, Venice	
4langeles_20110718_46f	Southwest Selpa		no				
4langeles_20110718_47f	geographically compact		no				
4langeles_20110718_48f	Beach cities		no			not with Gardena, Inglewood	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_51f	7182011	David Dameron	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	in 36th CD, Region 5 LA County do not skip LAX area and continue up to Santa Monica. Do not remove Torrance. Stop messing around with some unknown political agenda and come up with South Bay region for this district
4langeles_20110718_52f	7182011	Carrie Baltin	yes	Baltin Associates	Monte Nido	Los Angeles	yes	Group Monte Nido with Santa Monica MountainsCoastline. Coastal influenced not inland influenced home approval from Coastal commission. Group with like areas.
4langeles_20110718_53f	7182011	Katheryne Koelker	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Group Hawthorne with South Bay Cities to West and South, not East and North. Church in Hermosa Beach, shop in Torrance, El Segundo, etc. Member of SBCG, transportation, land use.
4langeles_20110718_54f	7182011	Herb Roussel	no		El Segundo	Los Angeles	yes	Include Playa del Rey, Westchester, El Segundo, Beach Cities, Palos Verdes, Torrance, Lomita as nucleus of new districts in USR CA-36, State Senate CA-28, State Assembly CA-53. South Bay should not be split in house and assembly
4langeles_20110718_55f	7182011	Lydia Plunk	no				yes	Objects to proposed realignment of 42nd CD. Diamond Bar is major hub, should be served by one district, logical ties to OC and Chino Hills in way 60fwy westbound does not. Protection of treasury and local control. Forward or reverse discrimination wrong
4langeles_20110718_56f	7182011	Marilyn and Roger Browning	no				yes	Re draw proposed SD EVENT. Santa Monica MountainsCoastal Communities should be together in EastWest district that does not include inland communities of Simi Vally, Moorpark, Santa Clarita

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_51f		South Bay, Los Angeles, Torrance, Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_52f		Monte Nido, Santa Monica Mountains, Coastline		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_53f		Hawthorne, South Bay, Torrance, Hermosa Beach, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach		no	yes		SBCOG, land use
4langeles_20110718_54f		Playa del Rey, Westchester, El Segundo, Beach Cities, Palos Verdes, Torrance, Lomita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_55f	Orange	Diamond Bar, Chino Hills		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_56f		Santa Monica, Simi Valley, Moorpark		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_51f	South Bay district		no				
4langeles_20110718_52f	coastal influenced, like areas		no			no inland influence	
4langeles_20110718_53f	transportation		no			less associated with Western and Southern neighbors	
4langeles_20110718_54f	South Bay has similar concerns,		no				
4langeles_20110718_55f	major hub, public treasury, employment, cultural matters		no				
4langeles_20110718_56f	coastal comunities		no			do not include N inland communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_57f	7182011	Patty Carranza	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Wiseburn is part of Beach Cities and should remain so in CD. Part of vital community relationships and strong ties, Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del-Aire, South Bay
4langeles_20110718_58f	7182011	John Edelston, Councilmember	yes	City of Agoura Hills	Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Extend Agoura Hills COI to Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, 101 corridor comunities in SF Valley as well as Thousand Oaks, Oak Park, in Ventura County. Not SCV or Simi Valley. Agoura Hills is part of 5-city COG that has worked together 20 yrs
4langeles_20110718_59f	7182011	Antonia Carranza	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Do not remove Wiseburn from South Bay. Keep with South Bay, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach in same CD. Removing will jeopardize vital ties schools, business, beach communities
4langeles_20110718_60f	7182011	Susan H. Imai	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not want Torrances district cut in half.
4langeles_20110718_61f	7182011	Sheila Kuehl, former State Senator	yes	23rd state senate district	Santa Monica Mountains	Los Angeles	yes	Tie Santa Monica Mountains community together Santa Monica, Malibu, Palisades, Brentwood, Westlake Village, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Hidden Hills, Woodland Hills, Encino, Tarzana and Topanga. Nest 2 Ads for Santa Monica-Malibu and Wooldand Hills in 1 SD
4langeles_20110718_62f	7182011	Margaret Siska	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Do not include Santa Monica MountainsCoastal Communities with N inlands of Simi Valley Moorpark, Santa Clarita in Ventura County. Ahmanson Ranch project shows conflict of interests between 2 communties pro-growth vs. pro open space.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_57f		Wiseburn, Hawthorne, Beach Cities, South Bay, Del-Aire		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_58f	Ventura,	SCV, Simi Valley, Agoura Hills, Oak Park, Santa Monica, Pacifica Palisades, Brentwood,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_59f		South Bay, Wiseburn, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach		no	yes		business needs
4langeles_20110718_60f		Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_61f		Santa Monica, Malibu, Palisades, Brentwood, Westlake Village, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Hidden Hills, Woodland Hills, Encino, Tarzana and Topanga		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_62f	Ventura	Santa Monica Mountains, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes		pro open space attitude

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_57f	strong ties, community relationship		no				
4langeles_20110718_58f	COG, Measure R transportation fund		no			does not make sense to add to SCV or Simi Valley	
4langeles_20110718_59f	beach communities, vital ties		no				
4langeles_20110718_60f			no				
4langeles_20110718_61f	Santa Monica Mountains community, watersheds, coast		no			nothing in common with Simi Valley, Stevenson Ranch, Thousand Oaks have no concern for SMM	
4langeles_20110718_62f			no			conflict of interest, pro-growth vs pro-open space	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_63f	7182011	Kenneth Donckels	no				yes	SFV you are dividing up the Valley into one large white section and 2 or 3 latin and mixed section. That is the only reason for shape of these districts
4langeles_20110718_64f	7182011	Mario Fonda-Bonardi	no				yes	Have Culver City absorb the tounge to Larchmont, in turn the Santa Monica district would expand to San Diego FWY and to Santa Moica Blvd. Boundaries would be at more natural boundaries
4langeles_20110718_65f	7182011	Robert J. Switzer	no				yes	Maps are frustrating because they lack district numbers, or guide that would show incumbents. Cannot tell who will represent home district. Add this info to Congressional, Assembly, Senate map
4langeles_20110718_66f	7182011	Steven Hova Gimian	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Supports new Congressional visualization July 14th. Favor option two which keeps Armenian communities in Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena as one voting block. Keep Glendale in one CD, federal issues of interest, recognition of genocide, support for Armenia.
4langeles_20110718_67f	7182011	Pat Maginnis	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Website is horrible, you are breaking the Brown Act. Malibu has nothing in common with Oxnard, should be in district that includes Westlake and Santa Monica. Made a terrible mistake giving inexperienced neophytes too much power.
4langeles_20110718_68f	7182011	Germaine Cook	no				yes	Do not split the santa Monica Mountains into 2 separate districts. Battle to keep them intact has been hard and long. No development is wanted by residents

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_63f		SFV		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_64f		Culver City, Santa Monica,	Larchmont blvd, San Diego fwy, 405	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_65f				no	no		
4langeles_20110718_66f		Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena, Burbank, Foothills, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta		no	yes	Armenian community hub	
4langeles_20110718_67f		Malibu, Oxnard, Westlake, Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_68f		Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_63f			no				
4langeles_20110718_64f	natural boundaries		no				
4langeles_20110718_65f			no				
4langeles_20110718_66f	voting block, recognition of genocide, support for Armenia dn Artsakh		no				
4langeles_20110718_67f			no			Malibu has nothing in common with Oxnard	
4langeles_20110718_68f	battle to keep intact was long and hard, do not want developers		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_69f	7182011	Reginald E. Fear	no				yes	July 8th Antelope ValleySCVNE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony. Connect SCV with E Ventura similar, in same SD since 1982.
4langeles_20110718_70f	7182011	Matthew Hicks	no				yes	Santa Clarita has 4 communities- Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, Canyon County. If you are going to divide the city in SD, place Newhall and Valencia in EVENT, and SaugusCanyon County in LAAVV. Keep Railroad ave boundary and continue N onto Bouquet Canyon Rd.
4langeles_20110718_71f	7182011	Bill Kennedy	no				yes	Do not divide SCV into two Senate seats. Follow COI testimony and present to Commission an E Ventura County to SCV SD that keeps SCV whole
4langeles_20110718_72f	7182011	Cathy Kennedy	no				yes	Do not divide SCV into two Senate seats. Follow COI testimony and present to Commission an E Ventura County to SCV SD that keeps SCV whole
4langeles_20110718_73f	7182011	Dave Dameron	no				yes	Do not gerrymander 36th CD, having it winding around to include Santa Monica, but leaving out Torrance. Do not insert political agendas into your work
4langeles_20110718_74f	7182011	Kerri Burk	no				yes	July 8th Antelope ValleySCVNE SFV SD does not reflect COI testimony. Connect SCV with E Ventura similar, in same SD since 1982.
4langeles_20110718_75f	7182011	Malcolm McClain	no		Santa Monica Mountains	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Monica Mountains Coastal area should not be in SD with N inland communities. Coastal communities protect SMM recreation area and have nothing in common with N Inland Communitie

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_69f	Ventura	Antelope Valley, SCV, SFV,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_70f		Santa Clarita, Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, Canyon County,	Railroad Ave, Bouquet Canyon Rd, Seco Canyon Road, BLM land to North of city, Highway 126	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_71f	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_72f	Ventura	Santa Clarita Valley,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_73f		Santa Monica, Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_74f	Ventura	Antelope Valley, SCV, SFV,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_75f				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_69f	similar, together since 1982		no				
4langeles_20110718_70f			no				
4langeles_20110718_71f			no				
4langeles_20110718_72f			no				
4langeles_20110718_73f			no			political agendas	
4langeles_20110718_74f	similar, together since 1982		no				
4langeles_20110718_75f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_76f	7182011	Evan Chase	no				yes	Bel Air and Agoura Hills have nothing in common with Redondo Beach. Have never visited Agoura Hills. Map for CD 36 is unrecognizable. Questions integrity of commission
4langeles_20110718_77f	7182011	Nancy Freedman	no				yes	Keep 90049 together and intact, have working relationship with local VA. LA is too sprawling a place to tear apart neighborhood.
4langeles_20110718_78f	7182011	Elena Farina	no				yes	Put Torrance back into Beach cities for voting
4langeles_20110718_79f	7182011	Madelyn Glickfield	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	There is no bike path in Malibu, bike riders must ride PCH with cars and trucks. Only way to get from Malibu to Redondo Beach is to take PCH to I10 to I-405. Conejo Valley, W SFV, SMM, Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica and Brentwood, closer to Malibu.
4langeles_20110718_49f	7182011	Steven A Hassoldt	yes	So-Cal Quality Appraisals	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not lump Torrance with Gardena, Inglewood. Is Beach City, belongs in Beach Cities District, from Westchester to Torrance, including El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach,
4langeles_20110718_50f	7182011	Steve Hassoldt	yes	So-Cal Quality Appraisals	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not lump Torrance with Gardena, Inglewood. Is Beach City, belongs in Beach Cities District, from Westchester to Torrance, including El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_76f		Bel Air, Agoura Hills, Redondo Beach		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_77f		Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_78f		Torrance, Beach Cities		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_79f		Culver City, Redondo Beach, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Conejo Valley, W SFV, SMM, Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_49f		Beach Cities, Torrance, Gardena, Inglewood, Westchester, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Gardena, Inglewood, Redondo Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_50f		Beach Cities, Torrance, Gardena, Inglewood, Westchester, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Gardena, Inglewood, Redondo Beach		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_76f			no			Bel Air, Agoura Hills, Redondo Beach have nothing in common	
4langeles_20110718_77f	working relationship with local VA		no				
4langeles_20110718_78f			no				
4langeles_20110718_79f	closer proximity,		no			no bike path from Redondo Beach to Malibu	
4langeles_20110718_49f	Beach cities		no			not with Gardena, Inglewood	
4langeles_20110718_50f	Beach cities		no			not with Gardena, Inglewood	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_80f	7182011	Gerald Marcil	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Torrance is a Beach City like Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach. Not same issues as Inglewood, South L.A. Torrance has no COI with South Central L.A. Go back to old 36th district. South Bay is a community, geographically consisistent.
4langeles_20110718_81f	7182011	Deborah Zak	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	Interests in Malibu Coastal area are not the same as Santa Clarita. New boundaries for SD do not work.
4langeles_20110718_82f	7182011	Jennie M. Cole	no				yes	Do not take Torrance, Lomita, Harbor City away from South Bay, do not put with InglewoodLennox where they have nothing in common. Politicians are out of control.
4langeles_20110718_83f	7182011	Jane Affonso	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Disturbed that South Bay Beach Cities have been chopped up in 36th CD, esp Redondo Beach. Keep Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, El Segundo in same district all involved in vitality city. Add portion of NE Redondo back into new Redondo.
4langeles_20110718_84f	7182011	Frank Scotto, Mayor	yes	City of Torrance	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Torrance in 36th CD. Imperative to have city in single district. Keep parts of city with Redondo Beach zip code in with Torrance
4langeles_20110718_85f	7182011	Peggy Light	no		Pacific Palisades	Los Angeles	yes	Split off entire coastal area into 3 separate districts, (north, airport, south), rather than having entire beach landscape from Malibu to Palos Verdes in same district. Interactive map was cool

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_80f		Torrance, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, South Central LA	105 fwy	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_81f		Malibu, Santa Clarita		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_82f		Torrance, Lomita, Harbor City, South Bay, Inglewood, Lennox		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_83f		El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_84f		Torrance, Redondo Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_85f		Pacific Palisades, Malibu, Palos Verdes		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_80f	South Bay, Geographically consistent		no				
4langeles_20110718_81f			no			different issues	
4langeles_20110718_82f	beach people in South Bay		no			nothing in common with InglewoodLennox	
4langeles_20110718_83f	connected, newpapers, Vitality City program		no				
4langeles_20110718_84f	contiguous and cohesive community, quality of life, best served by one voice		no				
4langeles_20110718_85f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_86f	7182011	Linnea Mielcarek	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Do not cut up Santa Monica Mountains area would damage ability of that area to protect natural habitat. Political and social culture of Topanga and Malibbu falls more in-line with Santa Monica and West-side of LA
4langeles_20110718_87f	7182011	Art and Jill Connor	no				yes	Cities in proximity and of common interests are best served in forming districts. Torrance should be with Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Palos Verdes, Lomita, San Pedro. Do not include Los Angeles cities stretching to Malibu.
4langeles_20110718_88f	7182011	Paul Culberg	no		Cornell	Los Angeles	yes	SD EVENT does not work. Santa Monica Mountains is and should be a contiguous district. Do not belong with Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110718_89f	7182011	Ardis and Edward Forgy	no				yes	Do not separate 90049 district from VA district. Long supported and given a great deal to the VA in WLA. Best not to isolate it from its western neighbors
4langeles_20110718_90f	7182011	David Schechter, MD	no				yes	Torrance should be in 36th, South Bay is south of Westchester, do not gerry mander
4langeles_20110718_91f	7182011	Judy Jordan	no				yes	Proposed SD for Santa Monica Mountains cuts mountains in half at ridgeline, adds communities with no common interests. Use 1990 boundaries
4langeles_20110718_92f	7182011	Cynthia Scott	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Put topanga in SMMtnsCoastal communities. Read area not north to south, but East to West where critical relationships of transportation, education, environment, emergency preparedness, land use, are well established. Do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_86f		Santa Monica, Topanga, malibbu, Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_87f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Palos Verdes, Lomita, San Pedro, LA, Malibu		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_88f		Santa Monica Mountains, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_89f		Los Angeles		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_90f		Torrance, South Bay, Westchester		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_91f		Santa Monica Mountains		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_92f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Monica Mountains, Santa Clarita,		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_86f	political and social culture Santa Monica Mountains, natural habitat		no				
4langeles_20110718_87f	traffic flow, fire, police, emergency services, common interests, beach cities		no			why include malibu?	
4langeles_20110718_88f	contiguous district		no			do not belong with Santa Clarita	
4langeles_20110718_89f	VA district		no				
4langeles_20110718_90f			no				
4langeles_20110718_91f			no			adds communities without common interests	
4langeles_20110718_92f	transportation, education, environment, emergency preparedness, land use		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_93f	7182011	Barry Cossette	no				yes	Tentative South Bay Assembly district 46 is worse than present one. Put Torrance in it. Take out Venice, Santa Monica, they are not part of South Bay and have nothing in common with us, except being near water. Torrance, Lawndale, Hawthorne are integral.
4langeles_20110718_94f	7182011	Valerie Mucha	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Do not remove Hawthorne, Lennox, Wilmington, San Pedro from South bay cities. Do not replace with Venice, Santa Monica, etc, nothing in common, different lifestyle. Lawndale and Hawthorne are part of South Bay. Eliminate Westchester Marina del Rey from AD
4langeles_20110718_95f	7182011	Eugene Starr	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Southbay CD should span from Wilmington to Westchester, including Playa Vista and Playa del Rey. Southbay cities have no COI with Venice, Santa Monica, add Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox instead. Commission did not listen to testimony.
4langeles_20110718_96f	7182011	Patricia Starr	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Southbay CD should span from Wilmington to Westchester, including Playa Vista and Playa del Rey. Southbay cities have no COI with Venice, Santa Monica, add Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox instead. Commission did not listen to testimony.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_93f		South Bay, Venice, Santa Monica, Lawndale, Hawthorne		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_94f		Hawthorne, Lennox, Wilmington, Venice, Santa Monica, San Pedro, Harbor City, Malibu, Beverly Hills, Bel Aire,	El Segundo blvd	no	yes		small businesses, aerospace industry,
4langeles_20110718_95f		Wilmington, Venice, Santa Monica Hawthorne, Lawndale, Playa Vista, Playa del Rey, Venice, Westchester	Jefferson Boulevard	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_96f		Wilmington, Venice, Santa Monica Hawthorne, Lawndale, Playa Vista, Playa del Rey, Venice, Westchester	Jefferson Boulevard	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_93f	integral parts of South Bay region		no			Venice, Santa Monica have nothing in common	
4langeles_20110718_94f	South Bay, population		no			nothing in common with Venice, Santa monica, etc	
4langeles_20110718_95f	population, common interest, south bay		no			no COI with Venice, Santa Monica	
4langeles_20110718_96f	population, common interest, south bay		no			no COI with Venice, Santa Monica	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_97f	7182011	Claire Merriam Hoffman	no		Topanga Canyon	Los Angeles	yes	Do not cut Topanga Canyon in half, put with Simi Valley, Moore Park, Thousand Oaks. Needs and requirements are different from that area. Santa Monica Malibu school district. What happens in Santa Monica and West LA effects our town. Coastal, mountain COI
4langeles_20110718_98f	7182011	Gagik Movsesyan	no		Burbank	Los Angeles	yes	Supports new Congressional visualization released on July 14th. Urge you to favor option two which keeps Armenian communities, in Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena as one voting block
4langeles_20110718_99f	7182011	Marianne Tyler	no		Playa del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Downside to new vision AD maps is that Venice is divided among three Ads close-knit community economically, psychologically. Add all to LAIHG. Objects to IGWSG, seperates Playa del Rey and Westchester from other LA commuities with similar concerns.
4langeles_20110718_100f	7182011	Jolie Willett	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	New proposed SD EVENT does not work.
4langeles_20110718_101f	7182011	Neal Polan	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Include all of the Beach cities in same district in 36th CD. Similar desire for role of government in lives, should be able to elect someone that represents those goals. Share problems and concerns
4langeles_20110718_102f	7182011	John Bailey	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Torrance in 36th Cd and 53rd AD. South Bay should be from Westchester to entire PVP without cutting Torrance in half. Torrance should be with El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Lomita, Palos Verdes, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_97f		Topanga Canyon, Malibu, Simi Valley, Moore Park, Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica, West LA	Mulholland, Kanaan	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_98f		Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena		no	yes	Armenian communities	
4langeles_20110718_99f		Venice, Palos Verdes, Playa Del Rey, Playa Vista, Los Angeles, Westchester		no	yes	voices of community	economically connected
4langeles_20110718_100f				no	no		
4langeles_20110718_101f		Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes, El Segundo, Beach Cities		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_102f		Torrance, South Bay, Westchester, Palos Verdes Peninsula, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_97f	coastal, mountain community, school districts, needs, requirements		no			different needs, requirements from Simi Valley, etc	
4langeles_20110718_98f	voting block		no				
4langeles_20110718_99f	psychologically connected, similar concerns		no				
4langeles_20110718_100f			no				
4langeles_20110718_101f	share problems, concerns, elect representatives		no				
4langeles_20110718_102f	South Bay, represntation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_103f	7182011	Denise Delurgio	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	South Bay 36th CD is community, work, shop, play together. Nothing in common with Malibu, Calabasas. Do not stretch district up coast 50 miles, over canyons into Valley. South Bay Torrance Gardena, Lomita, San Pedro, etc form reasonable boundary
4langeles_20110718_104f	7182011	Stan and Wanda Yetter	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	South Bay community is Westchester, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, local common interests, business, economic interests, personal lives.
4langeles_20110718_105f	7182011	Steve Felstein	no				yes	Vote for sensible, concise 36th CD with PV, RPV, Torrance, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan beach in one district. Do not need long strange boundaries including part of the Valley
4langeles_20110718_106f	7182011	Susan Nielsen	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	South Bay is Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, the Palos Verdes Peninsula, San Pedro and Carson, Torrance is Central part, do not delete. Let common sense reign.
4langeles_20110718_107f	7182011	Jolaine Merrill, Broker Associate	yes	Coldwell Banker Palos Verdes	Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	36th district should be El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rancho Palos Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates,San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_103f		South Bay, Malibu, Calabasas, Torrance, Gardena, Lomita, San Pedro, Palos Verdes		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_104f		Westchester, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena,		no	yes	personal lives	business interests, economic interests
4langeles_20110718_105f		PV, RPV, Torrance, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_106f		South Bay, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, the Palos Verdes Peninsula, San Pedro and Carson		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_107f		El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rancho Palos Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates,San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_103f	live, work shop, play, reasonable boundary		no			up coast 50 miles over canyons into Valley	
4langeles_20110718_104f	local interests		no				
4langeles_20110718_105f	sensible, concise		no			do not need boundaries that include Valley	
4langeles_20110718_106f	central part of South Bay		no				
4langeles_20110718_107f	South Bay		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_108f	7182011	Alisa Ismailyan	no		Glendale	Los Angeles	yes	Supports new Congressional visualization July 14th. Urge to favor option 2 which keeps Armenian communities in Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena in one voting block
4langeles_20110718_109f	7182011	J.R. Wenker	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Torrance in 36th. Only Westchester and cities to the South are acceptable for new 36th South Bay district. Long strung out district reeks of Gerrymanderign, which ignores wishes of people. Venice and other areas to N of Westchester not South Bay
4langeles_20110718_110f	7182011	Nancy and Stuart Thomason	no				yes	All parts south of Westchester including Torrance should be part of 36th, do not fix what is not broken
4langeles_20110718_111f	7182011	Yehuda Netanel	no		Monte Nido	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Monica Coastal communities should be together in EW district that does not include N inland communities of Simi Vally, Moorpark, Santa Clarita. Would cut through unified local neighborhoods. Save local cultural history and sense of communities
4langeles_20110718_112f	7182011	Linda Mikyska	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Include El Segundo. Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, Lomita, Torrance, San Pedro, Hawthorne and Gardena in same district. Vision, Values, goals, govt is similar, representative in 36th. Other cities dissimilar.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_108f		Glendale, Altadena, Pasadena		no	yes	Armenian communities	
4langeles_20110718_109f		Torrance, Westchester, South Bay, Venice		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_110f		Westchester, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_111f		Santa Monica Mountain, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		yes	yes	well established, unified local neighborhoods	
4langeles_20110718_112f		El Segundo. Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, Lomita, Torrance, San Pedro, Hawthorne and Gardena		no	yes	vision, values, goals	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_108f	one voting block		no				
4langeles_20110718_109f	South Bay		no			areas north of Westchester, little in common	
4langeles_20110718_110f			no				
4langeles_20110718_111f	local cultural unity		no			do not include north inland communities	
4langeles_20110718_112f	representatives		no			other cities have dissimilar problems and issues	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_113f	7182011	Susan Cloke	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Maintain continuous district for coastal cities to provide protection for Santa Monica Bay, precious environmental resource, coastal tourism is economic engine, recreation for millions of people, water quality.
4langeles_20110718_114f	7182011	Peter Heumann	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT boundaries do not work- aligns coastal communities and SMM communities with areas that do not share issues, geography. SMMs are protected National Recreation Area, and should be connected with communities on EW, not Simi Valley, Moorpark
4langeles_20110718_115f	7182011		no				yes	Keep Torrance in 37th district
4langeles_20110718_116f	7182011	June Bostick	no		36th District	Los Angeles	yes	Westchester should be in South Bay. Silly slivers on extreme Westside should be in another area. Now is the time for correct district drawing
4langeles_20110718_117f	7182011	William Anderson	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne in current district. Keep HawthorneWiseburn in the South Bay district, and put Carson, with no ties to south Bay, in new district. History, school districts, roots in South Bay
4langeles_20110718_118f	7182011	Ines M. Shipe	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Keep 36th CD and AD in South Bay is not the Westside. Torrance is part of it. Look at phone books, newspapers, sports, etc. South Bay starts at Westchester S to San Pedro. Personal lives, business interests, economic activity are intertwined

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_113f		Santa Monica		no	yes		Santa Monica Bay, precious environmental resource, coastal tourism is economic engine, recreation for millions of people, water quality.
4langeles_20110718_114f		Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_115f		Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_116f		Westchester, South Bay		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_117f		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, South Bay		no	yes	historical roots	
4langeles_20110718_118f		South Bay, Westside LA, Westchester, Torrance, San Pedro		no	yes	personal lives	business interests, economic activity

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_113f			no				
4langeles_20110718_114f	National Recreation Area, geography,		no			Simi Valley, Moorpark, do not share geography, issues or concerns	
4langeles_20110718_115f			no				
4langeles_20110718_116f			no			slivers on Westside should be in another area	
4langeles_20110718_117f	school districts.		no			other CD has no connections to Hawthorne	
4langeles_20110718_118f			no			no COI with proposed cities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_119f	7182011	Priscilla Clark	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Palos Verdes in South Bay district. Use straight lines from Palos Verdes to Westchester, Gerrymandering lines should go out with the past.
4langeles_20110718_120f	7182011	Steve Lazar	yes	Lazar design and build			yes	Make 36th district south bay cities only including Torrance. Stop manipulating for your benefit
4langeles_20110718_121f	7182011	David Zelaskowski	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Please redraw line so that it follows 170 fwy and keeps stakeholders in Valley Village in one CD. Community is a uniffied district.
4langeles_20110718_122f	7182011	Kathleen Roquemore	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Torrance in 36th district, are part of South Bay, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan Beach. Please keep intact
4langeles_20110718_123f	7182011	Jeff Kreager	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	South Bay does not include Santa Monica, Venice, Beverly Hills. Does include Torrance, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Palos Verdes, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan Beach, exclude Westside
4langeles_20110718_124f	7192011	Victoria Talbot	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Brentwood has symbiotic relationship with VA. Worked hard to maintain property and conditions, changing district would disengage from natural partner, create obstacles
4langeles_20110718_125f	7192011	Johnathan Pregler	no				yes	Supports 715 congress la opt 1.2. Looks like best option for West La, Culver City. Groups similar interests and demographics. 716 map will disenfranchise significant part of west LA
4langeles_20110718_126f	7192011	Elin Schwartz	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Brentwood should not be split into 2 districts; cohesive community with ongoing problems VA, BCC, BHA, SBRA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_119f		Palos Verdes, South Bay, Westchester		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_120f		South Bay, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_121f		Valley Village	170 freeway	no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_122f		Torrance, South Bay, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan Beach		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_123f		South Bay, Santa Monica, Venice, Beverly Hills. Does include Torrance, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Palos Verdes, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan Beach,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_124f		Brentwood		no	yes		VA
4langeles_20110718_125f		West LA, Culver City		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_126f		Brentwood		no	yes		VA, BCC, BHA, SBRA

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_119f	representation, needs, expectations		no				
4langeles_20110718_120f			no				
4langeles_20110718_121f	community, unified district, obvious boundaries		no				
4langeles_20110718_122f	are own city, but are south bay, small town feel		no				
4langeles_20110718_123f			no			does not include Santa Monica, etc	
4langeles_20110718_124f	natural partner, worked to improve property		no				
4langeles_20110718_125f	similar interests and demographics		no				
4langeles_20110718_126f	worked closely with rep offices		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_127f	7192011	Joan Kay	yes	Monte Nido Fire Safe Council	Monte Nido	Los Angeles	yes	Opposes SD EVENT. Nothing in common with Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita inland corridor. Santa Monica MountainsCoastal Corridor share interests of neighboring coastal communities and must be left intact
4langeles_20110718_128f	7192011	Roz Gamble	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep VA in Brentwood district work together to maintain and protect contiguous land and its use. Many programs and governance is done within zip code area to strengthen community input
4langeles_20110718_129f	7192011	Peter Zeegen	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Concerned about splitting 90049 Brentwood stirct and splitting Wadsworth VA from district. work together to maintain and protect contiguous land and its use
4langeles_20110718_130f	7192011	Mary Helen Michel	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep VA in Brentwood worked hard to maintain and protect the Contiguous VA land
4langeles_20110718_131f	7192011	Will and Patricia Stokes	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work, does not include Calabasas in COI area, which is E-W configuration including Agoura Hills, Westlake Village. No common interests with area NE of us, especially SFV
4langeles_20110718_132f	7192011	Ruth Williams	no		Silver Lake	Los Angeles	yes	Silver lake is in wrong district, belongs with Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Burbank
4langeles_20110718_133f	7192011	Barbara Bloom	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Brentwood has positive relationship with VA, keep in district. Worked hart to protect contiguous land. Many programs are within zip code. Prime Real estate, developers want to get their hands on.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_127f		Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, SMM		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_128f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_129f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_130f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_131f		SFV, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_132f		Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills, Burbank, Silver Lake		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_133f		Brentwood		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_127f	interests of neighboring coastal communities		no			no COI with Simi Valley, etc	
4langeles_20110718_128f	VA, land use, programs, governance done within zip code		no				
4langeles_20110718_129f	VA, land use, programs,		no				
4langeles_20110718_130f	contiguous VA land		no				
4langeles_20110718_131f	common interest area		no			no common interests with areas NE, esp SFV	
4langeles_20110718_132f			no				
4langeles_20110718_133f	VA, contiguous land use, governance		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_134f	7192011	Mr and Mrs James Knowlton and Family	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of Torrance in 36th CD, heart of South Bay, should not be expelled from Palos Verdes, Torrance, San Pedro, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, etc.
4langeles_20110718_135f	7192011	Joel Towler	no				yes	Why remove 36th district from South Bay. To make 36th part of beach cities makes no sense. Seems political
4langeles_20110718_136f	7192011	Alison Jamele	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Do not exclude Torrance from South bay CD, AD, do not include Venice, Santa Monica, Malibu, Beverly Hills, Bel Air, other LA cities that have no interests with South Bay.
4langeles_20110718_137f	7182011	Robert I. Ishii	no		El Segundo	Los Angeles	yes	Why are you taking Torrance out of 36th district, which should be from Westchester down to PV.
4langeles_20110718_138f	7182011	Jolene Denova	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in South Bay 36th CD and AD. South Bay should be Westchester south only
4langeles_20110718_139f	7182011	Candace Messer	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Keep cities together that represent the South Bay. Do not add cities further North, but keep cities more local. Look forward to more reasonable district.
4langeles_20110718_140f	7182011	Bonney Larson	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	New redistricting should include an actual community. Community is Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Torrance, San Pedro, S Westchester, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Gardena

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_134f		South Bay, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Hermosa, Manhattan, Palos Verdes, San Pedro		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_135f		South Bay, Beach cities		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_136f		South Bay, Torrance, Venice, Santa Monica, Malibu, Beverly Hills		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_137f		Torrance, Westchester, Palos Verdes		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_138f		Westchester, Torrance, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_139f		South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_140f		Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes, Lomita, Torrance, San Pedro, S Westchester, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Gardena, South Bay		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_134f	heart of the South Bay		no				
4langeles_20110718_135f			no			makes no sense	
4langeles_20110718_136f	South Bay, personal lives, business interests, economic activity, everything else		no			Venice, Santa Monica, Malibu, etc have nothing to do with interest in South Bay community	
4langeles_20110718_137f			no				
4langeles_20110718_138f	South Bay		no			south Bay should be Westchester South Only	
4langeles_20110718_139f	South Bay, local cities		no			do not add cities further North	
4langeles_20110718_140f	actual community of South Bay		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_141f	7182011	Marianne Tyler	no		Playa del Rey	Los Angeles	yes	Downside to new visualization AD maps that Venice is divided among three Ads close-knit community economically, psychologically. Add all to LAIHG. Objects to IGWSG, seperates Playa del Rey and Westchester from other LA commuities with similar concerns.
4langeles_20110718_142f	7182011	Frances Alet	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Thousand Oaks, Malibu in one SD, not with Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita. Long history of common interests. Otherwise share no services, priorities,no COI with Moorpark, etc.
4langeles_20110718_143f	7182011	Laurence Brody	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Population would be better served with cohesive district including Palos Verdes Peninsula, Torrance, Hermosa, Manhattan, Redondo Beach. Include as much of Harbor City, Lomita, El Segundo as possible.
4langeles_20110718_144f	7182011	Denise Nolan Delurgio	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Use city limits, freeways, geographical barriers for redistricting, not crazy boundaries, gerrymangered districts, minority communities
4langeles_20110718_145f	7182011	B McCaskill	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district. Dividing up electorate to suit political goals is reason CA is shadow.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_141f		Venice, Palos Verdes, Playa Del Rey, Playa Vista, Los Angeles, Westchester		no	yes	voices of community	economically connected
4langeles_20110718_142f		Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Thousand Oaks, Malibu, Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_143f		Palos Verdes Peninsula, Torrance, Hermosa, Manhattan, Redondo Hills, Harbor City, Lomita, El Segundo		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_144f				no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_145f		Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Gardena		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_141f	psychologically connected, similar concerns		no				
4langeles_20110718_142f	long history of common interests, services, santa monica mountains		no			share no services with simi valley, etc	
4langeles_20110718_143f	cohesive district		no				
4langeles_20110718_144f	city limits, freeways, geographical barriers		no			gerrymandered districts	
4langeles_20110718_145f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_146f	7182011	Linda Ilsley	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	Topanga has been proactive community in regards to politically and emergency preparedness. Do not want lines drawn by outside authority that has little understanding of what community means. Stand firmly against this.
4langeles_20110718_147f	7182011	Paul and Donna Kasper	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th district with other South Bay cities. Have common interests. 36th district should be Westchester south only
4langeles_20110718_148f	7182011	Linda Olmos	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th district with other South Bay cities. Have common interests. 36th district should be Westchester south only
4langeles_20110718_149f	7182011	Stephanie Palmer	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not separate Valley Village or divide in two. Keep neighborhood intact
4langeles_20110718_150f	7182011	Kellly Newby	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Valley Village into two parts, active and vital community. Redraw line to follow 170 fwy and keep stakeholders in one CD.
4langeles_20110718_151f	7182011	Patti LaGrelius	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	frustrated with 36th CD. Should include Palos Verdes Peninsula. N of Westchester does not make good fit. 36th should be Westchester South to San Pedro, including peninsula. Do not remove Torrance from the district
4langeles_20110718_152f	7182011	Norm Goyette	no		El Segundo	Los Angeles	yes	Restore 36th CD as South Bay district, not gerrymandered to Santa Monica and other North Bay communities with which we have little in common.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_146f		Topanga		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_147f		Torrance, Westchester, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_148f		Torrance, Westchester, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_149f		Valley Village		yes	yes		
4langeles_20110718_150f		Valley Village	170 freeway	no	yes	active and vital community	
4langeles_20110718_151f		Palos Verdes Peninsula, Westchester, San Pedro, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_152f		South Bay, Santa Monica, North Bay		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_146f	proactive, emergency preparedness		no				
4langeles_20110718_147f	common interests		no				
4langeles_20110718_148f	common interests		no				
4langeles_20110718_149f			no				
4langeles_20110718_150f			no				
4langeles_20110718_151f			no			North of Westchester does not make a good fit	
4langeles_20110718_152f	South Bay		no			little in common with North Bay communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_153f	7182011	Anita Zitta	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Keep all of South Bay area neighborhoods South of Westchester, including Torrance, together in 36th CD. Live and function together, deserve to be represented by local rep from common personal, economic, neighborhoods
4langeles_20110718_154f	7182011	Lavon Heinemann	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Torrance in 36th district. Torrance is a beach city, leave in South Bay
4langeles_20110718_155f	7182011	Gordon Peay	yes	Legacy Financial Group	Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Maintain 36th district as representative of South Bay communities, including Torrance. From LAX south, including Westchester. Keep together as group
4langeles_20110718_156f	7182011	Michael L. Newhart	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split Torrance from 36th district. Torrance is included in South Bay with El Segundo, Manhattan, Redondo, Hermosa Beach. Venice, Marina Del Rey are different city. All a community in S Bay
4langeles_20110718_157f	7192011	Marion Haynes	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD and AD. .South Bay should be Westchester South only share personal lives, business interests, economic activity, everything else with neighbors and community.
4langeles_20110718_158f	7182011	Dolores Garren	no				yes	Keep Torrance in 36th District. Everything south of Westchester should be South Bay
4langeles_20110718_159f	7182011	Jeff Tiddens	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Do not redistrict Hawthorne as it would create a bad situation for Fusion Residential complex, since they rely on neighborhood watch and quick reponse from police. Redistricting would pull police resources toward South Central.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_153f		San Pedro, South Bay, Westchester, Torrance		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_154f		Torrance, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_155f		Torrance, South Bay, Westchester		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_156f		South Bay, Torrance, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Venice, Marina del Rey		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_157f		Torrance, South Bay, El Segundo		no	yes		business interests, economic activity
4langeles_20110718_158f		Torrance, Westchester, South Bay		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_159f		Hawthorne, LA		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_153f	live and function together, representation		no				
4langeles_20110718_154f	beach city		no				
4langeles_20110718_155f	much in common, LAX		no				
4langeles_20110718_156f	all a community, South Bay		no			Venice, etc are lik entirely different city	
4langeles_20110718_157f	personal lives intertwined		no				
4langeles_20110718_158f			no				
4langeles_20110718_159f	residential complex, would have delayed police response		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_160f	7182011	Martin A. C. Enriquez Marquez	no				yes	Franklin School, zip 91001, Pasadena City College, Pasadena United have COI. Respect city boundaries, United school districts.
4langeles_20110718_161f	7182011	Martin A. C. Enriquez Marquez	no		Montebello	Los Angeles	yes	Persons have COIs in common East Los Angeles, Montebello, 90022
4langeles_20110718_162f	7182011	Martin A. C. Enriquez Marquez	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Persons have COIs Church, zip code, city college, pasadena United. Enclosed map for Pasadena Community College District. City boundaries, school districts, zip codes should be respected
4langeles_20110718_163f	7182011	Mary Grace Grammatico	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Include Wiseburn in same CD as rest of South Bay. Identify with Beach Cities South Bay, want united voice education, churches, hospitals, community relationships
4langeles_20110718_164f	7182011	Mark Moorefield	no				yes	Put blocks of areas together, no crazy lines. Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD. South Bay should be Westchester South Only
4langeles_20110718_165f	7182011	Elizabeth and Steve Kipner	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT is wrong and ridiculous, concern in Topanga is any compromise where emergency preparedness is undermined.
4langeles_20110718_166f	7182011	Judith Hodgins	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	Opposed to combining inland areas like Simi and Moorpark with Coastal Corridor. No commonality of needs, must not be combined. Fragile ecosystem needs informed care
4langeles_20110718_167f	7182011	Bert Hawkins	no				yes	Cease gerrymandering keep district 36 the way it needs to stay and is

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_160f		Pasadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_161f		E LA, Montebello		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_162f		Pasadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_163f		Wiseburn, South Bay		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_164f		Westchester, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_165f		Topanga		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_166f		Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_167f				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_160f	school districts, colleges, city boundaries		no				
4langeles_20110718_161f	place of worship		no				
4langeles_20110718_162f	church, zip code, school districts, city boundaries		no				
4langeles_20110718_163f	work, play, shop, medical care, family, churches		no				
4langeles_20110718_164f			no				
4langeles_20110718_165f	emergency preparedness		no				
4langeles_20110718_166f	Coastal area, fragile ecosystem		no			no commonality of needs with Simi Valley	
4langeles_20110718_167f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_170f	7182011	Greg Pass	no				yes	Why would Palos Verdes and Beverly Hills be in same district. You have created dumbbell district, make no common sense
4langeles_20110718_171f	7182011	Martin A. C. Enriquez Marquez	no		Pasadena	Los Angeles	yes	Persons have COIs Church, zip code, city college, pasadena United. Enclosed map for Pasadena Community College District. City boundaries, school districts, zip codes should be respected
4langeles_20110718_172f	7182011	Jan Webber	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Prefer to share district with S SFV than Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Simi Valley. Little in common with Inland areas, much in common with Malibu, santa Monica. Consider E-W boundary through EVENT and SFV district instead of N-S
4langeles_20110718_173f	7192011	Eric Freedman	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep VA in Brentwood district- worked to improve contiguous land and use. Many programs and governance done within zip code. VA has been part of Brentwood for as long as I can remember
4langeles_20110718_176f	7192011	Mary Ann Garvey	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	VA has been part of Brentwood for 100 years. Keep this in mind and keep all of Brentwood which includes VA in same CD
4langeles_20110718_177f	7192011	Sandra Caruso	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep VA in district, worked to protect land which is deserved by vets. Cohesive part of community, land should remain intact for their benefit.
4langeles_20110718_178f	7192011	Marylin Krell	no		South Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	S Brentwood is part of Brentwood, not West LA. Keep all in same district. Also keep VA in district, worked closely for years, partner

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_170f		Palos Verdes, Beverly Hills		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_171f		Pasadena		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_172f		SFV, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Malibu, Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_173f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_176f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_177f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_178f		Brentwood, LA		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_170f			no			dumbbell district	
4langeles_20110718_171f	church, zip code, school districts, city boundaries		no				
4langeles_20110718_172f	much in common		no			little in common with inland areas	
4langeles_20110718_173f	VA, land use, governance		no				
4langeles_20110718_176f	VA is 100 years old in Brentwood		no				
4langeles_20110718_177f	VA, well deserved bby bets, worked hard to protect the land		no				
4langeles_20110718_178f	VA, worked closely for years		no			are not West LA	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_179f	7192011	Sandra Carusos	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Keep VA in district, worked to protect land which is deserved by vets. Cohesive part of community, land should remain intact for their benefit.
4langeles_20110718_180f	7192011	Paulette Rochelle-Levy	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Voted for Paley and Waxman, cannot take own legislators away from us
4langeles_20110718_181f	7192011	Stephanie Labowitz	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	South Brentwood is Brentwood, not West LA. Also keep VA in district, work closely, partner, maintain land. Many programs and governance is done within zip code
4langeles_20110718_182f	7192011	Dana Schlumpberger	no		Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Santa Clarita will be difficult to coordinate issues between two senators. Please redraw with Santa Clarita represented by just one senator
4langeles_20110718_183f	7192011	Bobbi Feinstein	no		Brentwood	Los Angeles	yes	Do not split up Brentwood. Keep S Brentwood and VA in same 90049 zip code
4langeles_20110718_184f	7192011	Matthew Millen	no		Santa Monica	Los Angeles	yes	Santa Monica should be linked with South Bay rather than Malibu and up coast. More in common with Beach Cities south of us
4langeles_20110718_185f	7192011	Brian Smith	no				yes	Should have E Ventura County to Santa Clarita Valley SD that keep SD whole, unified voice with single senate seat. Keep community from being fractioned
4langeles_20110718_186f	7192011	Susan Hirsch	no				yes	Keep all of Brentwood and WLA VA in one district, community that works together. South Brentwood does not consider itself part of WLA

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_179f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_180f		Santa Monica		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_181f		South Brentwood, Brentwood, West LA		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_182f		Santa Clarita		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_183f		South Brentwood, Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_184f		Santa Monica, South Bay, Malibu,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_185f	East Ventura	Santa Clarity Valley		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_186f		Brentwood, West LA		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_179f	VA, well deserved bby bets, worked hard to protect the land		no				
4langeles_20110718_180f			no				
4langeles_20110718_181f	VA, work closely, land, zipcode, governance		no			not West LA	
4langeles_20110718_182f	will be difficult to coordinate issues between 2 senators		no				
4langeles_20110718_183f	VA		no				
4langeles_20110718_184f	more in common, beach cities		no				
4langeles_20110718_185f	community should be whole, unified voice		no				
4langeles_20110718_186f	VA, works together		no			S Brentwood is not W LA	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_187f	7192011	Resident	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Do not break up South Bay district. South Bay is different from West LA, Santa Monica, etc. Beaches are different. Want to select own politicians. Keep Torrance in the district, do not expand district above South Westchester
4langeles_20110718_188f	7182011	James E. Scott	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Boundary lines for 36th district should cover South Bay including Torrance. Lines should not extend North of El Segundo
4langeles_20110718_189f	7192011	Sue and Vic Lepisto	no		Agoura Hills	Los Angeles	yes	Las Virgenes areas should be connected to Westside, Malibu parts of SFV in district 23 as we share Santa Monica mtns and acces to Pacific Ocean with Thousand Oaks, and Oak Park as well. Do not share interests with Santa Clarita, Castiac, Simi
4langeles_20110718_190f	7182011	Ruth Herbert	no		Lomita	Los Angeles	yes	36th district should be Westchester South Only and Torrance should be included
4langeles_20110718_191f	7192011	Merle and Kathy Countryman	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Leave neighborhoods intact. Torrance is part of South Bay, not Topanga, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills. From San Pedro north is logical South Bay area. Little in common with Santa monica, westside. Has Redondo Beach zip, but torrance schools, utilities, etc.
4langeles_20110718_192f	7182011	John Johnson	no		South bay	Los Angeles	yes	36th district is El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena. Most citizens would say same thing, needs undivided representation

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_187f		Westchester, South Bay, West LA, Santa Monica		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_188f		South Bay, Torrance, El Segundo		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_189f		Simi, Castiac, Santa Clarita, Oak Park, Thousand Oaks, Malibu, SFV, Las Virgenes		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_190f		Westchester, Torrance		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_191f		Redondo Beach, Torrance, South Bay, San Pedro, Topanga, Santa Monica, El Segundo,		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_192f		El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena.		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_187f	select own reps, heart of south bay		no			different beaches, different areas	
4langeles_20110718_188f			no				
4langeles_20110718_189f	Santa Monica Mountains, Pacific Ocean		no			do not share common interests with Castiac, etc	
4langeles_20110718_190f			no				
4langeles_20110718_191f	share schools, utilities, fire, police, building dept		no			little in common with Santa Monica, etc, Westside	
4langeles_20110718_192f	community needs undivided representation		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_193f	7182011	Tracey Arnold	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT lines must be redrawn. Santa Monica Mountain Coastal Communities should be together in east west district that does not include north inland communities of Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita
4langeles_20110718_194f	7182011	Clark Rozas	no		South Bay	Los Angeles	yes	Keep 36th district from Westchester south, include Torrance, do not try to throw in favorite liberal areas who have nothing in common with South Bay. Used to be young, foolish.
7scruz_20110718_1f	7182011	Mary Thuerwatcher	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split city of Santa Cruz, dilutes voter impact. All of city should remain in district which contains Santa Cruz county
7scruz_20110718_2f	7192011	Erik Cota-Robles	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Draw Santa Cruz line down middle of San Lorenzo river and adjust population elsewhere in district W Santa Cruz with University would be lumped with Silicon Valley and E Santa Cruz would go with rest of county and Monterey. Student population
7scruz_20110718_3f	7192011	Manu Koenig	no		Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	yes	Do not split Santa Cruz in hafl, would not be good, share common business and cultural interests
8alameda_20110718_1f	7182011	Sharon Rodrigues	no				yes	Do not split Fremont into 2 districts where they will become invisible. Must all be kept in 1 district
8alameda_20110718_2f	7192011	Maureen Donlon	no				yes	Keep Fremont, Union City, Newark whole. Tri-cities need to be represented as one. Tri City map protects COI. Do not split Fremont from Tri-Cities, fourth largest city in Bay

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_193f		Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, SMM		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_194f		Westchester, Torrance, South Bay		no	yes		
7scruz_20110718_1f	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		
7scruz_20110718_2f	Santa Cruz, Monterey	Santa Cruz	San Lorenzo river	no	yes	student population rented apartments in beach flats	University of California campus
7scruz_20110718_3f	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz		no	yes		share business
8alameda_20110718_1f		Fremont		no	yes		
8alameda_20110718_2f		Fremont, Union City, Newark		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_193f	Mountains, coast		no			not N inland communities	
4langeles_20110718_194f	South Bay		no			nothing in common with South bay, favorite liberal areas	shame on your shameless fakery
7scruz_20110718_1f	splitting would dilute voter impact		no				
7scruz_20110718_2f			no				
7scruz_20110718_3f	cultural interests		no				
8alameda_20110718_1f	will become invisible if split		no				
8alameda_20110718_2f	Tri-Cities area, fourth largest city in bay		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
8alameda_20110718_3f	7192011	Chris Gray, Chief of Staff	yes	Alameda County Supervisor Haggertys Office		Alameda	yes	Keep Fremont, Union City, Newark whole. Tri-cities need to be represented as one. Tri City map protects COI. Do not split Fremont from Tri-Cities, fourth largest city in Bay
8ccosta_20110718_1f	7182011	Dolores Neese	no		Richmond	Contra Costa	yes	Do not divide Richmond. Have fought hard for unity and cooperation. Thought of division in irresponsibble and would be devestating to Richmond
9humboldt_20110718_1f	7182011	Will	no				yes	July 16th visualizations will not open. Can open all others, but July 16th for Senate, Nor Cal will not open
9humboldt_20110718_2f	7182011	Jim Briggs	no		Eureka	Humboldt	yes	Do not include HumboldtDel NorteMendocino Counties with Marin. Only thing in common is coast, otherwise nightday. More in common with rural counties like Siskiyou, Lake, Glenn, Tehama
9humboldt_20110718_3f	7182011	Ernie DeGraff	no		Fortuna	Humboldt	yes	Do not include Marin and southern Sonoma with HumboldtDel NorteMendocino. These three have much in common with each other, little in common with Marin, Sonoma, which are more aligned with Bay
9lake_20110718_1f	7182011	William Edgar Bennett III	no		Clearlake	Lake	yes	Lake is not part of Central Valley. Soils are uniquely suited to vineyards, not a central Valley ag pastureland. Vineyards and winery tourst are economic. Do not split coastal state delegates. First drafts were attractive, new ones are unacceptable.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
8alameda_20110718_3f		Fremont, Union City, Newark		no	yes	Asian Community, indo-americans, afghan-americans	
8ccosta_20110718_1f		Richmond		no	yes		
9humboldt_20110718_1f				no	no		
9humboldt_20110718_2f	Humbolt, Del Norte, Mendocino, Marin, Siskiyou, Glenn, Lake, Tehama			no	yes		
9humboldt_20110718_3f	Marin, HumboldtDel NorteMendocino, Sonoma,			no	yes		
9lake_20110718_1f	Lake, Napa			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
8alameda_20110718_3f	Tri-Cities area, fourth largest city in bay		no				
8ccosta_20110718_1f	fought hard for unity and cooperation, would be devastating to split		no				
9humboldt_20110718_1f			no				
9humboldt_20110718_2f	rural counties		no			Marin is night and day different	
9humboldt_20110718_3f	much in common with each other		no			little in common with Marin, Sonoma	
9lake_20110718_1f	wineries, vineyards,		no			not agricultural pastureland	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9lake_20110718_2f	7182011	Theresa Logsdon	no				yes	Oppose redistricting of Lake County into Yuba CD. Geographic, recreational, econ, tourism more aligned to NapaMendocino than YubaSutterGlen. Lake was once part of Napa. Lake is member of North Coast Toursim Council, more accesible from N Coast
9lake_20110718_3f	7182011	Dwain Goforth	no				yes	Cuturally, Socially, economically, Lake is more aligned with Napa and Mendocino than Yuba, Sutter, Yolo. Many roads connect Lake with Napa and Mendocino. Keep cities with natural affinities in same districts
9lake_20110718_4f	7182011	Jerry G Blackman	no			Lake	yes	Mike Thompson has been rep for years. Leave district alone. Great things are happening, do not throw to wolves
9lake_20110718_5f	7182011	Martha Steward	no			Lake	yes	Keep Lake County in original district with Napa and Mendocino. Congressman know how to assist grapewine industries, plus small country setting of small ag farms, growers. Not metro community nor large scale producer
9lake_20110718_6f	7182011	Philip Murphy	no			Lake	yes	Your plan sucks. Do not want to start bribing someone new, do not want to be associated with rednecks over in central valley, they smell funny. Leave us alone
4langeles_20110718_168f	7182011	Frank Green	no				yes	Torrance should be returned back to 36th CD, AD, and South Bay should be Westchester south only. Remember promise to voters. God remembers
4langeles_20110718_169f	7182011	Leonor Anderson	no		Wiseburn	Los Angeles	yes	Keep Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire in same CD with South Bay cities. Strong ties, shopping, movies, restaurants, fairs,

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9lake_20110718_2f	Lake, Yuba, Napa, Mendocino, Yuba, Sutter, Glenn			no	yes		agricultural, economic development, tourism base
9lake_20110718_3f	Lake, Mendocino, Napa Yuba, Sutter, Yolo			no	yes		
9lake_20110718_4f	Lake			no	yes		
9lake_20110718_5f	Lake, napa, Mendocino			no	yes		small ag farms, wineries, growers for pear, walnuts
9lake_20110718_6f	Lake			no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_168f		Torrance, South Bay, Westchester		no	no		
4langeles_20110718_169f		Hawthorne, Wiseburn, Del Aire, South Bay		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9lake_20110718_2f	geography, reacreation, Toursim Council		no			not part of Central Valley	
9lake_20110718_3f	natural environment, communications, transportation		no			only one road connects Lake with proposed CD and SDs	
9lake_20110718_4f	great things, Mike Thompson		no				
9lake_20110718_5f			no			not metro community or large scale producer	
9lake_20110718_6f	moderately happy with current crook, do not want to bribe someone new		no			rednecks in central valley smell funny	
4langeles_20110718_168f			no				
4langeles_20110718_169f	Strong ties, shopping, movies, restaurants, fairs		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
4langeles_20110718_174f	7192011	Lynn Arost	no				yes	Keep VA in district, all have worked hard to update and improve the land, it is part of community
4langeles_20110718_175f	7192011	Frank Dines	no				yes	Keep VA in district, it is part of our community that we take pride in
9lake_20110718_7f	7182011	JoAnn Saccato	no			Lake	yes	Lake County more aligned with Napa and Mendocino than Yuba, Sutter, Yolo, natural environment, communications, transportation. Would be misrepresentation
9lake_20110718_8f	7182011	Michael C. Coragliott	no		Clearlake	Lake	yes	New redistricting is unacceptable. Makes no sense to remove Lake from longstanding compatible neighboring counties. Common interest of grape growing, wine. Little in common with central Valley, common interests with coastal counties
9lake_20110718_9f	7182011	John A. Carlisi	no			Lake	yes	Do not isolate Lake from geographic, economic social COI with North CoastWine countryN coastal range. Do not attach with Central Valley. Specialty crops, not commercial crops. Premium wine growing area like Napa, Sonoma. Presevation of beauty of area
9lake_20110718_10f	7182011	Judith A. Barnes	no			Lake	yes	Do not redistrict Lake to Sacramento Region. Lake is small with unique resources, belons with Wine Country, Mendocino, rural areas. Metro Sacramento would squeltch voice
9lake_20110718_11f	7182011	Anna Ravenwoode	no			Lake	yes	Do not remove Lake from economic and cultural bases of Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma. DO not put with Sacramento Valley, would put at economic and political disadvantage

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
4langeles_20110718_174f		Brentwood		no	yes		
4langeles_20110718_175f		Brentwood		no	yes		
9lake_20110718_7f	Lake, napa, Mendocino, Yuba, Sutter, Yolo			no	yes		
9lake_20110718_8f	Lake			no	yes		grape growing, wine
9lake_20110718_9f	Lake, Napa, Sonoma			no	yes		wine growing, specialty crops
9lake_20110718_10f	Lake, Sacramento, Mendocino			no	yes		grape growing, tourism
9lake_20110718_11f	Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Sacramento			no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
4langeles_20110718_174f	VA, the land, community		no				
4langeles_20110718_175f	all take pride in VA		no				
9lake_20110718_7f	environment, communications, transportation		no			less aligned with Yuba	
9lake_20110718_8f	economically, socially compatible neighbors		no			little in common with central valley	
9lake_20110718_9f	natural beauty of area		no			not large-scale agriculture	
9lake_20110718_10f	wine country		no			not metro Sacramento	
9lake_20110718_11f	coastal community, economic base		no			economic and political disadvantage	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9lake_20110718_12f	7192011	Hedy Montoya	no			Lake	yes	Lake should be with Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, because socially, economically, culturally are all part of Northern California Coastal community
9lake_20110718_13f	7192011	Bryan Ridste	no			Lake	yes	Lake should be with Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, because socially, economically, culturally are all part of Northern California Coastal community
9placer_20110718_1f	7182011	Elizabeth Alelgard	no		Loomis	Placer	yes	Folsom and Folsom Lake should be lumped with El Dorado Hills and South Placer, rather than Elk Grove. To lump rural mountain community with Southern Sacramento and Elk Grove makes no sense.
9sacramento_20110718_1f	7182011	Mr and Mrs Tom Scott	no		Folsom	Sacramento	yes	Folsom and Folsom Lake should be lumped with El Dorado Hills and South Placer, rather than Elk Grove. To lump rural mountain community with Southern Sacramento and Elk Grove makes no sense.
9sacramento_20110718_2f	7182011	Ken Cooley, Councilmember	yes	City of Rancho Cordova	Ranco Cordova	Sacramento	yes	Do not carve up Rancho Cordova into four SDs. Highly diverse, urbanized jobs powerhouse,with solid community identity, diverse neighborhoods. Four senate district approach will disadvantage community
9sacramento_20110718_3f	7182011	likotin	no				yes	Folsom and Folsom Lake should be lumped with El Dorado Hills and South Placer, rather than Elk Grove. To lump rural mountain community with Southern Sacramento and Elk Grove makes no sense.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9lake_20110718_12f	Lake, Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino			no	yes		economically
9lake_20110718_13f	Lake, Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino			no	yes		economically
9placer_20110718_1f		Folsom, Folsom Lake, El Dorado Hills, South Placer, Elk Grove		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110718_1f		Folsom, Folsom Lake, El Dorado Hills, South Placer, Elk Grove		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110718_2f		Rancho Cordova		no	yes		
9sacramento_20110718_3f		Folsom, Folsom Lake, El Dorado Hills, South Placer, Elk Grove		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9lake_20110718_12f	socially, culturally, Northern CA coastal community		no				
9lake_20110718_13f	socially, culturally, Northern CA coastal community		no				
9placer_20110718_1f	similarly situated communities		no			rural vs. sacramento area	
9sacramento_20110718_1f	similarly situated communities		no			rural vs. sacramento area	
9sacramento_20110718_2f	Highly diverse, urbanized jobs powerhouse,with solid community identity, diverse neighborhoods		no				
9sacramento_20110718_3f	similarly situated communities		no			rural vs. sacramento area	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
9sacramento_20110718_4f	7182011	Ron and Diann Rogers	no		Gold River	Sacramento	yes	Folsom and Folsom Lake should be lumped with El Dorado Hills and South Placer, rather than Elk Grove. To lump rural mountain community with Southern Sacramento and Elk Grove makes no sense.
9shasta_20110718_1f	7182011	Kevin and Christine Martin	no			Shasta	yes	Keep Shasta away from coast and the delta and draft districts based on major economic connections of transportation influence. SD Remove Siskiyou, Shasta, Lincoln, Rocklin, ag areas of Placer, put in Yuba. AD, Shasta should be in Yuba, shift pop to Butte
general_20110718_1f	7182011	Matt Stafford	no				yes	Good luck
general_20110718_2f	7182011	Sharon Byers	no				yes	In favor of voters first act regarding redistricting
general_20110718_3f	7182011	Michael Wilson	no				yes	Apalled at political maneuvering to protect vested interests. District so that locals with local interests can vote on what is most relevant to them
general_20110718_4f	7182011	Rose Haliewicz	no				yes	CCAG map is fair. People voted for fairness, against politicians. If politicians are getting hand on this now they are breaking the law
general_20110718_5f	7182011	Martin A.C. Enriquez Marquez	no				yes	Fallacious to assert VRA protection in absense of violations or factual findings. Two wrongs making one right is not palpable. Asian Americans have not been non-favored.
general_20110718_6f	7182011	Scott Folkens	no				yes	Not happy with so-called non-partisan citizen commission. Looks like Berkeley think tank has drawn all the lines and commission takes it on the road.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
9sacramento_20110718_4f		Folsom, Folsom Lake, El Dorado Hills, South Placer, Elk Grove		no	yes		
9shasta_20110718_1f	Shasta, Yolo, Siskiyou, Placer	Lincoln, Rocklin, Butte	I-5, 395, 101	no	yes		agriculturally consistent
general_20110718_1f				no	no		
general_20110718_2f				no	no		
general_20110718_3f				no	no		
general_20110718_4f				no	no		
general_20110718_5f				no	no		
general_20110718_6f				no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
9sacramento_20110718_4f	similarly situated communities		no			rural vs. sacramento area	
9shasta_20110718_1f	well-established regions		no			Remove siskiyou, Shasta from Mt Cap district	
general_20110718_1f			no				
general_20110718_2f		in favor of VRA	no				
general_20110718_3f			no				
general_20110718_4f			no				
general_20110718_5f			no				
general_20110718_6f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
general_20110718_7f	7182011	Nan Waldman, Esq	no				yes	Do not understand all the computer things necessary to download or whatever. What about those who do not understand fully how to use technology.
general_20110718_8f	7182011	Patrick Warren	no				yes	Im the hidden unknown driving force, bases on my conscienceaffinanti
general_20110718_9f	7182011	Dorrit Ragosine	no				yes	I was almost part of CRC, looks like those chosen created a fair map
general_20110718_10f	7192011	Kevin Smith	no				yes	Do not know what a CDF file or SHP file is or how to use it. Nobody does, make info more user friendly
general_20110718_11f	7182011	Howard Burns	no				yes	Expect logical, compact, clean districts, no thin lines connecting disparate areas. Political processes insist on honest and fact based work, not special intersts, Succed or fail based on Fairness
sclara_20110718_1f	7182011	Elma Arredondo	no		San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	June 7th San Jose AD and SD maps discriminate against Latino Community, dilute political leadership in East San Jose. Maintain 23rd AD as it is with minor adjustment. Nest 23 and 28th Ads together to form SD that Comines COIs in Santa Clara, Monterey,
sclara_20110718_2f	7182011	Dennis W Chiu, Esq	yes	Prodigy Law	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	NW boundary of SANJO AD as proposed in July 16th Assembly map shift southwest to include major coner of W. San Carlos St and N Bascom Ave, to recognise LGBT community

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
general_20110718_7f				no	no		
general_20110718_8f				no	no		
general_20110718_9f				no	no		
general_20110718_10f				no	no		
general_20110718_11f				no	no		
sclara_20110718_1f	Santa Clara, Monterey	San Jose		no	yes	Latino community, political leadership	income and povery levels, employment needs
sclara_20110718_2f		San Jose	W. San Carlos st, N. Bassoom ave	no	yes	LGBT community	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
general_20110718_7f			no				
general_20110718_8f			no				
general_20110718_9f			no				
general_20110718_10f			no				
general_20110718_11f			no				
sclara_20110718_1f	educational needs, cultural similarities, transportation corridor		no				
sclara_20110718_2f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_37f	7182011	Bill, Sandy, Becky Patton	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_38f	7182011	James S Jones	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_39f	7182011	Amena Lela Chebatt	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_40f	7182011		no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_37f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_38f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_39f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_40f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_37f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_38f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_39f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_40f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_41f	7182011	Annie Moler	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_42f	7182011	Alfred J. Spaeter, Jr.	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_43f	7182011	Donna States	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_44f	7182011	Bruce Juell	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_41f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_42f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_43f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_44f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_41f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_42f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_43f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_44f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_45f	7182011	Ralph and Barbara Gilbert	no		PV Peninsula	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_46f	7182011	Sheila O Neill O Conner	no		Palos Verdes Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_47f	7182011	Lawrence W, Susan, Andrew Kneisley	no		Manhattan Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_48f	7182011	Debborah Berger	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_45f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_46f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_47f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_48f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_45f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_46f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_47f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_48f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_49f	7182011	Maggie Evans	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_50f	7182011	Gary Kaufman	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_51f	7182011	T.D. Elliot	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_52f	7182011	Joshua Perahia	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_49f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_50f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_51f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_52f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_49f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_50f			no			does not want precious community destroyed by these lesser communites, filled with crime, and people of low repute	
supporters_beachcities_20110718_51f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_52f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_53f	7182011	Arvel Witte	no		Palos Verde	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_54f	7182011	Stan Gorman	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_55f	7182011	Miriam Landau	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_56f	7182011	Merna Marshall	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_53f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_54f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_55f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_56f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_53f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_54f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_55f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_56f			no				one of worst gerrymanders in state

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_57f	7182011	Adolf K. Eitner	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_58f	7182011	Cathy Gillman	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_59f	7182011	Mrs Anderson	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
5ventura_20110718_1f	7182011	John Kramer	no				yes	Not computer savvy enough to navigate site to see proposed vs. existign lines of Oxnard
5ventura_20110718_2f	7192011	John Tolian	no				yes	Cannot bring up any maps that have lines drawn on them, you must not want public input, website is useless
5ventura_20110718_3f	7182011	Elaine Lin	no				yes	Instead of linking E Ventura with Malibu or Ventura Blvd in Valley, draw Santa Clarita with E Ventura. Keep Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in Senate seat will keep inland valleys together. Historically connected in senate

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_57f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_58f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_59f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
5ventura_20110718_1f		Oxnard		no	no		
5ventura_20110718_2f				no	no		
5ventura_20110718_3f	Ventura	Malibu, Santa Clarita, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley	Ventura blvd	no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_57f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_58f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_59f			no				
5ventura_20110718_1f			no				
5ventura_20110718_2f			no				
5ventura_20110718_3f	historically connected in senate seat, inland valleys		no			do not link with Malibu, etc	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
5ventura_20110718_4f	7182011	Annete and Kevin Morgan	no		Simi Valley	Ventura	yes	Keep simi Valley whole as one district, open space, fresh air, clean city, close-knit, unlike Los Angeles County santa Clarita
6kern_20110718_1f	7182011	William Deaver	no				yes	Proposed E KernAntelope Valley District is great, except Boron is in Kern Coutny and is part of East KernAV community. Keep in new district
6kern_20110718_2f	7192011	Jerry Poteet	no				yes	Opposed to changing Kern CD lines from what they are now. Would not have fair representation if moved into district with large cities that do not share concerns or economic needs
6tulare_20110718_1f	7192011	Kathryn Black	no		Springville	Tulare	yes	Visualizations are almost impossible to decode, but seems Springville is linked to places with no connection at all. Keep San Joaquin Valley and its counties together. First draft lines made sense
7sclara_20110718_1e	7182011	Dennis Chiu	yes	Prodigy Law	San Jose	Santa Clara	yes	NW boundary of SANJO AD as proposed in July 16th Assemly map shift southwest to include major coner of W. San Carlos St and N Bascom Ave, to recognise LGBT community
supporters_beachcities_20110718_60f	7182011	Mr AJ Anderson	no		Hawthorne	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
5ventura_20110718_4f	Ventura, Los Angeles	Santa Clarita, Simi Valley		no	yes	close knit community, fresh air, clean city	
6kern_20110718_1f	Kern	Antelope Valley, Boron		no	yes		
6kern_20110718_2f	Kern			no	no		
6tulare_20110718_1f		Springville, San Joaquin Valley		no	no		
7sclara_20110718_1e		San Jose	W. San Carlos st, N. Bassoom ave	no	yes	LGBT community	
supporters_beachcities_20110718_60f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
5ventura_20110718_4f	open space		no			Los Angeles only cares for bottom dollar	
6kern_20110718_1f	part of community		no				
6kern_20110718_2f			no			big cities do not share concerns or needs	
6tulare_20110718_1f			no			no connection at all with areas	
7sclara_20110718_1e			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_60f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_61f	7182011	Chris Plank	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_62f	7182011	Julie Hatch	no		Rolling Hills Estates	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_63f	7182011	Maureen Megowan,	yes	Remax	Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_64f	7182011	Bruce Megowan	yes	Investment Services Group			yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_61f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_62f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_63f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_64f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_61f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_62f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_63f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_64f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_65f	7182011	Robert Grant	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_66f	7182011	William and Teresa Parker	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_67f	7182011	Lee Hennis	no		Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_68f	7182011	Shirley Farley	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_65f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_66f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_67f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_68f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_65f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_66f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_67f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_68f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_69f	7182011	Neal Koss MD	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_70f	7182011	Benjamin Landau	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_71f	7182011	Ms Weber	no		Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_beachcities_20110718_72f	7182011	Greg Warren	no				yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_69f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_70f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_71f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_beachcities_20110718_72f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City	LAX, 405 South to 110	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_69f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_70f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_71f			no				
supporters_beachcities_20110718_72f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_beachcities_20110718_73f	7182011	Jonathan C. Ide	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance Back in Beach Cities AD and put Beach Cities CD back together starting with Westchester, ending with PV and or San Pedro. CD should include Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City, etc
supporters_gwnc_20110718_1f	7182011	Michael Schlesinger	no		Wilshire	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_2f	7182011	Dan Krasner	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_3f	7182011	Maurine Higgens	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_4f	7182011	Maurine Higgens	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_beachcities_20110718_73f		Westchester, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan, Hermosa Beach, Torrance PVP, Lomita, Harbor City		no	no		
supporters_gwnc_20110718_1f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_2f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_3f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_4f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_beachcities_20110718_73f			no				
supporters_gwnc_20110718_1f			no			no COI with Eastno COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_2f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_3f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_4f			no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110718_5f	7182011		no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_6f	7182011	Jane Usher	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_7f	7182011	Jack Humphreville	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_8f	7182011	Ina and Jerard Bryant	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_9f	7182011	Hyacinth Leus	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110718_5f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_6f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_7f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_8f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_9f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110718_5f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_6f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_7f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_8f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_9f			no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110718_10f	7182011	Clyde	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_11f	7182011	Bret Parsons	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_12f	7182011	Frances Hoge	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_13f	7182011	Holly	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_14f	7182011	David Donley	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110718_10f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_11f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_12f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_13f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_14f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110718_10f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_11f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_12f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_13f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_14f			no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110718_15f	7182011	Gina Brandt	no		Hancock Park	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_16f	7182011	Susan Roberts	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_17f	7182011	Andrew Reich	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_18f	7182011	Clyde Lieberman	yes	Windsor Village Association			yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_19f	7182011	Diane Dicksteen	no		Windsor Village	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110718_15f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_16f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_17f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_18f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_19f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110718_15f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_16f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_17f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_18f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_19f			no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110718_20f	7182011	Donna Wolff	no		Hancock Park	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_21f	7182011	Patricia M. Jasper	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_22f	7182011	Gloria Howard	no		Windsor Village	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_23f	7182011	Karalee Balue	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_24f	7182011	John Welborne	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110718_20f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_21f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_22f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_23f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_24f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110718_20f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_21f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_22f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_23f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_24f			no			no COI with East	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_gwnc_20110718_25f	7182011	Michael Sourapas	no				yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_gwnc_20110718_26f	7182011	Julie Grist, Paul Holahan	no		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	yes	Wilshire has history of 100 years, Hancock park, Windsor Square. Keep COI together. Return to LA district. CD do not divide in half at Plymouth blvd. Belong with WLADT. AD Do not divide in half at Plymouth, belong with LAMWS or LADNT
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110718_1f	7182011	Andrew Carillo	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Oppose plans to place La Habra in SD and Ads comprised solely of LA County Cities. Is OC city and does not share community, history, concerns with LA County cities. Relies upon OC for education, transport, water. Place with DB-YL SD and either DBRYL
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110718_2f	7182011	Yvonne Lopez	no		La Habra	Orange	yes	Oppose plans to place La Habra in SD and Ads comprised solely of LA County Cities. Is OC city and does not share community, history, concerns with LA County cities. Relies upon OC for education, transport, water. Place with DB-YL SD and either DBRYL
supporters_sbay_20110718_1f	7182011	Arthur and Marion Windsor	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_gwnc_20110718_25f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_26f		Wilshire	Western Ave, La Brea Ave, Plymouth	no	yes	100 year history, neighborhood	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110718_1f	LA, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110718_2f	LA, Orange	La Habra		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_1f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_gwnc_20110718_25f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_gwnc_20110718_26f			no			no COI with East	
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110718_1f	education, public transportation		no				
supporters_lhabralegislative_20110718_2f	education, public transportation		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_1f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sbay_20110718_2 f	7182011	Ericka Anderson	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_3 f	7182011	Eugene Wong	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_4 f	7192011	Joanne English	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_5 f	7182011	Christi Schneider	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sbay_20110718_2f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_3f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_4f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_5f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sbay_20110718_2f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_3f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_4f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_5f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sbay_20110718_6f	7182011	Jo Ann Travis	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_7f	7182011	Glendene Rascoe	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_8f	7182011	Cleston E and Nettie J. McCardle	no		Torrance	Los angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_9f	7182011	Mark Mendlovitz	no		Beverly Hills	Los angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sbay_20110718_6f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_7f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_8f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_9f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sbay_20110718_6f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_7f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_8f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_9f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sbay_20110718_10f	7182011	Sidney Mah	no		Torrance	Los angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_11f	7182011	Georgina Ortega	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_12f	7182011	Patrick and Barbara Green	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_13f	7182011	Madeline Ashley	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sbay_20110718_10f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_11f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_12f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_13f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sbay_20110718_10f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_11f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_12f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_13f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sbay_20110718_14f	7182011	David Badenoch	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_15f	7182011	Ambre Hanes	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_16f	7182011	Michael Malgeri	no		Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_17f	7182011	Steven Mandel	no		San Pedro	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sbay_20110718_14f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_15f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_16f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_17f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sbay_20110718_14f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_15f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_16f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_17f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sbay_20110718_18f	7182011	John and Mary Waring	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_19f	7182011	Ronald L. Handy	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_20f	7182011	Mrs Simmons	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_sbay_20110718_21f	7182011	C.P. Lefowitz	no		Rancho Palos Verdes	Los Angeles	yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sbay_20110718_18f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_19f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_20f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_sbay_20110718_21f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sbay_20110718_18f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_19f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_20f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_sbay_20110718_21f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_sbay_20110718_22f	7182011	N. Trask	no				yes	Put Torrance back in 36th CD, AD, South Bay should be Westchester South Only. El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena belong in same district.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_1f	7182011	Steve Danko	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_2f	7182011	Bernadett Bodnar	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_3f	7182011	Melinda McBride	no		Topanga	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_sbay_20110718_22f		El Segundo, Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, San Pedro, Hawthorne, Gardena, Westchester		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_1f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_2f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_3f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_sbay_20110718_22f	personal lives, Economic activity, business interests,		no				
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_1f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_2f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_3f			no			no COI with inland communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_4f	7182011	Adam Scott	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_5f	7182011	Robert L. Hodgins	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_6f	7182011	Emily Baron	no		Malibu	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_7f	7182011	R. Stoddard	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_4f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_5f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_6f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_7f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_4f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_5f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_6f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_7f			no			no COI with inland communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_8f	7182011	Jennie S. Handy	no		Torrance	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_9f	7182011	Catherine	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_10f	7182011	Andrea Sher	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_11f	7182011	Dr Jay S Grossman	no		Monte Nido	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_8f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_9f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_10f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_11f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_8f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_9f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_10f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_11f			no			no COI with inland communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_12f	7182011	Susan R. Ellis	no		Calabasas	Los Angeles	yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_13f	7182011	Annemarie Donkin	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_14f	7182011	Peter Rothenberg	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_15f	7182011	P. French	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_12f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_13f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_14f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_15f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_12f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_13f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_14f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_15f			no			no COI with inland communities	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_16f	7182011	Peter Conn	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_17f	7182011	Cheryl Azoulay	no				yes	EVENT SD does not work for Santa Monica MountainCoastal Communities. South and North are unrelated, do not add Simi Valley, Moorpark, inland corridor vs. coastal corridor. All SMMcostal COIs lie East West. Do not share transportation corridors either.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_1f	7182011	Gail Kantor	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_2f	7182011	Linda and Alan Barmaper	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_3f	7182011	Sheba Meymandi	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_4f	7182011	Sheba Meymandi	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_5f	7182011	Sheba Meymandi MD	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_16f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_17f	Ventura	Simi Valley, Moorpark, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica Mountains		no	yes		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_1f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_2f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_3f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_4f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_5f		Valley Village	170	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_16f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_smonicacostalcommunities_20110718_17f			no			no COI with inland communities	
supporters_vvillage_20110718_1f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_2f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_3f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_4f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_5f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_vvillage_20110718_6f	7182011	Beth Bentley	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_7f	7182011	Gail Kantor	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_8f	7182011	Joanna Johnson	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_10f	7182011	Ray Rostad	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_11f	7182011	Marc Woersching	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_12f	7182011	H. John Khoukaz	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_13f	7182011	Paula Ann Humerick	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_14f	7182011	Almut Carlock	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_vvillage_20110718_6f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_7f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_8f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_10f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_11f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_12f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_13f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_14f		Valley Village	170	no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_vvillage_20110718_6f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_7f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_8f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_10f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_11f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_12f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_13f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_14f			no				

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
supporters_vvillage_20110718_15f	7182011	Suzanne Schmidtke	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_16f	7182011	Chick and Julia Ciccarelli	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_17f	7182011	Carolyn Seeman	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_18f	7182011	Stacey Solomons	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_19f	7182011	Cathy Flynn	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_20f	7182011	Abbe Murray	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
supporters_vvillage_20110718_21f	7182011	Tara A. Kamin	no		Valley Village	Los Angeles	yes	Do not divide Valley Village into two parts, redraw line to follow 170 Freeway and keep 25,000 stakeholders in one CD. Right now you are cutting off private park.
3orange_20110718_3f	7182011	Tony Ortega	no				yes	Separate Imperial County from San Diego county and link Imperial with E Riverside County region. Reconsider SD and CD maps. AD is correct, keeps desert areas in one district.

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
supporters_vvillage_20110718_15f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_16f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_17f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_18f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_19f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_20f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
supporters_vvillage_20110718_21f		Valley Village	170	no	no		
3orange_20110718_3f	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego			no	no		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
supporters_vvillage_20110718_15f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_16f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_17f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_18f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_19f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_20f			no				
supporters_vvillage_20110718_21f			no				
3orange_20110718_3f			no			keep San Diego and Imperial separate	

Source Document	Date	Name of Author	Organizational Affiliation?	Description of Organizational Affiliation	City of Residence	County of Residence	Geographic Comment?	Summary of Geographic Comment
1imperial_20110718_2f	7182011	Jessica	no			Imperial	yes	Expresses support for AD map that keeps Imperial and Riverside in one region, draw SD and CDs within Imperial and East Riverside
1imperial_20110718_3f	7182011	Elle Kurpiewski, Office Manager	yes	Democratic Headquarters of the Desert			yes	Put Imperial county into Coachella Valley for Ads and SD, CD. Share geography, ag, language, education, water, air, Salton Sea
2riverside_20110718_1f	7182011	Dr John Manley Luckey	no		Temecula	Riverside	yes	Temecula, Riverside should be in Perris CD, Remove and add Corona to N. Keep Temecula in home county
2riverside_20110718_2f	7182011	Julie Bornstein	no		Palm Desert	Riverside	yes	Recognize similarities of Imperial and Riverside County desert, formalize visualization maps for COACH and BBCOH Ads 80th district is rural, ag economies, tourism, snow birds
2riverside_20110718_3f	7182011	Estela Z Horner	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not split Jurupa Valley, just became a city. Consult the citizens
2riverside_20110718_4f	7182011	Becky Wilson	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	Do not split Jurupa Valley or assign all but Pedley to San Bernardino. Do not change representation, leave with Riverside
2riverside_20110718_5f	7182011	Tizoc DeAztlan	no		Bermuda Dunes	Riverside	yes	Link Coachella Valley with Imperial Valley, keep together, would best serve community
2riverside_20110718_6f	7182011	Patt Quinlivin	no		Jurupa Valley	Riverside	yes	How can you split a new city? Keep with Riverside, not San Bernardino, have been working under Riverside County regulations

Source Document	Geographic Comment: Counties	Geographic Comment: Cities	Geographic Comment: Streets/Rivers/Other Dividers	Neighborhood Comment?	Community of Interest?	COI: Social Interest (s)	COI: Economic Interest (s)
1imperial_20110718_2f	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes		
1imperial_20110718_3f	Imperial	Coachella		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_1f	Riverside	Temecula, Corona		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_2f	Riverside, Imperial			no	yes	Latino communities	rural, ag economies, tourism
2riverside_20110718_3f		Jurupa Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_4f	Riverside, San Bernardino	Jurupa Valley, Pedley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_5f	Imperial	Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley		no	yes		
2riverside_20110718_6f	Riverside, San Bernardino	Jurupa Valley		no	yes		

Source Document	COI: Why keep together	VRA Sec. 2 Comment	VRA Sec. 5 Comment?	Sec. 5 County	Summary of Sec. 5 Comment	Non-COI-based Comment	Comment on Commission Process
1imperial_20110718_2f	desert region		no				
1imperial_20110718_3f	geography, ag, language, education, water, air, Salton Sea		no				
2riverside_20110718_1f	home county		no				
2riverside_20110718_2f	snow birds		no				
2riverside_20110718_3f	just became a city		no				
2riverside_20110718_4f	always been Riverside, representatives		no				
2riverside_20110718_5f	best serves community		no				
2riverside_20110718_6f	new city, regulations		no				