

Subject: Inland Empire Assembly/Senate Lines

From: Benjamin Gamboa <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 17:12:17 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

Commissioners:

This is my second written testimony I have provided to the Commission. In my first testimony, I requested that the Commission consider placing the entirety of the City of Highland (zip 92346) into the same district. For far too long, the city has been artificially carved into three Assembly districts, two Senate districts, and two Congressional districts. I am pleased to see that the Commission's first draft maintains the City of Highland as whole in each of its respective districts, and I send my gratitude. I am especially pleased with the SBCUAC Assembly and SB Congressional districts, which I believe represents a good cross-section of the population of the San Bernardino Valley. In fact, I believe all of the Assembly and Congressional districts for the Inland Empire are drawn to include the correct communities of interest within each district.

I am a little concerned with how the Senate districts are composed, however, and I respectfully request the Commission to review the Senate district compositions based upon the well-drawn proposed Assembly districts. Currently the Commission has approved within the first draft the following Assembly/Senate districts for Riverside County and urban/suburban San Bernardino County:

SBCUCA + MORONGOBAN = San Bernardino - Banning (SBBAN)

POMVAL + RIALTFONT = Pomona - San Bernardino (POMSB)

RIVJUR + METROMV = Riverside - Moreno Valley (RIVMV)

COACH + MURTEM = Coachella - Temecula (CCHTM)

Rather, I believe the Commission should consider the following Assembly/Senate district combinations listed below. In addition to creating Senate seats that will have communities of interest placed more accurately together, I believe there will be a significant number of more competitive seats.

RIALTOFON + SBCUCA = San Bernardino Valley (SNBNO): The Commission-proposed SBBAN and POMSB Senate districts split the city of San Bernardino and the entire San Bernardino Valley in half. A more appropriate Senate district would combine the San Bernardino and Rancho Cucamonga (SBCUCA) and Fontana/Rialto (RIALTFONT) Assembly districts. Not only would this make for a more compact and contiguous Senate district (as opposed to the SBBAN district that spans 60 miles of LA urban/suburban and desert communities), but it would also combine all of the San Bernardino Valley communities into a single Senate district -- something we haven't seen since I was born. Interestingly enough, this new district I propose would look similar to the SB Congressional district, which shows that the Commission recognizes the continuity of these communities of interest. This seat will subsequently be more competitive between the parties.

POMVAL + RIVJUR = Pomona - Riverside (POMRV): This new Senate district would combine all of the large communities created over the last few decades from LA and Orange County suburban sprawl into a single community of interest. Pomona, Chino, Ontario (POMVAL), Corona, Norco, and Riverside (RIVJUR) have grown by leaps and bounds and share a unique common interest as the first cities one enters as they travel from urban centers to the Inland Empire using either I-10 or Highways 60 or 91. Anyone who lives in the Inland Empire can tell you how central freeways are to our daily lives, determining where we prefer to work, shop, and seek entertainment. This seat will be more competitive between the parties.

METROMV + MURTEM = Moreno Valley - Temecula (MOVTM): The Commission-proposed RIVMV district is logical that it combines the large city of Riverside into a single Senate district (a difficult task as the city is quite large). However, this district as proposed by the Commission will significantly minimize the importance of the Corona-Norco area and all of Moreno Valley and Perris (METROMV) as communities in their own right. Placing Moreno Valley and Perris in the same district as Murrieta and Temecula (MURTEM) would lead to more equal and united representation. This seat will also be more competitive between the parties.

MORONGOBAN + COACH = Banning - Coachella (BANCO): The Commission-proposed CCHTM district is separated by the unpopulated San Jacinto mountains between Temecula (MURTEM) and Palm Springs (COACH) where the communities share completely disparate relations. The Commission-proposed district will more likely create a split between the two communities rather than lead to unified representation in Sacramento. The Coachella Valley (COACH) and Banning (MORONGOBAN) Assembly districts as proposed contain a more developed community of interest as desert communities along the I-10 corridor. With significant tourist travel and similar electrical utility corridor interests, I believe these two proposed Assembly districts would do better placed together as a Senate district. This seat will be slightly more competitive between the parties.

I truly appreciate the work the Commission is doing and hope my testimony assists in its considerations.

Regards,

Benjamin Gamboa
Lifelong Resident of the Inland Empire & Active Voter
[REDACTED] Highland, CA 92346

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Debora Biddick <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 21:26:21 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Debora Biddick <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Communities of Interest

Message Body:

Firstly, thank you for taking on this challenging task as requested by the voters!

I have lived in Mentone for the past two years and lived in Redlands for 35 years prior to that. The communities most related to each other both geographically and culturally in this area are Redlands, Loma Linda, Highland, Mentone and Yucaipa, with loser ties to San Bernardino, the mountains to the north, and the Beaumont/Banning area to the east. If you're wanting to keep "communities of interest" intact, I would request that the above named areas should be considered as one unit and not be broken up into separate districts.

Thank you,
Debora Biddick

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission



City of
Chino Hills

June 17, 2011

Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission Members:

Re: Proposed Congressional District Split of Chino Hills

We are strongly opposed to the draft Congressional District map (Draft Map) that splits Chino Hills into two different Districts, with half of our City aligned with a District oriented to Los Angeles County and the other half aligned with a District oriented to San Bernardino County. The Draft Map is flawed because it does not meet your stated criteria to "respect counties, cities, communities of interest, and neighborhoods, where possible." In fact, with respect to Chino Hills, the Draft Map has split our City at every level – county and city level, communities of interest, and even next-door-neighbors have been relegated to different Districts. Another concern is that one small neighborhood in the City of Chino was included with Chino Hills in the East San Gabriel Valley / Diamond Bar District which isolates it from the remainder of the City of Chino.

Chino Hills, which is located in southwestern San Bernardino County, is strongly tied to the City of Chino and our other neighbors in the west-end of San Bernardino County. We request that our entire City be located within a single Congressional District that encompasses primarily other San Bernardino County communities.

As currently proposed, the Draft Map places the northerly portion of Chino Hills in the East San Gabriel / Diamond Bar District, a Los Angeles County district that extends west to Rowland Heights and north to Arcadia. Chino Hills shares no community interests with this Los Angeles County District, differing along all major lines, including regional issues, socioeconomics, and race/ethnicity.

The Draft Map places the southerly portion of Chino Hills in the Ontario / Pomona District, a predominantly San Bernardino County District that extends east to Chino and north to Rancho Cucamonga. We request that all of Chino Hills, and the isolated Chino neighborhood, be placed in this District. This request is based on our strong community of interest with these neighboring San Bernardino County cities. Maintaining our ties to this community of interest is vital to the welfare of our citizens and meets your own criteria to respect counties, cities, communities of interest, and neighborhoods.

The following outlines the critical facts that connect Chino Hills to our west-end San Bernardino County neighbors:

1. Chino Hills has a contractual relationship with San Bernardino County for many of the services we provide to our residents. We contract with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department for Police services. In case of emergency, our local emergency operations are coordinated with the Emergency Operation Center in San Bernardino. In addition, our James S. Thalman Chino Hills Library is part of the San Bernardino Library system. These are three areas where we have historically been assisted by elected representatives.
2. Two of our biggest challenges are regional in nature and shared with our neighboring west-end cities. The challenges we face with building an adequate transportation system and water delivery system are similar to those faced by the City of Chino and other local agencies in the west end of San Bernardino County. To ensure adequate water delivery we have worked to develop local authorities such as the Water Facilities Authority, the Chino Desalter Authority, the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, and Monte Vista Water District. These are complex contractual relationships, developed over many years.
3. The San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG) works to solve regional transportation issues for our west end region. Our public transportation authority, OmniTrans, serves the San Bernardino County valley area. We also are on the edge of three other CalTrans districts but we are in District 8, along with the other West End cities.
4. The Army Corp of Engineers owns considerable property along the border of Chino Hills and Chino and they control the Prado Flood Control Basin which has significant impacts on Chino Hills, Chino and Ontario.
5. Chino Hills and Chino are both served by the Chino Valley Independent Fire District and the Chino Valley Unified School District. The Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce brings the businesses of both cities together.

We previously presented these concerns to the Commission. Again, we request that all of Chino Hills be placed in a single District and that this District be the Ontario / Pomona District, which is shared by Chino and our neighboring west-end San Bernardino County cities.

The attached map illustrates the draft Congressional Districts against the City of Chino Hills boundaries. Clearly, Chino Hills should be fully within the Ontario / Pomona District. Congressional balance can be achieved by removing Pomona, a Los Angeles County city, from the Ontario / Pomona District and placing Pomona in the East San Gabriel Valley / Diamond Bar District.

The City of Chino Hills respectfully requests due consideration of our recommendation. Please don't hesitate to call me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF CHINO HILLS



ED GRAHAM, MAYOR

ATTACHMENT

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Larry Anderson <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 15:37:48 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Larry Anderson <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Chino Hills division

Message Body:

Dear Commission Members,

Please do not redraw the lines dividing Chino Hills political districts. We wish to remain one united political entity. We do not have the same interests as people from a different city and/or county. This is politics at its worst and only serves to divide and not unite people in the same city. Resist your favoritism and do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Larry Anderson

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting

From: Dan Stipp [REDACTED]

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 15:00:22 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

16 June, 2011

Dear persons involved in re-districting decisions,

I am a concerned citizen and resident of the mountain community of Crestline. My work puts me in contact with about 400 people from our community each week. I am a member of the Crestline Chamber of Commerce as well.

I believe it to be in the best interest of Crestline, the mountain communities and the county as a whole to have the representation and governance of the communities of Crestline, Lake Arrowhead and Running Springs together. We share a school district, (RIM of the World), road way access (including Highway 18 & 330), and business and community interests. Helping these communities together to address problems, represent their interests and make plans to prosper, benefits the whole county. To disconnect these communities and split their representation does not make sense when considering how much common ground we share.

I hope that you will seriously consider these things and not split the representation of our mountain communities. Thank you!

I am available for questions or further comment should that be helpful to the process.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Stipp
[REDACTED]

Crestline, CA 92325-0914

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Fran Wermerskirchen <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 09:16:38 -0700 (PDT)
To: [REDACTED]

I live in San Bernadino County, Lake Arrowhead. The lines as drawn now will divide our Mountain Communities. This would be wrong for the following reasons.

1. It divides the school District. Lake Arrowhead, Crestline and the surrounding small towns share the same school district.
2. The natural boundaries have not been considered. Since we are separated by being on the mountain it would be a hard ship to drive down the mountain for district meetings etc. Lake Arrowhead, Twin Peaks, Crestline and Runnung Springs and the small communities in between should be be within the same boundary on top of the mountain. We all drive the same roads, use the same parks and frequent the same establishments.
- 3, Most mountain residents have little involvement with the areas below as drawn.
4. There are within the communities mentioned above people from all party affiliations, religions , race, sexual persuasion.

Please reconsider this division.

Fran Wermerskirchen
[REDACTED]
Lake Arrowhead, Ca 92352

Subject: **Citizens Redistricting Commission-Chino Hills**

From: "cj" <

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 09:08:58 -0700

To: <

Dear Commission,

The consideration of dividing Chino Hills in this Redistricting is unbelievable!!! I am a Chino Hills resident for the last 25 yrs. We are ONE CITY! I want our current representative(s), who were voted in to office by the people to remain our voice in California. Do not DIVIDE our city!!!!

Christine Jarreau

Chino Hills Resident-91709

Subject: Crestline Redistricting

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 13:12:29 -0400 (EDT)

To: [REDACTED]

Gentlemen,

I live in Crestline, a mountain community just north of the city of San Bernardino.

It is my understanding that at least some of the new maps show Crestline being separated from the other mountain communities located to our east (Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, Big Bear) and, instead, being put with more urban non-mountain communities.

The communities in the San Bernardino mountains have similar issues and they should be kept together, not split apart. This is both fair and efficient. Placing us in a district of mainly urban communities will more than likely result in Crestline's unique issues as a rural community being overshadowed.

Please revisit the placement of Crestline and keep us in the same district as our neighbors.

Peter Giacoletti

[REDACTED]

Crestline, CA 92325

[REDACTED]

Subject: Fwd: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino
From: Voter <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 09:00:36 -0700
To: [REDACTED]

—Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino
From: Gene Hinds <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 2011 16:56:29 +0000
To: [REDACTED]

From: Gene Hinds <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Assembly District 63

Message Body:

You have included Rancho Cucamonga in the 63rd Assembly Distric.
Rancho Cucamonga is associated with the Pomona Valley and not the eastern part of the Inland Empire.

Please consider removing Rancho Cucamonga from the 63rd Assembly District and include the Calimesa area in place of Rancho Cucamonga.

Thank you,
Gene Hinds
Redlands

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

—Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

Subject: Fwd: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino
From: Voter <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 2011 10:36:45 -0700
To: [REDACTED]

—Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino
From: Steven Palacios <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2011 10:38:47 +0000
To: [REDACTED]

From: Steven Palacios <[REDACTED]>
Subject: New District "6"

Message Body:

To Committee,

I find the city of Upland, Ca.
has more in common with Ontario, Ca.

than with Claremont . Surely this is a consideration?

concerned voter S. Palacios

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: "David E. Raley" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2011 15:10:05 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: David E. Raley <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Proposed SBCUCA Assembly District

Message Body:

Thanks for your efforts on behalf of the citizens.

The proposed AD repeats the same mistake as now exists by including Rancho Cucamonga with Redlands area in an Assembly District. The two cities have no common interest. While I am not connected with Inland Action their proposal to keep Rancho with the west end districts and create a District of east end cities that have common interest of transportation routes I-10 and I-215) (proposed light rail San Bernardino to Redlands) (proposed SBX high speed bus from North SB to Loma Linda), shopping facilities (central city mall and citrus plaza), school districts (Redlands and San Bernardino)(SB Valley, Crafton Hills, and Cal State SB, water sources (bunker hill basin)etc. Please revisit this District and reconsider the District proposed by Inland Action (Their AD C-1)

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Proposed SBCUCA Assembly district

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2011 11:40:52 EDT

To: [REDACTED]

Thanks for your efforts on behalf of the citizens of California.

The proposed AD repeats the same mistake as now exists by including Rancho Cucamonga with Redlands area in an Assembly District. These two cities have no common interests. The Cities of San Bernardino, Highland, Redlands etc have obvious common interests and should not be split. This can be avoided shifting the adjacent AD westward to include Rancho Cucamonga and thus keeping San Bernardino and Highland intact.

While I am not connected with Inland Action, but their proposal to keep Rancho with the west end districts and create a District of east end cities that have common interests of transportation routes I-10 and I-215) (proposed light rail San Bernardino to Redlands) (proposed SBX high speed bus from North SB to Loma Linda), shopping facilities (Central City Mall. Citrus Plaza, Hospitality Lane, etc.), school districts (Redlands and San Bernardino) (SB Valley, Crafton Hills, and Cal State SB, water sources (bunker hill basin) etc., joint political agencies such as Inland Valley Development Agency (former Norton AFB), SB

Valley Municipal Water District, SB Valley Water Conservation District, Inland Valley Resource Conservation District, various Santa Ana River use and conservation agencies, etc makes a lot of sense.

Please revisit this District and reconsider the District proposed by Inland Action (Inland Action AD C-1 attached).

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Re-districting

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2011 14:26:52 EDT

To: [REDACTED]

CC: [REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern,

As a citizen of Lake Arrowhead, we are a member of the San Bernardino Mountain Communities. It is very important to ensure that all of the Mountain Communities are bundled together in any redistricting plan. The demographics of the mountain communities, from Crestline to Big Bear, are quite different than those of the close by urban areas and it is quite important that whatever representation we get be familiar with the issues of these communities and that we not be split into pieces and bundled with nearby urban areas.

Please do a thorough job of reviewing the issues related to the areas in our mountain communities and ensure that we are kept together as a "package" so that the folks in our mountains are represented by someone that can give thought and credence to issues unique to our area.

Thanks for your consideration in this matter. If you have any questions about this request, please do not hesitate to call me at [REDACTED]

Phil and Terry Wolloch

[REDACTED] Blue Jay, CA 92317

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Redistricting

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2011 14:32:02 EDT

To: [REDACTED]

CC: [REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern,

My husband and I are unable to attend the subject meeting to be held on Father's day as we already have commitments to visit family out of town. However, this issue is very important to us and this email is sent IAW your announcement.

We feel it is imperative and critical that if redistricting is to occur, that the mountain communities from Green Valley Lake to Cedarpines Park be kept under the same District. We are 14 year residents and registered voters in Crestline and the rumor is that Crestline would be separated out from the rest of the mountain representation. This not logical nor fair to our town. We have a unique community which is not an incorporated city. Many concerns and issues for our mountain are the same in Crestline as they are for Lake Arrowhead and surrounding areas. We must have representation that is familiar with all mountain

resident needs. It would be very inefficient - especially in these hard economic times - to place Crestline as the only mountain community with down the hill cities.

Please record our concern and request that if redistricting is required, that our part of the mountain stay with adjoining mountain communities and under one Supervisor.

Sincerely,
Jim and Dora Huff
[REDACTED]
Crestline, CA 92325
[REDACTED]

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Robert Ward <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2011 20:35:21 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Robert Ward <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Oddities in the grouping of the Eastern Inland Empire

Message Body:

In looking at each of the four maps, I begin to notice an irregularity in the maps when it comes to boundary lines in reference to the Eastern Inland Empire; the specific communities in question being the Cities of Yucaipa, Calimesa, Banning, and Beaumont. As an overview I list the communities the cities are grouped with below:

Assembly - MORONGOBAN (Morongo Valley, Hemet, and Menifee)

Senate - SBBAN (Highland, Hemet, Morongo Valley, and Redlands)

Congress - INMSB (Mammoth Lakes, Inyo County, Barstow, and Needles)

Equalization - ORSD (Highland, Riverside, San Diego)

If the intent was to group those with common regional interest then the Redistricting Board has failed with this area of California. As evident in the groupings listed, the Board seems to believe that residents of the Eastern Inland Empire have more in common with the Morongo Valley and High Desert than with those in the Inland Empire. They could not be more wrong. As a resident from this area, I assure you that the needs of the residents from these communities better align with those in Redlands, Loma Linda, and cities west opposed to cities east. Citizens from this area do not travel east for shopping and recreation but West into the Inland Empire. The people of Yucaipa, Calimesa, Beaumont, and Banning will be severely misrepresented and their concerns will not be met as adequately as they should be if they were in a district that was truly common in regional interest.

The map that requires the heaviest amount of scrutiny is the Congressional map. The reasoning behind carving these communities from the rest of the Inland Empire and lumping them with the High Desert is absolutely baffling.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: "Jay P. Ebersohl" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 2011 19:50:36 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jay P. Ebersohl <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Screw up on a community

Message Body:

I live in east Highland (92346). I was reviewing the draft Congressional maps, and the committee put all of Highland in with San Bernardino.

What few people outside the area realize is that the Highland city limit is not as strong of a boundary as the CA-30 freeway that splits the city in half. Those two halves have nothing to do with each other and are as different as night and day. West of the freeway is indistinguishable from San Bernardino and is in the San Bernardino school district. East of the freeway is indistinguishable from Redlands and Yucaipa and is in the Redlands school district. Worse, any demographic study that considers the city as a whole would find it to be a very average place. But in reality, high and low just average out. By associating east Highland with San Bernardino, you are damaging our quality of life. We in east Highland want absolutely nothing to do with west Highland or San Bernardino.

It would be much better to put east Highland with the IMNSB district and keep west Highland with SB. The true physical boundary is the CA-30 freeway, but if you want a political boundary, use the boundary between the Redlands and San Bernardino school districts.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: "Joseph W. Schroer" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 2011 20:09:02 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Joseph W. Schroer <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Keep Chino and Chino Hills Together

Message Body:

Chino Hills should not be divided into 2 Congressional districts. Please keep us as one community. The Northern part of Chino Hills is wrongly included in the E. San Gabriel Valley/Diamond Bar district. Rather, it should be included with the rest of Chino Hills and Chino in the Ontario district.

If you need to balance the population lines, I would suggest moving Pomona into the E. San Gabriel Valley/Covina area, where the communities are similar.

The current draft of the state Assembly districts should also be modified.

Chino and Chino Hills are two similar communities, with many cultural and demographic

aspects in common. Both cities strive to maintain an agricultural/rural atmosphere, to the extent they are able to. The two cities even share the same newspaper.

Many thanks for your considerations.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: "Sal Carlos, Jr" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 2011 23:16:39 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Sal Carlos, Jr <[REDACTED]>

Subject: crazy lines

Message Body:

I live in Chino Hills and how can you split my city up? Also my family lives in La Verne & San Dimas .. You SHOULD NOT SPLIT CITIES!~!!!!!! One member of Congress for ONE City!!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

— Fwd: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Fwd: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

— Proposed SBCUCA Assembly district.eml —

Proposed SBCUCA Assembly district.eml

— Inland_Action-AD_Submittal SB Redlands.pdf —

Inland_Action-AD_Submittal SB Redlands.pdf

— Re-districting.eml —

Re-districting.eml

— Redistricting.eml —

Redistricting.eml

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —


Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml



Field	Value
District	C1
Population	465,757
Deviation	83
% Deviation	0%
White	234,626
% White	50%
Hispanic Origin	249,561
% Hispanic Origin	54%
Asian	28,467
% Asian	6%
Black	53,971
% Black	12%
B_LAT_CVAP	93,420
% B_LAT_CVAP	37%
Asian_CVAP	13,213
% Asian_CVAP	5%
Black_CVAP	32,967
% Black_CVAP	13%
B_CVAP_EST	251,430
% B_CVAP_EST	54%



Subject: Chino Hills re: redrawingthelines

From: "Larry Anderson" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2011 09:03:52 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Dear Commission,

I resent your plan to break up our community. There is no justification for lumping us in with some other city and/or county district. Please reconsider your political activism and leave well enough alone.

Sincerely,

Larry Anderson

Board of Supervisors
County of San Bernardino

GARY C. OVITT
SUPERVISOR, FOURTH DISTRICT



Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

June 15, 2011

Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission Members:

Let me start by thanking you for your time and service to the State of California. I am writing to you to ask that you look at changing the borders for the proposed Ontario-Pomona Congressional District. Constituents of mine have voiced their concerns with the current proposal and I share their concern.

While serving as the President of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), I learned about the many different regions of Southern California. You may or may not be familiar with SCAG which is the nation's largest metropolitan planning organization, representing six counties, 190 cities and more than 19 million residents. SCAG undertakes many planning and policy initiatives that encourage a more sustainable Southern California. This experience with SCAG has given me a very regional perspective for Southern California and helped me to learn what our different communities' interests and needs are.

Regarding the proposed Ontario-Pomona Congressional District, I think that all of Chino Hills should be included into that district for many reasons, including the following:

- The City of Chino Hills is obviously its own community of interest. Splitting this city and having the northern portion as the only San Bernardino County sliver in a Los Angeles County Congressional District is a disservice to residents. All of Chino Hills should be included within the Ontario-Pomona Congressional District and kept within San Bernardino County.
- The City of Chino Hills shares a County Supervisor, school district, fire protection district, community college district, water agency, and chamber of commerce with Chino, which is in the proposed Ontario-Pomona Congressional District.
- The City of Chino Hills' commonalities are in line with the San Bernardino County, not Los Angeles County.

Thank you for your consideration of this change. Please enjoy your use of our County Board of Supervisors Chambers for your meeting in San Bernardino; I regret not being present to voice these concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Gary C. Ovitt".

GARY C. OVITT
Supervisor, Fourth District