

From: "Esther Rice" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 7:26 AM
Subject: 80th Assembly District

= am a resident of the city of Blythe, CA, which is in the current 80th Asse=bly District. I have resided here for 33 years. I am disappointed in =he tentative maps released by the Commission on June 10th. =The Coachella Valley and Imperial County are in the same desert, share=the same history, water and utility district. We have the same climat=, much of the same industries like tourism, agriculture and green ene=gy, and both the Coachella Valley andImperial County are dealing with the growing problems at the Salton Sea. <=em>

Voters in the Coachella Valley =nd Imperial County need a single legislator who understands the issues=of our unique desert and population. Dividing Imperial County and the=Coachella Valley will just result in the same lack of representation our de=ert has received in the past. **Please keep our desert together s= we can continue to prosper.**

=p class=MsoNormal>

Esther M. Rice=****

Financial Aid Secretary

Palo Verde College

<= class=MsoNormal>One College Drive

Blythe, CA 92225

<= class=MsoNormal>(760) [REDACTED]

</html

From: "John W. Kopp" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 3:23 PM
Subject: Reg 2-Riverside -- New Cities / Cities-In-Need Unnecessarily CD Splits, i.e., the NEW Riverside County cities of Eastvale and Jurupa Valley

I'm not sure if my submission a few minutes earlier on your web site was successful, so I'm re-submitting in an e-mail using my own e-mail service.

Here is the message I tried to send to you.

I've looked at your most recent visualizations for **RIVERSIDE COUNTY** for State **ASSEMBLY** (070711_AD...) and State **SENATE** (070711-SD...), and don't have much of a quarrel with what you've put up as hypotheticals.

I can **NOT** say the same thing with regard to what you've done to the Northwest corner of Riverside County in your **CONGRESSIONAL**

With the creation of cheek-to-jowl visualizations **ONTPM**, **SBRIA**, and **RVMVN** you've --hopeful-- inadvertently -- managed to maim the two newest cities in the state, Eastvale [incorporated 10/01/2010] and Jurupa Valley [incorporated effective 07/01/2011, just 12 days ago (!!!)].

The first visualization (2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization-ONTPM) rips off the 'top' 1/2 of the Riverside County's new City of Eastvale and throws it in to a CD that includes parts of San Bernardino County and, moving Westward through the proposed district, towns that are in Los Angeles County. I'm perplexed. There is very little commonality between this Northern 1/2 of Eastvale and anything in either San Bernardino or Los Angeles Counties.

Clearly with the 'top' 1/2 in this city being placed in ONTPM, the 'bottom' 1/2 has to go somewhere, and that can be found on visualization 2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization- (See for discussion of this as the new City of Jurupa Valley is discussed.)

The next two visualizations (2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization-SBRIA and 2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization-RVMVN) show the very very new City of Jurupa Valley similarly ripped asunder.

You've placed the largest part of this new city, the neighborhoods/COIs of Mira-Loma, Glen Avon, and Rubidoux, in visualized CD SBRIA with a number of much larger town and more well-established town in San Bernardino County. The voice of this very poor city of Jurupa Valley -- comprised of many English-language-isolated neighborhoods, consisting of very many largely Latino communities -- will be drowned out by the 'big' voices of the cities in San Bernardino County. Jurupa Valley is a city that needs to foster the creation of an identity and find a voice for itself, not an identity and a voice that will be subsumed in the noise from San Bernardino County.

When you look at the second map involving the City of Jurupa Valley (2011.07.08 Congressional Visualizations-RV=VN) you see that a substantial part of Jurupa Valley North of the Santa Ana River, the Pedley neighborhood, pasted on to a

district that contains most of rural central Riverside County plus the lower 1/2 of the also-fractured new city of Eastvale. The same argument posed above holds true for Pedley (and the 'lower' 1/2 of Eastvale) as it does for the larger part of Jurupa Valley and the 'top' 1/2 of Eastvale. Both towns need to establish identities and develop a voice that will argue their interests.

 These two new cities need to be kept in their entirety, and both of them need to be in the same CD, whichever that might be. In addition to the simple need to establish a city identity, recent law changes occasioned by budget problems in Sacramento **MANDATE KEEPING THESE TWO CITIES WHOLE AND TOGETHER.**

 Both of these brand new cities have recently had their viability, i.e., ability to continue as functioning cities, brought into question by Governor Brown having recently signed **SB=89**. This new law will divert critical funds from the DMV Vehicle Licensing Fee which were previously earmarked to assist newly incorporated cities. I'm not sure of the exact numbers as they apply to the new City of Jurupa Valley (I don't live there), but as to Eastvale (where I do live), the city's General Fund will suffer the agony of a \$ 3.1 million 'hit'.
 .=SPAN style="mso-spacerun: yes">

 The expected funds from the DVM Vehicle Licensing Fee was expected to be part of these two city financial strength for the first few years of existence. It was an essential part of the plan when Riverside County's Local Agency Formation Committee (LAFCO) and later the County's Board of Supervisors -- before either voted to allow these two cities to come into existence -- believed there would be financial stability.

 Mr. "...a successful incorporation is next to impossible without the revenue of the DMV Licensing Fee as part of the new city budget."

 Given the extremis in which these two new Riverside County cities find themselves, they will struggle over the next decade. They need to speak as whole cities and they need to speak together to protect their threatened strength and even existence.

 Please review and kindly **TRASH these visualizations**, coming up with something better that will keep the Northwest corner of Riverside County viable.

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kopp
 Eastvale, CA

[REDACTED]

From: "Sharon Deuber " <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 11:39 PM
Subject: Redistricting of Riverside County
To Whom IT =ay Concern:

My name is Sharon Deuber and I have lived in the San Jacinto Valley for 6 years. As a Real Estate Broker by profession for the past eleven years, I also serve the community of Hemet in the capacity of Vice Chair on the Hemet Planning Commission. For visionary reasons as to the future growth of the San Jacinto Valley, and for personal reasons as a resident of our Valley, I strongly encourage that we remain in the 45th Congressional District of Maryono-Mack. As a desert community, having much in common with the Coachella Valley, our majority of residents being of retirement age benefit greatly from what the 45th District demonstrates to its citizens. In addition, as a growing community, the San Jacinto Valley is stretching toward tourism, arts, culture, entertainment venues, and manufacturing industries as future attractions to our existing foundation of a healthy family style environment. For years the San Jacinto Valley has been home to generations of families raising their families here, and as a community collectively seeking to establish its identity in southwest Riverside County, splitting us from our existing district at this time would be an irreparable fracture, not just a re-districting. As a result we would lose 20+ years of history from a District who cares about our future, our families, and our anticipated growth within the county. Please do not split the San Jacinto Valley from its proven and rightful position within Maryono-Mack's 45th Congressional District.

Respectfully,

Sharon L. Deuber

</html

[REDACTED]

From: "Michael Wilson" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 5:30 PM
Subject: Redistricting Maps

As a body created to craft district boundaries and subsequently adopt them you have a difficult job. Nonetheless, it is a job you must do. When you crafted your original draft plans I believe you accomplished your goal, got it right, and it made since. The latest drafts to come out are absolute nonsense. Splitting the lower Coachella Valley and making it inclusive of Imperial County to form these districts has no merit. Indio, Coachella, and the County of Riverside belong with the other 7 incorporated Cities in the Coachella Valley in one district as we are all linked through our Association of Governments and other regional bodies to address our local and regional issues. We do not have any relationships on the local or regional levels in all forms of government or political bodies with Imperial County what so ever. To carve out the areas in the second drafts, which also includes a small portion of Cathedral City, that you have does not pass the headline test and stinks of political party manipulation. It appears there are two goals, One, to cater to a Democrat Party favorite stronghold and two, which explains the first, to carve out a particular race, Latino, to bolster number one. As a City Council Member of the largest City in the Coachella Valley, Indio, I implore you to return to the original drafts that represent the valley as a whole and does not split apart the Coachella Valley based on income levels, and racial profile. Both of these issues, on face value, violate the very intent of redistricting in a fair and impartial way which the rules and guidelines dictate. Please keep the Community of Interests together in the Coachella Valley and put Imperial County where it belongs, in it's relationship with San Diego County which also keeps the California Border Communities of Interest together

Respectfully,

Michael H Wilson
Council Member
City of Indio

Sent from my iPad

Michael H. Wilson

[REDACTED]

From: "Mary Lisi" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 5:08 AM
Subject: redistricting of the 80th

</table
*"I am a resident of the city of Desert Hot Springs, which is in the current 80th Assembly District. I have resided here for 11 years. I am disappointed in the tentative maps released by the Commission on June 10th. The Coachella Valley and Imperial County are in the same desert, share the same history, water and utility district. We have the same climate, much of the same industries like tourism, agriculture and green energy, and both***SPAN style="FONT-FAMILY: 'sans-serif'; FONT-SIZE: 10pt; FONT-WEIGHT: normal">the Coachella Valley and Imperial County are dealing with the growing problems at the Salton Sea.**

Voters in the Coachella Valley and Imperial County need a single legislator who understands the issues of our unique desert and population. Dividing Imperial County and the Coachella Valley will just result in the same lack of representation our desert has received in the past. Please keep our desert together so we can continue to prosper."

Mary Lisi
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 7:06 AM
Subject: Redistricting - 80th Assembly District

I am a resident of the city of La Quinta, which is in the current 80th Assembly District. I have resided here for over 30 years. I am disappointed in the tentative maps released by the Commission on June 10th. The Coachella Valley and Imperial County are in the same desert, share the same history, water and utility district. We have the same climate, much of the same industries like tourism, agriculture and green energy, and both and Imperial County are dealing with the growing problems at the Salton Sea.

Voters in the Coachella Valley and Imperial County need a single legislator who understands the issues of our unique desert and population. Dividing Imperial County and the Coachella Valley will just result in the same lack of representation our desert has received in the past. Please keep our desert together so we can continue to prosper."

P.M CHAPMAN
La Quinta, CA

[REDACTED]

From: "Joe Ludwig" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 4:57 PM
Subject: Public Comment: 2 - Riverside
From: Joe Ludwig <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Regarding lines involving the City of Riverside

Message Body:

First, on the Assembly level, is there a delineation of the line between the RIVJU and MTRMV districts as it goes through Riverside? Second, on the Congressional level, the RTLFO district contains all of the newly incorporated City of Jurupa Valley except the Pedley area; could a swithc be made to include Pedley into RTLFO and the City of Grand Terrace be included into the same district as Riverside, as it is in the latest Assembly and Senate visualizations?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

[REDACTED]

From: "John Kopp" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 3:10 PM
Subject: Public Comment: 2 - Riverside
 From: John Kopp <[REDACTED]>
 Subject: New Cities-In-Need Unnecessarily Split

Message Body:

I've looked at your most recent visualizations for RIVERSIDE COUNTY for State ASSEMBLY (070711_AD...) and State SENATE (070711-SD...), and don't have much of a quarrel with what you've put up as hypotheticals.

I can NOT say the same thing with regard to what you've done to the Northwest corner of Riverside County in your CONGRESSIONAL configurations.

With the creation of cheek-to-jowl visualizations ONTPM, SBRIA, and RVMVN you've -- hopefully inadvertently -- managed to maim the two newest cities in the state, Eastvale [incorporated 10/01/2010] and Jurupa Valley [incorporated effective 07/01/2011, just 12 days ago (!!!)].

The first visualization (2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization-ONTPM) rips off the 'top' 1/2 of the Riverside County's new City of Eastvale and throws it in to a CD that includes parts of San Bernardino County and, moving Westward through the proposed district, towns that are in Los Angeles County. I'm perplexed. There is very little commonality between this Northern 1/2 of Eastvale and anything in either San Bernardino or Los Angeles Counties.

Clearly with the 'top' 1/2 in this city being placed in ONTPM, the 'bottom' 1/2 has to go somewhere, and that can be found on visualization 2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization-RVMVN. (See for discussion of this as the new City of Jurupa Valley is discussed.)

The next two visualizations (2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization-SBRIA and 2011.07.08 Congressional Visualization-RVMVN) show the very, very new City of Jurupa Valley similarly ripped asunder.

You've placed the largest part of this new city, the neighborhoods/COIs of Mira Loma, Glen Avon, and Rubidoux, in visualized CD SBRIA with a number of much larger town and more well established town in San Bernardino County. The voice of this very poor city of Jurupa Valley -- comprised of many English- language-isolated neighborhoods, consisting of very many largely Latino communities -- will be drowned out by the 'big' voices of the cities in San Bernardino County. Jurupa Valley is a city that needs to foster the creation of an identity and find a voice for itself, not an identity and a voice that will be subsumed in the noise from San Bernardino County.

When you look at the second map involving the City of Jurupa Valley (2011.07.08 Congressional Visualizations-RVMVN) you see that a substantial part of Jurupa Valley North of the Santa Ana River, the Pedley neighborhood, pasted on to a district that contains most of rural central Riverside County plus the lower 1/2 of the also-fractured new city of Eastvale. The same argument posed above holds true for Pedley (and the 'lower' 1/2 of Eastvale) as it does for the larger part of Jurupa Valley and the 'top' 1/2 of Eastvale. Both towns need to establish identities

and develop a voice that will argue their interests.

These two new cities need to be kept in their entirety, and both of them need to be in the same CD, whichever that might be. In addition to the simple need to establish a city identity, recent law changes occasioned by budget problems in Sacramento MANDATE KEEPING THESE TWO CITIES WHOLE AND TOGETER.

Both of these brand new cities have recently had their viability, i.e., ability to continue as functioning cities, brought into question by Governor Brown having recently signed SB 89. This new law will divert critical funds from the DMV Vehicle Licensing Fee which were previously earmarked to assist newly incorporated cities. I'm not sure of the exact numbers as they apply to the new City of Jurupa Valley (I don't live there), but as to Eastvale (where I do live), Eastvale City Councilwoman Kelly Howell has indicated that the city's General Fund will suffer the agony of a \$ 3.1 million 'hit'.

The expected funds from the DVM Vehicle Licensing Fee was expected to be part of these two city financial strength for the first few years of existence. It was an essential part of the plan when Riverside County's Local Agency Formation Committee (LAFCO) and later the County's Board of Supervisors -- before either voted to allow these two cities to come into existence -- believed there would be financial stability.

Mr. George Spiliotis, Executive Officer of Riverside's LAFCO is quoted in the July issue of the Eastvale-Norco Community News as saying "... a successful incorporation is next to impossible without the revenue of the DMV Licensing Fee as part of the new city budget."

Given the extremis in which these two new Riverside County cities find themselves, they will struggle over the next decade. They need to speak as whole cities and they need to speak together to protect their threatened strength and even existence. Stated more bluntly, these two cities need to work together, lobby together and otherwise gather their resources together to protect themselves from predation by State of California budget shortfalls.

Please review and kindly TRASH these visualizations, coming up with something better that will keep the Northwest corner of Riverside County viable.

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Kopp
Eastvale, CA

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

[REDACTED]

From:
To:
Cc:

[REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 6:20 PM
Attach: California Redistricting Com 07-13-11.doc
Subject: Coachella Valley Redistricting Map
Mr. =laypool and Commissioners,

On =half of Indio City Manager Dan Martinez, we are submitting the attached letter =or your consideration in redistricting of eastern Riverside County to allow =ndio to remain as part of the Coachella Valley.

Please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Martinez at 760-391-4015 should you have any =uestions.

Sincerely,

Martha Sommons
Executive Assistant to CM
City of Indio - **the =lace to Be!**

[REDACTED]
Indio, CA 92201
[REDACTED]

City Hall Hours: Monday to Thursday, 7:30 am - 5:30 =m

The =nformation in this communication is confidential and may be privileged and is directed =nly to the intended recipient. Please do not forward this =ommunication without my permission. If you have received this communication in =rror, please notify me immediately and delete/destroy this =ommunication.

Delivery via E-mail & Fax

July 13, 2011

California Citizens Redistricting Commission

████████████████████
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Coachella Valley Redistricting Map for Eastern Riverside County

Dear Commissioners:

Over the last 10 years, the City of Indio experienced exponential growth, which led to the doubling of Indio's population, raised the city's median income and assessed valuation to be in parity with the Coachella Valley, and greatly enhanced Indio's economic base. A key part of the Coachella Valley economy and Indio's economic engine is that Indio is a tourist destination known to the world. Our city draws in more than one million people annually through festivals like the Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival, Stagecoach Country Music Festival, and polo tournaments.

In May of 2011, the Southern California Association of Governments published its Profile on Indio and accurately outlined the city's economic breakdown by sector. In that report, it identified leisure-hospitality as one of the top Indio created job sectors for the city. Other large job sectors included retail, education, and the public sector. Agriculture represents one of the smallest parts of Indio's economic base at 3.9%. Much of that remaining agricultural sector is being replaced by continued urban growth as has taken place over the last several years.

In closing, Indio is the second county-seat for Riverside County, which makes Indio the Coachella Valley's center for business, government and as previously described entertainment activity. Several county services are operated out of Indio, which makes us inextricably connected to our surrounding communities, and also, we share in regional governmental bodies like the Coachella Valley

Daniel Claypool
July 13, 2011
Page 2 of 2

Association of Governments, SunLine Transit Agency, and the Palm Springs Desert Resorts Convention and Visitors Authority.

Should you have further questions or would like to contact me, please call me at

[REDACTED].

Sincerely,

Dan Martinez
City Manager

cc: Mayor and Council

[REDACTED]

From: "Alma Flores" [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 8:24 AM

*"I am a resident of the city of The Imperial Valley, which is in the current 80th Assembly district. I have resided here for 40 years. I am disappointed in the tentative maps released by the Commission on June 10th. The Coachella Valley and Imperial County are in the same desert, share the same history, water and utility district. We have the same climate, much of the same industries like tourism, agriculture and renewable energy, and both **the Coachella Valley and Imperial County** are dealing with the growing problems at the Salton Sea.*

Voters in the Coachella Valley and Imperial County need a single legislator who understands the issues of our unique desert and population. Dividing Imperial County and the Coachella Valley will just result in the same lack of representation our desert has received in the past. Please keep our desert together so we can continue to prosper."

Alma Flores
Division of Children and Family Services
MHS Director Secretary

[REDACTED]
El Centro, CA 92243 =
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: "willie washington" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 8:03 AM
Subject: 80th Assembly District redistricting

We live in the current 80th Assembly district, in the City of Indio. We want my city to stay in the 80th district. We want representation in the state legislature. Your current suggests would hand legislative control of my city to cities that have no understanding or interest in the needs of the Coachella and Imperial valleys. Please be sure Coachella and Imperial Valleys have a voice in our state government.

Sincerely,
Nettie H. & Willie Washington

REGION 2: RIVERSIDE**CITY OF INDIO**

[REDACTED] INDIO, CA 92201

[REDACTED] WWW.INDIO.ORG

Delivery via E-mail & Fax

July 13, 2011

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

Re: Coachella Valley Redistricting Map for Eastern Riverside County

Dear Commissioners:

Over the last 10 years, the City of Indio experienced exponential growth, which led to the doubling of Indio's population, raised the city's median income and assessed valuation to be in parity with the Coachella Valley, and greatly enhanced Indio's economic base. A key part of the Coachella Valley economy and Indio's economic engine is that Indio is a tourist destination known to the world. Our city draws in more than one million people annually through festivals like the Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival, Stagecoach Country Music Festival, and polo tournaments.

In May of 2011, the Southern California Association of Governments published its Profile on Indio and accurately outlined the city's economic breakdown by sector. In that report, it identified leisure-hospitality as one of the top Indio created job sectors for the city. Other large job sectors included retail, education, and the public sector. Agriculture represents one of the smallest parts of Indio's economic base at 3.9%. Much of that remaining agricultural sector is being replaced by continued urban growth as has taken place over the last several years.

In closing, Indio is the second county-seat for Riverside County, which makes Indio the Coachella Valley's center for business, government and as previously described entertainment activity. Several county services are operated out of Indio, which makes us inextricably connected to our surrounding communities, and also, we share in regional governmental bodies like the Coachella Valley

Daniel Claypool
July 13, 2011
Page 2 of 2

Association of Governments, SunLine Transit Agency, and the Palm Springs
Desert Resorts Convention and Visitors Authority.

Should you have further questions or would like to contact me, please call me at
(760) 391-4015.

Sincerely,


Dan Martinez
City Manager

cc: Mayor and Council

REGION 2: RIVERSIDE

July 13, 2011

Dear Commissioners

My name is Hal Lutz. I am a retired WWII Veteran who has lived in Hemet, CA for over 10 years. I am asking the commission to leave the Hemet/San Jacinto valley connected with the Coachella Valley Congressional District.

I have many retired friends throughout the San Jacinto and Coachella Valley. Many of the issues we face involve federal issues such as Social Security, Medicare and Veterans Benefits.

Again I ask you to consider keeping the city of Hemet in the Coachella Valley Congressional District.

Sincerely,



Hal Lutz

City of Hemet

REGION 2: RIVERSIDE

July 13, 2011

To: California Redistricting Commission
Re: Coachella Valley Congressional District

Dear Commissioners:

As former Mayor of the City of Hemet, I would ask the Commission to keep the Hemet/San Jacinto Valley connected with the Coachella Valley Congressional District.

Like the Coachella Valley, the San Jacinto Valley has a high number of retirees who need assistance with federal agencies such as Social Security, Medicare and Veterans Benefits.

The city of Hemet also acts as an entry way to the Santa Rosa San Jacinto Mountain National Monument. This National Monument encompasses the Hemet/San Jacinto Valley as well as the Coachella Valley. The Monument attracts hikers from around the world and is a key component to the area's tourism.

The first draft map that was released is an ideal Congressional district for the Hemet/San Jacinto Valley.

Thank you for your consideration.



Marc Searl
Former Mayor of Hemet