

**Subject:** Redrawing the lines

**From:** Richard Grubbs <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 20 Jul 2011 16:27:02 -0700 (PDT)

**To:** [REDACTED]

I do not have any technical information to set forth, but I would like to relay my feelings concerning the division of Districts, whether they be for State or Federal legislative seats.

It is my opinion, the districts must have a commonality within its boundaries. As an example, in the mountain communities of Southern California, San Bernardino County to be more specific, needs to have the same person representing the citizens, Assembly or Senate, due to the fact they have more in common than the residents in the off mountain communities. If a person is asked to represent uncommon areas, there is great possibility there will not be equal representation for one side or the other, due to the difference of priorities.

While I am sure that this is not a new thought, I ask the entire Commission take that into consideration when making the final draft.

Richard Grubbs

[REDACTED]

Yorba Linda, CA 92886

[REDACTED]

Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** Alan Swarm <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 20 Jul 2011 15:24:41 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Alan Swarm <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redlands

Message Body:

we don't want our town of Redlands split right down the middle.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** Steven Mrochek <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 20 Jul 2011 16:44:47 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Steven Mrochek <[REDACTED]>

Subject: California Citizens Redistricting Commission

Message Body:

I am very concerned that the northwest portion of our city is currently included in a proposed Assembly District that stretches out to the San Fernando Valley and places it with a half-dozen LA County communities that do not resemble Rancho Cucamonga. Lets keep our lovely city the way it is. Lets keep all the history of Rancho Cucamonga intact.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** Joanne Genis <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 20 Jul 2011 22:28:57 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Joanne Genis <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting

Message Body:

I have heard that my city of Chino Hills will be split in half with the newdistricting that will take place. I do not agree with this.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** viola spagnolo <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 20 Jul 2011 23:17:10 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: viola spagnolo <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting city of rancho cucamonga

Message Body:

Dear commission

Please consider resending the boundaries of the north end of my city and leave us in  
tak with the rest of the city.

Thank You

Vi Spagnolo

5432 Briartree place

Rancho Cucamonga

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** Carol Robb <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Thu, 21 Jul 2011 00:48:56 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Carol Robb <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Wrightwood with Redlands and Rancho Cucamonga

Message Body:

Other than expediency, what is your justification for putting Wrightwood in a district that includes Rancho Cucamonga, bits of San Bernardino, and Loma Linda and Redlands in the same Assembly district?

Wrightwood is a fairly isolated mountain community on the NORTH side of the mountains. What representation would it get in a district composed of much more populated urban/suburban areas? Where is the community of interest? The folks I know in Wrightwood rarely come to San Bernardino for anything! Victorville, Lancaster and Palmdale, yes, but not San Bernardino.

I was hoping that the Commission would do something to make the current 63rd AD more compact, and less gerrymandered. This configuration, however, seems to just make it worse!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** James Vita <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Thu, 21 Jul 2011 01:08:17 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: James Vita <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Chino Hills

Message Body:

I understand a proposal to divide our city in two different districts. That is absurd. We need to remain consistent with the current Orange County districts we are aligned with.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** Lars Oldewage <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Thu, 21 Jul 2011 03:02:22 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Lars Oldewage <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Misleading Subjects

Message Body:

Many of the comments posted have subject lines stating "Supporter" when in fact the comment is critical of the proposed map. As such, I have no confidence in this process. I strongly suspect it has been corrupted by unions, politicians and political correctness.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

**From:** Dan whalen <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Thu, 21 Jul 2011 03:05:14 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Dan whalen <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Phelan being split into two assembly districts

Message Body:

Would you please reconsider splitting our desert community in two, we are a small community and I know that our collective voice will be silenced by this separation. This will cause confusion as to who will represent us, and I know that any rep will pay little attention to such a small population. Thank you for your time, Dan Whalen

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Redistricting Recommendations

**From:** Seth Strongin <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 20 Jul 2011 15:26:02 -0700 (PDT)

**To:** [REDACTED]

Dear Re-Districting Commission,

Please find my comments attached to this email. Thank you for your consideration.

Seth Strongin  
Tarzana, CA

**Redistricting Letter San Gabriels.pdf**

July 19, 2011

Citizens Redistricting Commission

████████████████████  
Sacramento, California 95814

## **Please Extend San Bernardino Congressional District North to Include the San Gabriel Mountains**

Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission:

I am very concerned about the future of the San Gabriel Mountains where my friends and family are frequent visitors.

The shape of Congressional Districts that include the San Gabriels will influence an individual's ability to improve these conditions. Recreational conditions in many areas in the San Gabriels are substandard, especially areas frequented by people of color, communities often separated from the districts that include public lands.

I am pleased that the Commission has generally placed the federal public land in the San Gabriel Mountains in the same Congressional Districts as the foothill and San Gabriel River watershed communities to the south of the range, which form a community of interest. The Redistricting Commission has admirably united foothill residents with their federal public lands in the San Gabriel Mountains as reflected in all three of the Los Angeles County Congressional Districts visualizations.

I believe that the Congressional District visualizations that include the section San Gabriel Mountains located in San Bernardino County above Rancho Cucamonga falls far short of the mark by including this heavily used section of the range in the same Congressional District as Death Valley far the north, with which it has little in common. Even worse, the most heavily populated foothill city adjacent to the San Gabriels, Rancho Cucamonga, would no longer be included in the same Congressional District as its backyard mountain range. Like the Pasadena area to the west, Rancho Cucamonga has a very intimate relationship with the San Gabriel Mountains. **I urge the Commission add the San Gabriel Mountains to the north of Rancho Cucamonga to the San Bernardino Congressional District, which includes Rancho Cucamonga, and to reflect this change in its visualizations of the district.** This will also better link Rancho Cucamonga with the remainder of the district to the east by expanding the linkage in the San Gabriel Mountains. I believe that is design will look much more logical to the public and it fits well with what the Commission has done to the west in Los Angeles County.

I strongly recommend that the San Bernardino Congressional District be expanded to the north above Rancho Cucamonga to include the section of the San Gabriel Mountains in San Bernardino County that is located west of the I-15. Adjusting the proposed San Bernardino Congressional District can readily be accomplished by extending the district north from Rancho Cucamonga to the northern national forest boundary. The western district boundary in the San Gabriel Mountains would be the LA County line and the eastern boundary I-15. With this

boundary adjustment the entire San Gabriel range and the citizens who have the strongest relationship with the mountains will be located in a series of well-designed Congressional Districts which recognize the community of interest of foothill communities in both Los Angeles and western San Bernardino Counties.

Sincerely,

Seth Strongin

[REDACTED]

Tarzana, CA 91356