

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Denise Morehand <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 5:54 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Denise Morehand <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Huntington Beach Redistricting

Message Body:

I have been a resident of Huntington Beach for more than 30 years and am expressing concern over the prospect of Huntington Beach being divided. Please keep HB WHOLE!!!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Cathy Kurihara <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 8:36 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Cathy Kurihara <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Huntington Beach

Message Body:

My family and community are outraged that my state government would want to break up or "redistrict" our Huntington Beach family.

This is completely wrong - we do not want a North vs South mentally- we are ONE wonderful city!!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Heidi Vega <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 9:00 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Heidi Vega <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Huntington Beach

Message Body:

Please don't divide the voting district lines for North and South Huntington Beach residents. Huntington Beach is one city and should not be divided.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Stephanie Cordrey <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 9:20 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Stephanie Cordrey <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting Commission looking to divide HB

Message Body:

Do not divide Huntington Beach keep Huntington Beach as a whole for costal voting.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Nancy Basaldua <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 9:47 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Nancy Basaldua <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Dividing Huntington Beach

Message Body:

Huntington Beach is a great community, whether it is north or south! To think you are considering dividing the community in any fashion would be disastrous! I am pleading that you leave Huntington Beach the way it is....one great voting community!

Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Brad DeWitt <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 10:25 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Brad DeWitt <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Huntington Beach

Message Body:

quit messing with boundry and work on getting us out of debt. Cut pensions and stop all this pay in the future, get California back where jobs maybe will stay or come back.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Dana Whitney <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 10:27 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Dana Whitney <[REDACTED]>

Subject: division of Huntington Beach

Message Body:

I'm a Huntington Beach resident of 40 years and see no logical reason for its division. It is a coastal city and should be kept a whole city, never divided and the north added to other cities. I object to this reasoning and implore you to leave our city undivided.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Jeff Gillette <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 10:29 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jeff Gillette <[REDACTED]>

Subject: re-districting proposal

Message Body:

It makes no sense to split Huntington Beach into two districts. Please re-consider this proposal. We are a tight community and dividing it would be a step in the wrong direction.

Thanks for your consideration

Jeff

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Jeff Ettinger <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 10:50 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jeff Ettinger <[REDACTED]>

Subject: City of Orange

Message Body:

As a resident of Villa Park, I ask that you do not split up our city. I feel that things are going well for the city and feel it would not benefit Villa Park.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Graham Crowe <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 10:56 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Graham Crowe <[REDACTED]>

Subject: WSTSA State Senate District

Message Body:

This is in regard to the WSTSA Senate district in Orange County that was the subject of debate on Friday June 22 and Sunday June 24.

On Friday, when Q2 was asked about the difference between the Option 1 and Option 2 versions of WSTSA with respect to how much of Anaheim is in each version, this was the response:

“In Option 2, the flatlands of Anaheim are reduced. There’s less of the flatlands of Anaheim in WSTSA. In Option 1, the central flatlands of Anaheim are in WSTSA.”

The only other difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is that a large chunk of Huntington Beach was added to the southwest corner of Option 2 in order to make up for the loss of Anaheim flatlands. No cities in the North County area were reunited in Option 2. It was a straight up swap between the Anaheim flats and Huntington Beach.

Commissioner Aguirre argued strongly and eloquently for Option 1, pointing out that Option 1 is the only version remaining that at least partially keeps the low income areas together in one State Senate district (although even Option 1 is somewhat diluted from prior visualizations).

Despite this, Commission Dai lobbied fellow commissioners for Option 2. Here is a direct transcript from the video of Friday June 22:

“I’d actually like to advance (Option) 2 and let me just run through the reasons why 2 is better than 1 and see if I can convince some of my fellow commissioners to at least move to 2. We had a lot of testimony that Anaheim Hills is very different from the Anaheim flats and it’s much more affluent and it’s much more similar to the areas immediately south of it, Orange and Villa Park and North Tustin and those areas. So I think that (Option) 2 does a better grouping there. You have the North County areas together which is consistent with COI. You still preserve by and large most of the COI between the flatlands of Anaheim and Santa Ana. The South OC (portion of the) district I think is reasonable. The problem (portion of the) district I think is the one that has the Little Saigon COI in it. It has a couple of different COIs and this is problematic for a number of people. We have testimony that Santa Ana didn’t really want to be with Seal Beach but we also have

east Long Beach in there so we thought it made sense to put them with Seal Beach. And Seal Beach gains a little bit of northern Huntington Beach which is what we just did in the Assembly. So I think that’s a pretty reasonable reflection of all of the communities of interest and it’s a little bit better than (Option) 1.”

The assertion that the areas taken out of Anaheim are from Anaheim Hills and/or are more compatible with Anaheim Hills is inaccurate and likely misled a number of commissioners. All of the areas removed from Anaheim in Option 2 were from the flatlands and include some of the poorest sections of the city (above and below the 91 freeway). To replace them with the wealthiest portions of Huntington Beach is just as disturbing as what was being proposed in the South Bay Area Congressional district (IGWSG) on Sunday.

Here is a comparison of the areas that were removed and added in Option 2:

Removed - Approximately 55,000 people from Anaheim flatlands

Zip Codes: parts of 92801 and 92805

Median Income: \$45,000

% Below Poverty Level: 20%

Added - Approximately 55,000 people in Huntington Beach

Zip Codes: Most of 92649 and part of 92647

Median Income: \$80,000

% Below Poverty Level: 5%

When the vote was taken in support of Option 2 on Sunday, it seemed as if most of the commissioners were unaware of exactly what was occurring. The vote was presented as a choice between Option 2 and Option 4 (Commissioner Ward's proposal, a variation of Option 2, which split low income communities in a different but equally effective way.) Several commissioners asked to see income distributions in the district, but that was not provided. Option 1 was never voted on (and barely even discussed on Sunday) because Commissioner Dai started right away with getting commissioners to replace it with Option 2. If this had not been done, Option 1 would have been the status quo since it was in the merged statewide plan and it would have taken 9 votes to remove it.

It is unclear what the motivation was behind the push for Option 2. Perhaps it was to placate the Little Saigon residents with a district that is more winnable for them. Perhaps it was to provide an alternative to Commissioner Ward's proposal, but Option 4 was not close to getting 9 votes and was really not much different in its net effect. There is no community of interest testimony linking Huntington Beach with inland cities such as Santa Ana. Whatever the rationale, the end result of replacing Option 1 with Option 2 was very unfavorable to low income residents in WSTSA.

The only hope at this point is at least three commissioners from one of the parties will see the damage that has been done to WSTSA and will demand changes before supporting the final Senate plan.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO: Redistricting Commission	FROM: Ria Ioannidis For Adria Jimenez
COMPANY: Cal Citizens Redistricting Comm	DATE: 07/26/11
FAX NUMBER: [REDACTED]	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
PHONE NUMBER: [REDACTED]	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER: [REDACTED]
RE: Los Alamitos	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER: [REDACTED]

URGENT FOR REVIEW PLEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

Notes/Comments:

Originals will be sent thru the mail.

Thank you,

Ria Ioannidis

Administrative Services

City of Los Alamitos

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] LOS ALAMITOS, CA 90720-5600

[REDACTED]

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Geri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Aguirre:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Aguirre
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS


Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Ancheta:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Ancheta
Page 2
July 26, 2011


we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Geri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Barabba:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Barabba

Page 2

July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Geri L. Graham-Mejia
Marlynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Blanco:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Blanco
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerri L. Graham-Mejia
Marlynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Dal:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Dai
Page 2
July 26, 2011


we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Geri L. Graham-Mejia
Morlynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

Michelle R. DiGuilio
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner DiGuilio:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner DiGuilio
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerrit L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Webber:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Webber
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Forbes:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Forbes
Page 2
July 26, 2011


we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Malloy:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Malloy
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Geri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

Libert "Gil" Ontai
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Ontai:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Ontai
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,


CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerrit L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

M. Andre Parvenu
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Parvenu:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Parvenu
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Geri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Raya:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Raya
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerrit L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Yao:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.ca.us

Commissioner Yao
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011



Mayor:
Ken Stephens

Mayor Pro Tem:
Troy D. Edgar

Council Members:
Warren Kusumoto
Gerri L. Graham-Mejia
Marilynn M. Poe

City Manager:
Jeffrey L. Stewart

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

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Ward:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Social Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Social Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Social Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Social Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Social" and "Assembly Social" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,

Los Alamitos, CA
90720-5600

www.ci.Los-Alamitos.co.us

Commissioner Dr. Ward
Page 2
July 26, 2011

we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Social Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Social Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS



Kenneth Stephens
Mayor

Subject:

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 7/26/2011 6:36 PM

To: [REDACTED]

The Citizen Redistricting Commission has proposed to place La Habra in Senate and Assembly District that are composed solely of Los Angeles County cities. Please leave La Habra in the Orange County district that it is in now, where it belongs.

Thank you Mr.and Mrs.Hottle

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Steven Hill <Cat[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 12:27 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Steven Hill <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Coastal

Message Body:

As a resident of Irvine, I want to urge the Commission to make sure our city is placed in a coastal Congressional District. We have a much greater community of interest with coastal communities like Newport Beach than we do with cities in inland Orange County. We are more likely go shopping, recreating and generally spending more time along the coast than in inland areas.

Irvine and Newport Beach are joined by our common participation in youth sports teams, family activities, parks and sports fields and our dependence on the same roads such as Jamboree, MacArthur Blvd. and the 405 freeway. Also, San Diego Creek runs through Irvine and dumps into the back bay of Newport Harbor which the federal government has many responsibilities at.

Thanks for listening.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Erminio Maganzini <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 1:32 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Erminio Maganzini <[REDACTED]>

Subject: La Habra-Yorba Linda

Message Body:

You have created a north Orange County district called Le Habra/Yerba Linda. Interesting name! Might it be possible you could rename it after two north Orange County cities like La Habra and Yorba Linda?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Roseanne Ziegler <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 1:41 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Roseanne Ziegler <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Splitting Huntington Beach into North and South

Message Body:

I am a long time resident of Huntington Beach, living in the 92649 area code since 1983. I see the proposed division of HB into north and south for redistricting purposes as having a potential negative impact on the city. We, as a coastal city, have nothing in common with the issues of Garden Grove and Westminster. I am sure that those cities have the same feeling. Another stupid government idea.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Lisa Head <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 4:51 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Lisa Head <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistrict HB

Message Body:

Please DO NOT break Huntington Beach into a North/South separate voting block. We are one city with the same concerns.

Lisa Head

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Cathy Keler <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 6:23 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Cathy Keler <[REDACTED]>

Subject: We draw the lines

Message Body:

PLEASE don't lop off an appendage from the Huntington Beach body. Leave this city intact.
DO NOT redraw the lines.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Cindy Minato <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 9:23 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Cindy Minato <[REDACTED]>

Subject: no redistricting for HB

Message Body:

I am a 40 year resident and am proud to be a Huntington Beach resident. I grew up in the southside and now am raising a family in the northside. Please leave HB intact. It is a great city, all on it's own.

Thank you,
Cindy Minato

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Put La Habra in district with only OC cities

From: Robert Sheridan <creat[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 3:26 PM

To: [REDACTED]

7-26-11

From:

Robert Sheridan

[REDACTED]
La Habra, CA 90631

To:

Citizens Redistricting Commission

Please put La Habra
in a district
with only Orange County cities.

Thank You,
Robert Sheridan

Subject: re districting to Loretta Sanchez

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 7/26/2011 2:14 PM

To: [REDACTED]

As a resident of Villa Park I favor the Orange plan to be linked to Tustin, Tustin Hills and Anaheim Hills along with Orange. As a small city, our desires and needs would be totally opposed to those of Santa Ana and our voice would be lost in the politics of Loretta Sanchez.

Mary Jo Chorbagan

Subject: REDISTRICTING ORANGE COUNTY

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 7/26/2011 10:14 AM

To: [REDACTED]

DEAR COMMISSION MEMBERS,

I AM WRITING BECAUSE WE DO NOT WANT THE CHANGES THE PROPOSED CHANGES THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION ARE PLANNING. WE BOUGHT OUR HOUSE IN LAHABRA BECAUSE WE WANTED TO LIVE IN ORANGE COUNTY. WE DON'T WANT TO MOVE TO STAY IN ORANGE COUNTY.

OUR OPINIONS AND VOTES WOULD BE LOST IF WE WERE REDISTRICTED WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY. I WANT THOSE I VOTE FOR TO REPRESENT ME. I DO NOT FEEL THAT WILL HAPPEN IF WE ARE SWITCHED TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

PLEASE PUT US IN A DISTRICT WITH OTHER ORANGE COUNTY CITIES.

THANK YOU.

JAMES AND CATHERINE HERMAN

[REDACTED]

LA HABRA, CA. 90631

Subject: Redistricting

From: "Dale Peterson" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 9:03 PM

To: <[REDACTED]>

Hi:

As residents of La Habra, CA we are quite surprised to find that our fair city in Orange County will be grouped with cities of Los Angeles County. In fact, La Habra will be the only Orange County city among a large population of Los Angeles County cities.

We understand that established boundaries cannot always be considered when redistricting. This would not pose quite as large a problem if there were a balance between Orange and Los Angeles cities. However when only one city among a group from another county are grouped, the interests of an Orange county city cannot be fairly represented.

We respectfully request that you reconsider this issue.

Dale & Pat Peterson
La Habra, CA

From: Lisa Mingear <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 7:22 PM

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

Please do not split up Dana Point in your redistricting

Lisa Mingear
Accurate Bookkeeping
[REDACTED]

— Attachments: —

DATE: - Powered by Google Docs.webarchive

336 KB

Subject: Redrawing the Lines for Orange County City -La Habra

From: Ken Olson <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 7:04 PM

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

How in the world can you consider an Orange County city to have anything in common with Los Angeles County? There is more than a mountain range of differences between us. Please leave us with Brea or Anaheim, our Orange County cities to the East and South.

We paid more for this house because it was in Orange County. Now let us continue to get get what we are paying for.

Ken Olson

[REDACTED]
La Habra, CA 90631

Subject: [REDACTED] Orange Plan

From: Frank Bryant <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 12:05 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission,

As a resident of the City of Orange, I want to thank you for your service and your attention to the needs of local communities. I have watched you struggle with how to handle our city and our desire to be kept whole inside a single congressional district.

Our city is unique. Unlike Santa Ana, which is the government seat for Orange County, or Anaheim, which has become a 24 hour tourist destination, Orange is mostly a community of quiet neighborhoods and small businesses. Putting Orange into a congressional district with Santa Ana and Anaheim would serve to minimize our voice and our ability to receive attentive representation. Therefore, it is our desire to be linked with other similar neighborhoods and smaller communities, such as Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hills and Tustin. This will allow us to work with communities of similar interests and not be dominated by much larger or more influential cities of Santa Ana and Anaheim.

When looking at where to draw the district lines I would encourage you to consider the "Orange Plan" as submitted by members of the Orange City Council today.

Thank you again for your service.

Sincerely,

Frank and Patricia Bryant

[REDACTED]
Villa Park, CA

Subject: Boundry Maps

From: "Gary Remland" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 9:42 AM

To: <[REDACTED]>

Please see my letter attached. Thank You for your consideration of my opinion.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Remland
Remland Insurance Services
Orange California

— Attachments: —

Quick Image Navigator-07-26-2011.pdf

395 KB

Remland Insurance Services

Orange, CA. 92866

July 26, 2011

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

RE: Orange County State Legislative and Congressional Boundary Maps

Dear Commissioners,

As an active and concerned civic leader in Orange County and the City of Orange, I would respectfully submit the following recommendations to the CRD as it begins to finalize the state's legislative boundary maps. These recommendations reflect my belief of what is in the best interest of the city and community I work in, and the bordering cities and communities. These cities should be grouped together as best possible.

- The City of Orange should only be represented by one congressional district. We are a small city. Based on the way the lines are drawn now, I live in one district in Orange, and my office is in another district. This makes no sense. And in addition, the city of Villa Park and Tustin are a closer representation of Orange and being like cities, rather than Santa Ana.
- Coto de Caza is too small to split into two districts. They would just get completely lost and have no unified voice to represent this small city.
- The last Board of Equalization maps seem to be without logic and very problematic for Orange County. As currently drafted, the vertical orientation of the BOE districts groups southern California cities with those on the Oregon border. So, rather than this confusing configuration, the counties of Orange, San Diego, Imperial, San Bernardino and Riverside should be grouped together, while Los Angeles has its own BOE district.

Thank you for your consideration of my recommendations. I know this is not an easy job, and I do appreciate your effort and diligence to make this as fair and accurate as possible.

Sincerely,


Gary W. Remland

Subject: City of La Habra Senate and Assembly Districts

From: Lisa <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 11:57 AM

To: [REDACTED]

July 26, 2011

Dear Commission Members:

As a resident in the City of La Habra, located in Orange County, I am strongly opposed to the Commission's plans to place La Habra in Senate and Assembly Districts comprised solely of Los Angeles County cities.

Specifically, the City of La Habra should be placed in the DB-YL (Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda) Senate District and either the DBRYL or ANAFULL (Anaheim Fullerton) Assembly District.

La Habra needs to be represented by elected officials that understand and share our local vision, goals and objectives.

I urge you to reconsider the placement of La Habra in the proposed district and realign the City with its other north Orange County communities of interest.

Sincerely,

Lisa Frear



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Mayor

Michael F. Henn

Mayor Pro Tem

Nancy Gardner

Council Members

Keith D. Curry

Leslie J. Daigle

Rush N. Hill, II

Steven J. Rosansky

Edward D. Selich

July 25, 2011

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

By E-Mail

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to thank the Commission for placing Newport Beach with Costa Mesa, Huntington Beach and Laguna Beach in a coastal Congressional district. Newport Beach has a strong community of interest with these other coastal cities and shares less in common with Irvine, an inland city without coastal access.

As you finalize the Congressional district lines, I strongly urge you to keep Newport Beach, Costa Mesa and Huntington Beach together in a coastal-oriented district.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Michael Henn
Mayor

Subject: Fw: Redistricting

From: "Dale Peterson" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 9:06 PM

To: <[REDACTED]>

We are resending this note, as we omitted our address in the original.

Dale & Pat Peterson

[REDACTED]
La Habra, Ca 90631

----- Original Message -----

From: [Dale Peterson](#)

To: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 9:03 PM

Subject: Redistricting

Hi:

As residents of La Habra, CA we are quite surprised to find that our fair city in Orange County will be grouped with cities of Los Angeles County. In fact, La Habra will be the only Orange County city among a large population of Los Angeles County cities.

We understand that established boundaries cannot always be considered when redistricting. This would not pose quite as large a problem if there were a balance between Orange and Los Angeles cities. However when only one city among a group from another county are grouped, the interests of an Orange county city cannot be fairly represented.

We respectfully request that you reconsider this issue.

Dale & Pat Peterson

La Habra, CA

Subject: La Habra Redistricting

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 7/26/2011 10:36 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Putting La Habra in an LA County district will severely diminish our voice on issues of concern to us. Please do not cut us out of OC; instead, put us in a district with other OC cities. We live in an OC city and those we vote for should represent us and our city!!

Mr. & Mrs. Andrew Maffucci

[REDACTED]
La Habra, CA 90631

Subject: Legislative Redistricting of La Habra, Ca.

From: <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/26/2011 11:43 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Sirs;

I have received information regarding Legislative Redistricting of La Habra, Ca. to the Los Angeles County District. I am totally opposed to that as we are an Orange County City and need to remain in the Orange County District with our neighbor cities of Brea and Fullerton.

Taking La Habra out of the Orange County District would have a distinct effect on our ability to be effectively represented on issues of concern in regards to education, public safety, transportation, land use and many other legislative issues.

Please do not vote to redistrict La Habra to the Los Angeles County District.

Thank you for your time!

Cliff & Kim Robertson

[REDACTED]

La Habra, Ca. 90631

[REDACTED] (Home)

[REDACTED] (Cell)

Subject: Please keep La Habra, CA in Orange County, and not throw us into Los Angeles.
From: Lee Elmquist <[REDACTED]>
Date: 7/26/2011 4:13 PM
To: <[REDACTED]>

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

From: [REDACTED]
To: votersfirstact.ca.gov
Subject: La Habra, CA (Orange County) should not be re-districted into LA County
Date: Tue, 26 Jul 2011 15:58:03 -0700

PLEASE folks, some common sense here. La Habra has always had a "community of interest" in Orange County. Our people shop here (La Habra, Brea, Fullerton) work here, go to church here and rarely do we go north "over the hill" into La Puente, Rowland Heights etc. It is another world over there, (culturally, ethnically), and these people rarely shop here, eat here, work here, go to church here etc> It is two different worlds. To have our votes thrown into LA is a real miscarriage of what you are trying to accomplish. We need to be fairly represented. Please seriously consider changing this boundry!

Sincerely, LeRoy Elmquist [REDACTED] La Habra, CA 90631 562/[REDACTED]

—ATT00001—

Reporting-MTA: dns;snt0-omc1-s28.snt0.hotmail.com
Received-From-MTA: dns;SNT126-W35
Arrival-Date: Tue, 26 Jul 2011 15:58:03 -0700

Final-Recipient: [rfc822;](#) [REDACTED]
Action: failed
Status: 5.5.0
Diagnostic-Code: smtp;550-5.1.1 The email account that you tried to reach does not exist.
Please try
550-5.1.1 double-checking the recipient's email address for typos or
550-5.1.1 unnecessary spaces. Learn more at
550 5.1.1 <http://mail.google.com/support/bin/answer.py?answer=6596> bz9si1780866vdc.125

—Attachments:—

ATT00001

548 bytes