

Redistricting Commission Hearing, June 16, 2011
Culver City City Hall
Testimony by Iku Kiriyaama (purple 19 speaker)
Retired LAUSD educator
[REDACTED]
Torrance 90501

Thank you for the months you have spent on this very daunting but important assignment that affects all of us.

My name is Iku Kiriyaama. I am a Torrance resident. I have grown up in, worked in and been involved in the communities of Torrance and Gardena for 54 years.

I testified at the Long Beach hearing to request the cities of Torrance and Gardena be in the same district, respecting the 100+ year community of interest history of the Japanese American community.

I ask the commission to change the map to keep the Japanese American community in Torrance and Gardena together. The Japanese American community of the South Bay resides in the greatest number in Gardena, south of Rosecrans and in Torrance.

Placing Torrance and Gardena in 2 separate districts especially does not make physical sense. Seniors, 3rd generation adults and fourth generation young people cross borders on a daily basis to take part in the activities offered. The Gardena Valley Japanese Cultural Institute is already separated by city lines. The senior housing complex, JCI Gardens, is in Torrance, split from JCI by the parking lot where the city lines of Torrance and Gardena meet. The residence directly across the street is an example of the arbitrary city lines as their garage is in Gardena and the home in Torrance.

Nearly 70% of the congregations of the Gardena Buddhist and Gardena Baptist churches come from Torrance. Many business owners do business in Gardena while residing in Torrance.

The Harbor Gateway, the north-south corridor running west to east between Normandie and Vermont, is with Gardena in the commission draft. It is important to retain this as the residents of the Gateway have a Gardena PO and consider themselves as Gardena residents. Gardena High School and 186th Street School are in the Gateway. The community adult school attached to Gardena High School was recently renamed for my late husband. To separate the Harbor Gateway from Gardena in any potential new lines would be a disaster. Neighborhood friends and colleagues in the Gateway support this part of the commission draft.

We urge you to reconsider the Assembly and Senate lines affecting Torrance and Gardena.

Subject: Redistricting California Voters

From: "Kathi Wolfsohn" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2011 14:22:15 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Redistricting Commission

Perhaps I need a larger map, but your current redistricting map looks almost identical to the one drawn up after the last census. There are still "fingers" instead the the "fists" that you promised. You do not appear to be using already existing divisions such as counties, cities, zip codes, school districts, water districts or area codes.

Each of you is being paid \$300.00/day, you have hired staff, you have rented meeting places, you have incurred expenses and you will have been doing this for nine months, but you have made no appreciable changes. In a state that has a debt of twenty billion dollars (\$20,000,000,000.00), you are wasting even more taxpayer dollars. All of the people in California need fair representation and you are not providing it.

This is not acceptable and I respectfully request that you rethink your redistricting.

Sincerely,

Kathi Wolfsohn
Millbrae

Subject: RE: Redistricting

From: "Rodriguez, Cirenio A" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2011 14:13:10 -0700

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

The first draft maps released on June 10 by California's Citizens Redistricting Commission would severely diminish opportunities for future Latino political progress in the state.

During the last decade, California's Latino population accounted for 90% of the state's growth. The Commission's maps fail to reflect that growth by not creating fair opportunities for increased Latino representation.

California's maps must comply with the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA), which protects underrepresented communities from discrimination in the electoral process. Under state law, strict adherence to the VRA is the second highest priority that the Commission must apply when drawing the state's new districts.

The Commission's First Draft Maps do not provide sufficient opportunities for fair Latino representation as required by the VRA. The Commission must ensure that it addresses this issue when it revises its draft maps.

Please take corrective action to address the issues listed above.

Cirenio Rodriguez

Subject: 1st Draft Redistricting for San Joaquin County

From: "Inn at Locke House" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2011 18:16:45 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Please consider other more cohesive options to the first draft.

Lockehouse <[REDACTED]>

Redistricting Letter.doc

June 17, 2011

California Citizens Redistricting Commission
1130 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: 1st Draft Maps
San Joaquin County's State Senate and Assembly Districts

To: Members of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission

I am a resident and small business owner who lives and works in Lockeford, an unincorporated town, seven miles from Lodi in the San Joaquin County. The proposed redistricting plan will give me no voice and no effective representation in the State Senate and Assembly.

Through my business I purchase, as much as possible, products grown and manufactured in the San Joaquin County communities around Stockton, Lodi and Lockeford/Clements. As a bed and breakfast owner-innkeeper, I send my clients to Lodi and Stockton to enjoy, participate and shop: concerts, restaurants, Farmers Markets, County Fair, Lodi Grape Festival, Delta Sandhill Crane Festival, University of Pacific and San Joaquin Delta College, Haggin Museum, Bob Hope Fox Theater, Hutchins Street Square, Stockton Arena, Lodi Parachute Center, etc.

Through my business, I draw visitors to the area because it offers them opportunity to explore: the Gateway to the Sierra foothills, Delta, Lodi Wine Appellation, Mokelumne River, Gold Country, etc. It is easy for me to "market" all of San Joaquin County because I live here and know the people, the social environment, the natural and cultural options, and particularly the economic and educational achievements and needs of this area.

To place Lodi and Lockeford in the same district as Yolo, Napa, Marin and Solano counties does not make sense on many levels. Did the commission take notice of the geographical delineations used by the media in reporting the weather and area news?
Did the commission take notice of the geographical delineations used by various state agencies in promoting agriculture, manufacturing, commerce, housing, recreation, economic development, and cultural heritage in the state? If they had, they would have proposed keeping the San Joaquin County – the northern section of the great central valley – as a unique entity.

Take another look at all the factors that make up communities, including their spheres of influence. Should a division of the county be needed, then consider placing Tracy in the Bay area because of the high number of residents who commute there for work.

Upon closer consideration, you will see that Lodi - and Lockeford/Clements with all other small unincorporated communities between and around Stockton and Lodi - should be kept in a single Senate District and should compose an entire Assembly District (but not more than two) in the county.

Sincerely,

Lani Eklund
Proprietor-Innkeeper, The Inn at Locke House
Former teacher, Lodi Unified School District (at schools in Stockton and Lodi)
Chair of the Lockeford Municipal Advisory Council

Prepared June 17, 2011

TO: California Redistricting Commission Members and Staff

FROM: Brian Lawson

RE: Verify analysis in public comments if seem useful

- A) Redistricting is data intensive. It is probably a good idea to verify any claims which are made in public comments before acting on them.
- B) If the analysis in the public comment looks useful at first glance, rather than go with what the public comment claims, if it can be done quickly, it should probably be verified by your linedrawer.
- C) Most likely, though, most public comments will not contain claims which are more important than the work which the linedrawer is carrying out. But if some are, you should probably go with the linedrawer's analysis rather than with what is claimed in the public comment.
- D) You should be very careful not to load the linedrawer down with requests for extraneous analysis. Be selective.
- E) In relation to this I discovered that a portion of the public comment I sent in June 14, 2011 contained an error. This is corrected below. The point of the June 14 comment was not so much to advocate for these particular numbers (almost certainly the figures in the table will change in future drafts), it is to suggest a method to use in selecting the numbers for senate districts.

Portion of the comment from June 14, 2001 which was in error (now corrected, hopefully!):

- 4) This produces a random geographic distribution of odd and even districts, except in one area. In the Bay Area it produces a large number of ~~even~~ odd districts (five: EALAM, MATEO, OAKRI, SF, SJOSE) and only one ~~odd~~ even district (HAYWD).

Everything else should be correct. The spreadsheet and map are consistent with the table and do not need to be changed.

Subject: Don't Ignore LATINOS

From: Leonel Leal <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2011 19:15:01 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

The first draft maps proposed by the Citizen's Commission should comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act. The proposed maps would limit Latino communities ability to effect change in California's political landscape.

As the largest minority of the State of California and the accounting for 90% of the population growth in the last decade it is critical for the new redistricting maps to empower and grow the influence of these communities not diminish their impact in elections.

The first draft maps do not provide a respective and necessary political opportunities to Latinos seeking fair democratic representation.

Additionally, the first draft proposed maps do nothing to allow Latinos in new growth areas of our State of California to voice their electoral progress. It is unfair that as the population of Latinos across the State has shifted and expanded to new areas; the first draft maps do not acknowledge this true demographic reality. It is critical that the final redistricting maps acknowledge and empower Latinos in southern California, northern California, and Central California.

The entire country and many international organizations are watching how our new maps developed by a citizens commission can impact voter's and the electorate. Reducing, stifling, or eliminating the voice of a large and under-representative minority is NOT the direction we need take our State.

I look forward to hearing directly from the Citizens Redistricting Commission and seeing the changes in the next maps proposed for the State. I am hopeful that the commission will fully understand the limitations the first draft map imposes on the Latino community and takes action to correct and improve these issues.

Regards,

Leonel C. Leal

[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA 95130

Subject: First Draft maps

From: "sckamhi" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2011 10:36:58 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

The maps I have been able to see and the newspaper descriptions I have read for district V look good to me.

Subject: Follow-up To Hearing Presentation

From: Eugene Starr <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2011 11:07:04 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

Commissioners:

Last evening I presented at the Culver City hearing at about 9:45 PM. Unfortunately I was unable to complete my input to you under the duress of time. Although I handed a paper copy of my presentation and work sheet to the individual who was monitoring time, I have decided to forward it to you via this e-mail, especially my attached worksheet.

The worksheet is an EXCEL file in which I attempt to calculate the totals of population for the shown configurations for the proposed 36th, Palos Verdes E-Beach Cities, Congressional District. It shows the swap of Lawndale, Hawthorne and the west half of Gardena into the 36th district vs a swap out of Venice and Santa Monica, cities with which the Southbay has no interaction of any kind. Venice and Santa Monica are NOT a part of the Southbay community. As such, I request that Venice and Santa Monica be eliminated from the planned 36th CD. Further, I request Lawndale and Hawthorne be added to the planned Palos Verdes E. - Beach Cities State Assembly district with possibly the elimination of Westchester, Playa Del Rey and Marina Del Re from the currently proposed plan. Under all circumstances PLEASE ASSURE THAT THE PENINSULA CITIES REMAIN WITH THE BEACH CITIES TO THE NORTH IN ALL FINAL DISTRICTS.

Hopefully, you will find the spread sheet helpful as I have in determining a quick tally of the population for the CD. The populations are based on 2010 census data for the cities and recent website data for all remaining Los Angeles communities.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter and thank you for your interest in our communities.

Eugene L. Starr

Copy of my testimony handed in last evening follows. It is also attached above.

INPUT TO THE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

Culver City, CA

June 16, 2011

I thank the Commission for giving me the opportunity to again speak to you about redistricting our community. I am a resident of Rolling Hills Estates.

I am very thankful to the Commission for including the Palos Verdes peninsula cities in districts with the beach cities to the north us. We no longer feel like an orphaned gerrymandered community. I expect this will be echoed many times this evening.

I have reviewed the preliminary districts released on the Commissions website. In general, I find the proposed districts to be acceptable for the most part. I do have a tough time accepting the fact that Hollywood is a part of our community as proposed by the Senatorial District, however I have more fundamental recommendations in mind for all three proposed districts.

Others and I were very pleased with the preliminary edition of the 36th congressional district available on the website, June 2, 2011. It was almost a carbon copy of what others and I proposed and placed on the Commissions website. However, between June 2nd and the current preliminary releases, we note a very significant change was made. Specifically, **two key cities or our community were removed, Lawndale and Hawthorne.** These were replaced by Venice and Santa Monica.

Lawndale and Hawthorne are very much a part of our Southbay community, were as Venice and Santa Monica are not. In fact, the city of Lawndale posts on their website that they are “The Heart of the Southbay.” Except for the fact that Venice and Santa Monica are on the Pacific coastline, they have little else in common with the Southbay in my opinion. For instance, most of us seldom visit the cities of Venice and Santa Monica nor do we work or recreate in these cities.

On the other hand, many of those who reside in the cities of Lawndale and Hawthorne work in Southbay businesses. Further, many of us have friends and relatives residing in these cities, not to mention businesses. In my wife’s and my case, we have rental

properties in the city of Lawndale and have enjoyed serving residents of Lawndale for the past thirty-three years. We have continuously upgraded our properties and have tenants who have been with us for as long as ten or more years. We also have friends residing in Hawthorne and I often shop at the Hawthorne Hardware store. These cities are very much part of our community where as Venice and Santa Monica definitely are not.

I respectfully request that the Commission include Lawndale and Hawthorne in all three proposed districts and eliminate Venice and Santa Monica. From the viewpoint of population, it is almost a one for one swap; Venice and Santa Monica have a combined population of approximately 129,000 and Hawthorne and Lawndale have a combined population of approximately 118,000. To accommodate the difference, I suggest the Commission consider adding the section of Harbor Gateway south of the 405 Freeway. I approximate 12,000 people reside in this area, thus making up the difference.

I recognize each congressional district must have a population of on the order of 715,000 people based upon 2010 census numbers. It is very much a numbers game. Accordingly, for your reference, **I include a work sheet with estimates of total populations for the congressional district** we originally proposed and the current one modified as discussed. I use 2010 census data for each city as available or data listed at the websites of communities where 2010 census data is not specifically available.

I also attach a copy of the input I posted on the Commissions website defining the boundaries of the congressional district we initially proposed. These boundaries, for the most part, apply to the congressional district proposed by the Commission except for the elimination of Wilmington and now Venice and Santa Monica, if you accept my request.

I again thank the Commission for your interest in our community and your conscientious work in our behalf.

Eugene L. Starr

INPUT TO THE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

Placed on Website 05-23-11

To the Members of the Redistricting Commission:

I thank the Commission for giving me the opportunity to address you at the Long Beach hearing April 27, 2011. As I stated at the time, I am a resident of Rolling Hills Estates. As a voter, I am very concerned about where the Palos Verdes Peninsula cities are placed in a new congressional district. I sincerely hope that our cities do not end up being placed in a district that does not embody our cities demographics and business-industry interests.

As I stated in my testimony, our cities are very much connected with the cities to our north. They are the cities where we work, shop and recreate. Because of the two-minute time limit I was unable to adequately address, articulate important specifics I believe the Commission should know. The following provides these specifics in the context of the questions posted on your website.

What bonds our community?

Our community is bonded by a beach lifestyle and numerous synergistic businesses and industries. These include the aerospace industry, (our community is the capital of the aerospace industry), shipping and transportation, i.e., the port of LA and the LA International Airport, Asian automotive industry offices, and major business, shopping arterials such as Hawthorne Blvd. and Crenshaw Blvd. Additionally, our highly qualified technical base provides terrific opportunities for developing a “green” industry for our nation.

Perhaps the most important bond is the fact that many of us residing in the peninsula cities have children residing and working in the cities immediately north of us. They are busy rearing their children, our grandchildren, in these cities. For instance, my daughter and son-in-law reside in Lomita wherein they are rearing their son, our grandson, just minutes from our home.

Where is your community located?

Our community is located approximately twenty miles Southwest of Los Angeles along the Pacific coast shoreline. It encompasses the current 36th Congressional District excluding Venice and West Carson the cities of Hawthorne, Lawndale, and the western half of Gardena, currently in the 35th Congressional District; the cities of Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills, Palos Verdes Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, and Catalina, currently in the 46th Congressional District; and the city of San Pedro. The population of these combined cities per data available via Google is on the order of 712,000, almost exactly the population required per district based upon the recent census.

In summary, the congressional district I propose for our community encompasses the following cities: Catalina, Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills, Rancho Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, San Pedro, Wilmington, Lomita, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, Lawndale, the western half of Gardena, Hawthorne, El Segundo, Lennox, Westchester, Del Aire, Playa Del Rey, and Marina Del Rey.

What are its boundaries?

The boundaries to the west and south of our community are the Pacific coastline. The north boundary is Jefferson Blvd, the north boundary of Westchester that proceeds to the east boundary for that area of our community, the 405 Freeway. The east boundary proceeds southeast along the 405 Freeway to the north and east boundaries of the city of Lennox and then to the north boundary of Hawthorne (Imperial Hwy). From Hawthorne, the east boundary proceeds south along Western Avenue and encompasses the west half of Gardena and the east boundary of Torrance until it extends to the north boundary of Wilmington long Lomita Blvd. The east boundary then proceeds further south along the east boundary of Wilmington to the coast.

Why should the community be kept together, or separate from another area?

As summarized above, our community is comprised of numerous synergistic businesses and industries, all of which network to become the powerful economic engine of our community. With our community's cities represented as one congressional district, our community will have a single voice representing our multi-faceted business-industrial base and our richly diversified demographic community.

Again, I thank you for your interest in our community and request that you form a new congressional district that includes the Palo Verdes Peninsula cities as I suggest. We of the Palos Verdes Peninsula are vitally involved with the businesses and industries of our community, many as leaders of these businesses. Accordingly, we believe it imperative that our peninsula cities be combined with the cities to the north where our work and businesses are generally located and with the cities of Wilmington and San Pedro where our jobs are predominately associated with the port. Our Palos Verdes community has little interaction with the cities to the east such as Long Beach and with the cities east of Western Ave., north of Wilmington.

In conclusion, I believe the congressional district I propose complies with all of the specific prioritized criteria the Commission has been given by the California Constitution with which to draw a district map for our community. In short, it brings the peninsula cities back to the status they had over ten years ago before the politicians agreed to gerrymander our cities with Orange County cities, cities with which we have little to nothing in common. Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Commission implements the congressional district I recommend. It is the only appropriate placement for the peninsula cities.

Respectfully,

Eugene L. Starr

CDWorksheet 06-16-11.xls

Worksheet for Proposed 36th Congressional District that Includes Palos Verdes Peninsula

Initial Proposal: 05/22/2011, Commission's Preliminary Plan Modified: 06/16/2011

Current 36th Congressional District	Population	Initially Proposed Congressional District for PVP 04/27/2011 Placed on Website 05/22/2011	Attempt at Construction of Commission June 10, 2011 Preliminary Plan	Substitute Hawthorne, Lawndale for Venice, Santa Monica. Add Harbor Gateway South of 405 Not Now Included & 40%	Notes
El Segundo	16,182	16,182	16,182	16,182	
Hermosa Beach	18,566	18,566	18,566	18,566	
Lomita	20,118	20,118	20,118	20,118	
LA (Playa Del Rey)	9,755	9,755	9,755	9,755	
Part of San Pedro (.4?)	23,465				
Venice	40,885		40,885		
Westchester	41,500	41,500	41,500	41,500	
Wilmington	53,308	53,308			
Manhattan Beach	36,665	36,665	36,665	36,665	
Redondo Beach	67,346	67,346	67,346	67,346	
Torrance	142,350	142,350	142,350	142,350	
Del Aire (0.3 %)	2758	9,193	9,193	9,193	
Lennox	23,412	23,412	0	0	
Marina Del Rey	8,340	8,340	8,340	8,340	
West Carson (95.1%)	93,850	0	0	0	
Total	598,500				
Published Total	639,087				
Not Accounted For?	40,587				
35th Congressional District					
Hawthorne	85,438	85,438	0	85,438	
Lawndale	32,016	32,016	0	32,016	
Gardena	59,733	23,893	0	23,893	West Gardena: Estimate 40%
Total	177,187				
Harbor Gateway	61,048	0	6,105	12,210	Harbor Gateway: Estimate 10% for June 10 Plan. Estimate 20% My Current Proposal
Harbor City	24,640	0	24,640	24,640	
Santa Monica	88,050	0	88,050	0	
40th Congressional District					
Rolling Hills Estates	8,067	8,067	8,067	8,067	
Rolling Hills	1,903	1,903	1,903	1,903	
Palos Verdes Estates	13,546	13,546	13,546	13,546	
Rancho Palos Verdes	41,754	41,754	41,754	41,754	
Catalina	3,696	3,696	3,696	3,696	
San Pedro	58,662	58,662	58,662	58,662	
Total	127,628	715,710	657,323	675,840	
Required Population		715,000	715,000	715,000	
Net Discrepancy		710	-57,677	-39,160	Unable to Reconcile Differences