

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

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

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

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Jay P. Ebersohl <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Screw up on a community

Message Body:

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

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

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

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

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

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

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Sal Carlos, Jr <[REDACTED]>

Subject: crazy lines

Message Body:

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

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

—Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml—

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

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

Message Body:

To Committee,

I find the city of Upland, Ca.  
has more in common with Ontario, Ca.  
than with Claremont . Surely this is a  
consideration?

concerned voter S. Palacios

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

—Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml—

**Subject:** Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino  
**From:** "David E. Raley" <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** Tue, 14 Jun 2011 15:10:05 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]

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

Message Body:

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

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

---

**Subject:** Proposed SBCUCA Assembly district

**From:** [REDACTED]

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

**To:** [REDACTED]

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

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

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

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

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

---

**Subject:** Re-districting

**From:** [REDACTED]

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

**To:** [REDACTED]

**CC:** [REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern,

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

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

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

Phil and Terry Wolloch

[REDACTED], Blue Jay, CA 92317

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

**Subject:** Redistricting

**From:** [REDACTED]

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

**To:** [REDACTED]

**CC:** [REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern,

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Jim and Dora Huff

[REDACTED]

Crestline, CA 92325

[REDACTED]

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

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

**From:** Robert Ward <[REDACTED]>

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

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Robert Ward <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Oddities in the grouping of the Eastern Inland Empire

Message Body:

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

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

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

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

Equalization - ORSD (Highland, Riverside, San Diego)

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

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

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

---

**Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml**

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —

---

**Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml**

— Proposed SBCUCA Assembly district.eml —

---

**Proposed SBCUCA Assembly district.eml**

— Inland\_Action-AD\_Submittal SB Redlands.pdf —

---

**Inland\_Action-AD\_Submittal SB Redlands.pdf**

— Re-districting.eml —

---

**Re-districting.eml**

— Redistricting.eml —

---

**Redistricting.eml**

— Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml —


---

**Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino.eml**





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





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

**From:** Gene Hinds <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 15 Jun 2011 16:56:29 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Gene Hinds <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Assembly District 63

Message Body:

You have included Rancho Cucamonga in the 63rd Assembly Distric.

Rancho Cucamonga is associated with the Pomona Valley and not the eastern part of the Inland Empire.

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

Thank you,

Gene Hinds

Redlands

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

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

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

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Joseph W. Schroer <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Keep Chino and Chino Hills Together

Message Body:

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

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

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

Chino and Chino Hills are two similar communities, with many cultural and demographic aspects in common. Both cities strive to maintain an agricultural/rural atmosphere, to the extent they are able to. The two cities even share the same newspaper.

Many thanks for your considerations.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission