

Tony Lima

████████████████████  
Artesia, CA 90701

Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission:

Cerritos and Artesia do not belong in an Orange County delegation.

Artesia and Cerritos have a great deal in common both socially and demographically with cities such as Bellflower, Downey, Lakewood, Norwalk, Paramount, Lynwood and Bell Gardens (Gateway Cities), and very little in common with the cities within Orange County.

As a point of reference maps created by the Chinese American Citizens Alliance displayed at the Commission Hearing on June 17 in Whittier provide much better representation than those posted by your Commission, especially for the people of Artesia and Cerritos.

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) provides regional leadership, in transportation, housing and air quality to name just a few issues. If more than ¾ of one of the districts is in a different county, the majority of the attention of the elected representatives will be on how policy issues affect that county.

Our message to local elected officials on issues we share with our neighboring cities in Los Angeles County will be fractured if we have different representation in Sacramento and Washington than the other cities in the COG.

It will be much more difficult to have cohesive representation with a representative in Sacramento or Washington DC who is not primarily concerned with our county's needs.

The places we go to shop, to eat and for entertainment are in the Gateway Cities area. We do not travel to Orange County for these kinds of activities on a daily basis.

Proposition 10 contained the following language: "The geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, neighborhood, or community of interest shall be respected to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions." There does not seem to be a compelling reason to split Cerritos and Artesia from the rest of the Gateway Cities and place them in Orange County.

Please consider keeping Gateway Cities together during your drafting of future maps. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Tony Lima

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Marie Cruz <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 17:26:11 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Marie Cruz <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Keep Santa Clarita Whole

**Message Body:**

Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Please add the community of Newhall into th Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley congressional district. Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Roger Colwell <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 03:09:06 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Roger Colwell <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Keep Newhall in the same Congressional Dist as City of Santa Clarita

Message Body:

Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Please add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.

Thank you

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** "Francis J. Cunningham III" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 18:27:36 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Francis J. Cunningham III <[REDACTED]>

Subject: I Support Keeping the Santa Clarita Valley Whole

Message Body:

Commissioners: Please do not split the Santa Clarita Valley into two separate Congressional Districts. That would have the effect of dividing neighbor's votes on important issues. Please include the community of Newhall in the Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita Valley Congressional District to safeguard the integrity of our community. Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Sharon Masters <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 03:11:08 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Sharon Masters <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Santa Clarita/Newhall congressional district

Message Body:

My husband & I live in Newhall, in the section that you have aligned with the San Fernando Valley instead of the rest of Santa Clarita. We would like for you to realign this section of our valley, so that our whole community can be unified as a single congressional district as you provided for in our other electoral districts.

Geographically, we are separated from the San Fernando Valley, & our community's vision is a part of Santa Clarita.

Thank you for your consideration,  
John & Sharon Masters

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Howard Welinsky <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 15:43:25 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Howard Welinsky <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Toluca Lake

Message Body:

The Toluca Lake area has historically been a "gypsy" area with the present Assembly district coming from Beverly Hills-West Hollywood, the Senate District from Pasadena and the Congressional District from the San Fernando Valley. The Proposed lines do the same Assembly District from Burbank/Glendale Senate District from Downtown and congressional from Pasadena. We are in the city of Los Angeles, we belong in the Southern Part of the East San Fernando Valley. We seem to be a last minute add-on or filler.

Thank you for your Consideration

Sincerely

Howard Welinsky

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Sharon Masters <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 03:11:09 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Sharon Masters <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Santa Clarita/Newhall congressional district

Message Body:

My husband & I live in Newhall, in the section that you have aligned with the San Fernando Valley instead of the rest of Santa Clarita. We would like for you to realign this section of our valley, so that our whole community can be unified as a single congressional district as you provided for in our other electoral districts.

Geographically, we are separated from the San Fernando Valley, & our community's vision is a part of Santa Clarita.

Thank you for your consideration,

John & Sharon Masters

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** POMVAL Support

**From:** "Leigh Cornell" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 11:31:01 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

**CC:** "Richard Yochum" <[REDACTED]>

Name: Leigh Cornell, MHA

City: Pomona, CA

Reference: POMVAL redistricting maps

Dear Redistricting Commission:

We are Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center would like to extend our support of the **POMVAL** map as drafted and released on June 10, 2011. The **POMVAL** map represents the communities that should be kept together which include: Pomona, Chino, Ontario and Montclair. As I articulated at the hearing on May 5, 2011 we feel it is important to Pomona that we remain with the other communities we serve. We are in existence today because of the support and loyalty from the residents of the Pomona Valley.

We strongly urge you to please keep the maps as drafted on June 10, 2011.

Thank you,  
Leigh Cornell

*Leigh C. Cornell, MHA*

Manager Administrative Services

Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center

[REDACTED]  
Pomona, CA 91767

Before printing this e-mail, please consider if it is necessary to do so. Think Green

The information transmitted herewith is privileged / confidential information intended only for use by the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Florence Nelson <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 03:18:39 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Florence Nelson <[REDACTED]>

Subject: South Pasadena

Message Body:

Thank you to the members of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission for taking on the important work of ensuring that California's voters are equitably represented. As a resident of South Pasadena (Los Angeles County) I am concerned about the proposed district boundaries that divide South Pasadena into two districts. Dividing the community would mean for South Pasadena that the overriding interests of our community will not be heard by our representatives in the CA legislature nor in Congress. South Pasadena is a diverse community that shares a distinctive history and cultural background. Historically South Pasadena has been linked to Pasadena and the Western San Gabriel Valley. The Arroyo Seco, running along the west side of South Pasadena, has divided our city both geographically and culturally from downtown LA and East Los Angeles. South Pasadena has aligned socially, commercially and culturally with Pasadena throughout its history. I urge you to revisit the district lines for South Pasadena and ensure that our representatives' districts keep the city of South Pasadena intact and aligned with our sister cities of Pasadena and the San Gabriel Valley.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** "James V. Upton" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 19:55:03 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: James V. Upton <[REDACTED]>

Subject: I support nesting like areas and changing the 1st draft maps.

Message Body:

Commissioners:

In your first draft maps, you created two State Senate seats that should be changed. By switching the nesting of two districts, you can keep like communities together, in line with community of interest testimony you have received.

Instead of nesting Santa Clarita with Malibu, you should nest Santa Clarita with East Ventura County.

Keeping Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark and Simi Valley connected to Santa Clarita in a Senate seat will keep inland valleys together and better represented. Historically, for over 30 years, these areas have been connected in a Senate seat.

Connecting these areas to the coast divides both the inland and coastal populations. Please keep our inland suburban valleys connected by nesting Santa Clarita with East Ventura County.

Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Barbara Walker [REDACTED]

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 05:38:13 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Barbara Walker [REDACTED]

**Subject:** PLEASE - do not break up Santa Clarita - Keep NEWHALL with us - we're incorporated together

**Message Body:**

Santa Clarita has been incorporated for a number of years. Saugus, Valencia, Canyon Country, AND Newhall purposely incorporated together to form the city of Santa Clarita. We are geographically together by the mountain ranges. We have commonality of interests and are all in ONE CITY HALL. WE SHARE A LOCAL GOVERNMENT. We share local activities, businesses, shopping, churches - AS ONE COMMUNITY. To tear away Newhall is the same as taking away one mother's child and giving the child to someone else. You just don't do that. We are one joined community of - Canyon Country, Saugus, Valencia, Newhall = City of Santa Clarita. Please keep our family intact.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Marvin H Andrade <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 19:11:43 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Marvin H Andrade <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Pico Union / Westlake

Message Body:

For the last 28 years CARECEN has served tens of thousands of people with immigration services, after school programs, technology and civic engagement. The citizenship program at CARECEN is one of the most popular programs and hundreds of immigrants have become citizens because they want to exercise their right to vote and want to have a say on who represents them at all levels of government. They want to elect representatives that understand their needs and interest.

The initial maps of the Congressional, State Senate, and the State Assembly districts, presented by the Commission will prevent Pico-Union Citizens from electing a representative that will represent them effectively because their community with the unequal far affluent western communities of Beverly Hills, Pacific Palisades. Pico Union and Westlake has been and currently is in a primarily Latino district and it should be kept as such.

During the last decade Latinos in California have accounted for 90% of the States growth. The initial maps drawn by the commission do not reflect that growth. As presented, the current maps would further weaken the potential of Latino political progress in the Pico Union and Westlake communities.

As the commission moves forward in revising its initial maps it is imperative that these maps are in accordance with the federal voting rights act of 1965 which protects underrepresented communities from discrimination in the electoral process

The commission must ensure that Blacks, Asians, and Latinos, are given fair and equal voice in the democratic process, in particular those is low income communities.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** "M.H. Levison" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 18:23:41 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: M.H. Levison <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Santa Clarita redistricting

Message Body:

Please do not carve up our City of Santa Clarita. All properties within our zipcodes should be left intact!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** "William L. Reynolds" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 21:09:06 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: William L. Reynolds <[REDACTED]>

Subject: The City of Santa Clarita

Message Body:

To those who are redrawing "the lines", I would respectfully request that you strongly consider maintaining the boundaries of our Santa Clarita Valley and leave Newhall with the rest of SCV. It's very difficult to make sense why you would add Newhall to the San Fernando Valley!?

Also, please consider keeping SCV in tack and working us in with areas to our immediate west as we have much more commonality with that area than any other.

Thank you!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Brandon Murphy <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 22:05:00 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Brandon Murphy <[REDACTED]>

Subject: I oppose the plan

Message Body:

I live in Brentwood Glen and oppose the plan. Brentwood Glen should be in the same district as the rest of Brentwood because we share common issues and concerns. Brentwood Glen should not be in the same district as Westwood because the interests are dissimilar. The new plan also splits up Brentwood into two districts, which makes no sense.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Testimony from Culver City public hearing on June 16

**From:** Jim Clarke <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 13:35:22 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

I was speaker #211 at the end of a very long evening. I commend you all for your willingness to listen to us.

My recommendation was to keep the Port of Los Angeles and San Pedro together in the same congressional district.

The Port of Los Angeles represents three census tracts 9800.31, which comprises most of the port area, 9800.14 which comprises the Dominguez Channel portion of the port and 9800.15 a mixed industrial and residential area to the northwest corner of the port. Census tract 9800.14 has 239 people, primarily liveaboards (83% Caucasian) for the boats which tie up there. Census tract 9800.15 has 554 residential people with 41% Caucasian. Census tract 9800.31 has a population of 1,262 (58% Caucasian and 18% Black). However, the vast majority of these individuals are prisoners at the Federal prison on Terminal Island and it is my understanding that prisoners are not be counted for redistricting purposes where they are in prison but where they came from (last legal residence). Nonetheless, we are talking about moving somewhere between 800 and 2,000 people, depending on how you count the prisoners.

While we are only talking about hundreds of residents, the daytime population of the port exceeds 16,000 people, the largest portion of which live in San Pedro so there is an economic connection between the two area.

Another rationale for keeping the port tied to San Pedro is that the headquarters of the port is in San Pedro. Currently, San Pedro and the port headquarters are represented by CD36 while the port itself is represented by CD46. This has resulted in the port being less effective in obtaining federal assistance. Conventional thinking might assume that having two Congress members representing the port would be more effective than having just one but it is the opposite. Applications for federal grants are made from one congressional office while the funds will actually be spent in and benefit the other congressional district. Problems arising in the port congressional district have to be addressed by the Congress member who represents the headquarters. This lack of coordination is only exacerbated when the two Congress members are of different political parties.

Lastly, I believe environmental protection and water quality are important issues for this area and I would prefer to see the port attached to a coastal community and coastal congressional district.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Jim

Jim B. Clarke

[REDACTED]

Culver City, CA 90230

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** redistricting

**From:** SUSAN BENFATTO <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 07:29:11 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

Hello.

I live in Sunland-Tujunga because I can board my horses near my home. I have recently heard that you are thinking of redistricting CD2 to include us in the flats of Sun Valley, Pacoima, Arleta area.

Sunland - Tujunga as well as Shadow Hills is primarily a rural area (rural for Los Angeles). Our horses can walk in the streets and many of my neighbors have other farm animals in their back yard.

Most of our free time is spent riding and hiking in the Tujunga Wash and the surrounding mountains. We take pride in our community and help keep the wash and trails clean and safe for our neighbors.

We belong with the surrounding communities of Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sunland, Tujunga, La Crescenta, Montrose, La Canada-Flintridge, Glendale and Burbank as they share our lifestyle along the northern rim of the valley.

These communities share the same watershed and have joined together to create natural water retention, purification and ground-water aquifer recharge facilities.

Because of the freeways, we are bound by the 210, which serves as a corridor for our neighboring communities and to some smaller extent the 5. We are somewhat isolated from the flatlands of the San Fernando Valley, which serves to protect our way of life and we tend to stand together with Lake View Terrace and other communities along the rim as our lifestyles are so similar. Our "non-official" boundary to the south is GlenOaks Blvd, where we hit "civilization" - large and unkempt apartments, ugly industrial & commercial areas and citizens that have nothing to do with our way of life around the rim.

The new district you are proposing will have the same problems as the old district we shared with Valley Village and parts of Sherman Oaks & Studio City, where the differences between the communities are often in conflict. How can a Council Person serve such diverse communities well?

It would seem that your commission has just drawn an arbitrary line in the sand and know very little about the community you are redistricting. I would suggest you come and take a look. There is a BBQ and ride this Sunday at All Nations Church. It's free. Bring your horse.

Susan Benfatto

[REDACTED]  
Tujunga, CA 91042

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Terry Rubin <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 18:23:30 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Terry Rubin <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Santa Clarita Valley

Message Body:

Hi,

I live in the Santa Clarita Valley and understand with the current draft of congressional districts puts me into a different district than the majority of the valley.

It does not make sense to split our community since we (Newhall/Valencia voters) have no connection to the San Fernando Valley since there is a huge mountain dividing the areas--we have nothing in common. The Newhall/Valencia area is also part of the City of Santa Clarita and as such the congressional district should include ALL city residents.

Thank you,  
Terry Rubin

[REDACTED]  
Valencia, CA 91355

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** SAN PEDRO, CA

**From:** Grieg Asher <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 16:19:07 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly object to splitting my community between multiple districts. San Pedro (LA County) is one of the oldest communities in California. Even though legally, it is part of the City of Los Angeles, residents and businesses consider it a unified community of approximately 85,000, with a strong sense of identity, common history and common future. There is no physical or cultural boundary that warrants splitting the community into two, nor any other reason to split the community into a west district and an east district. I request that the district boundaries in San Pedro be revisited, and redrawn, in order to keep the community of San Pedro together in a cohesive whole, single district, for Assembly, Senate, and Congressional districts. Further, I would suggest that if you need a north/south boundary line in the general vicinity of San Pedro, that the district boundary be moved east of the draft line, possibly to Figueroa Boulevard.

Thank you for your attention to this grave injustice,

Sincerely,  
Grieg Asher

[REDACTED]  
San Pedro, CA 90731

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Dick Jeffrey <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 21:58:25 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Dick Jeffrey <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Santa Clarita

Message Body:

I am extremely concerned that those in charge of redistricting are not following their own rules. In keeping with the guideline of not splitting up communities, I ask why our community (Santa Clarita) is being divided at Lyons Ave. This does not make sense in consideration of law enforcement, water rights, equal representation and mandates that two opposing views are in charge of representing two areas within the same community is nothing more than a bureaucratic nightmare. I strongly recommend that this community and valley be left in tact and undivided. I thank you in advance.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Noelle Guzman <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 20:15:16 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Noelle Guzman <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Keeping Reseda in 1 district

Message Body:

Hi - I am part of the Reseda Neighborhood Council and am urging your board to keep Reseda unified in 1 district and as part of the West San Fernando Valley. Reseda has been working hard over the last few years to unify as a community and come together as a unified force to do volunteerism, community improvements, & neighborhood beautifications. Since these efforts are driven by volunteers, it is essential for us to work with local city & state representatives to help us make these much needed community improvements a reality. The transformation in our community is real & is only at the beginning. For continued improvements in this hard working community, we need to be under 1 district and not split. The economy has had a serious impact on our community - but by coming together and working with city & state representatives, we are turning that around. Furthermore, Reseda is an integral part of the West San Fernando Valley. The west and east san fernando vally are more than j!

ust areas on a map. Each community has their own unique identify, history, & community culture. Reseda is very west san fernando valley. I encourage your board to walk along Sherman Way - you will the differences in west vs. east. Both are great communities, but have very different 'feels'. Reseda is the West San Fernando Valley. Thank you for your consideration.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Senate and Congressional legislative districts for the Santa Monica Mountain Region

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

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 08:38:59 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

Dear Honorable Commissioners:

I am writing in disapproval of the proposed Senate and Congressional legislative districts for the Santa Monica Mountain Region. The proposed legislative districts for our region severely break up our strongly tied communities.

The communities of West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Malibu, and the adjacent unincorporated communities are deeply connected through collaboration and services. These communities form the Las Virgenes - Malibu Council of Governments. The COG is the core of Los Angeles County's Disaster Management Area B. These communities collaborate in the Santa Monica Mountains Fire Safe Alliance. The inland communities are served by a single Sheriff's Station, located in Calabasas. These communities are served by three Fire Stations, located in Agoura Hills, Calabasas, and Westlake Village. The Las Virgenes Municipal Water District provides these communities with water and sewer services. The communities are also united through the distinguished Las Virgenes Unified School District.

Our strength as an interactive and collaborative community of interest rests on our ability to have a shared legislative voice. Our shared interest in preserving the ecology and beauty of the Santa Monica Mountains region is but one of the many elements that binds us together. Please respect the integrity of our communities and our quality of life by restoring the legislative integrity of our region. In this, I support the redrawn maps presented on June 22 to the Commission by the Las Virgenes Homeowner's Federation in regards to the Senate and Congressional districts for the Santa Monica Mountain Region, and posted online at <http://cressmm.com>.

With best regards,

Robert Lia

[REDACTED]  
Calabasas, CA 91301

**Subject:** San Gabriel Mountains-Foothills Congressional District Expansion

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 12:18:39 EDT

**To:** [REDACTED]

June 24, 2011

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

**RE: Expand Ontario Congressional District North To Include the San Gabriel Mountains; Retain Well-designed San Gabriel Mountains-Foothills Congressional District**

Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission:

I support a redistricting effort that will place the federal public lands in the San Gabriel Mountains from Interstate 14 on the west to I-15 on the east in the same Congressional Districts as the foothill and watershed cities to their south.

**As a current commissioner of the 2011 Los Angeles County Boundary Commission (Reapportionment Commission)**, I have had the opportunity learn, first hand, the importance of public input in determining "community of interest". In this case, the residents of foothill cities are users of a common recreational area and public land.

These cities, stretching along the 210 Freeway from Sylmar on the west to Rancho Cucamonga on the east form a community of interest. These cities have extensive geographic, economic and recreational connections to the mountain range. I strongly recommend that the San Gabriel Mountains-Foothills Congressional District be retained and the Ontario District expanded to the north to include the San Gabriel Mountains. This will place the important public lands in San Gabriel Mountains, which are visited by over 3 million people a year, in two logically designed Congressional Districts which connect highly populated foothill communities with their magnificent public land to the north.

Sincerely,

*Alma D. Martinez*

Alma D. Martinez

[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, California 90022

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Joy wilson <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 22:35:27 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Joy wilson <[REDACTED]>

Subject: proposal to cut up Newhall/Valencia

Message Body:

(this is a continuation of my previous e-mail sent a minute aGO)

Valencia (as a planned community) has very distinct and very different needs than Newhall. Even so, separating a slice of Valencia (Old Orchard I and Old OrchardII)from the rest of Valencia is RIDICULOUS!!! That would mean people across the street from you would be part of Santa Clarita and the others would be in the San Fernando Valley?? CRAZY!! What about the schools? The William S. Hart District (in Newhall and the High Schools) and the Newhall District (elem. and Jrm, High would be part of San Fernando?? What about Community events and Community organizations? (i.e.-Senior Center)

If you had to re-do the boundary line, an idea would be to keep Newhall as one and keep ALL of Valencia as one (don't slice it up)

PLEASE,please, re-do and redesign your boundary lines for this Congressuional district and keep Newhaa/Valencia as ONE and all INTACT as the Santa Clarita Valley , just like the Senate districts

Thank You

Joy Wilson

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Redistricting Process/ Proposal

**From:** Mary Bucci Bush <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 13:38:21 -0400 (EDT)

**To:** [REDACTED]

Concerning the redistricting of Pasadena/ Altadena, and surrounding areas:

As a resident of NW Pasadena, CA, I strongly oppose the proposed redistricting of my area that would split Pasadena and Altadena, among other things. I urge you to keep the communities of Pasadena and Altadena together in all instances (Congressional, Assembly, and Senate). Together, we are a community of interest that share significant social and economic interests such as churches, school district, generational families, and business/educational institutions. We have a long tradition of being represented by a single representative and splitting Pasadena and the two cities between Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County boundaries is not in the best interest of our residents.

Thank you,

Mary Bucci Bush

[REDACTED]  
Pasadena, CA 91103

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** joy Wilson <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 22:23:44 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: joy Wilson <[REDACTED]>

Subject: keeping Santa Clarita Valley as ONE

Message Body:

I am writing about the newest proposal to divide the Santa Clarita Valley into 2 congressional districts-assigning a part of Valencia and all of Newhall to the San Fernando Valley.

WHAT ARE YOU THINKING?? The Santa Clarita Valley needs to be kept as ONE.

First of all, Newhall is the original city of Santa Clarita. Its the HEART of the city- it is now undergoing a very expensive but wonderful revitalization of the downtown area and will bring in many new people and visitors and will become a beautiful new area (new Library, new parking and streets, new restaurants, theatres, Metrolink Station, etc)

Second, Valencia (as designed by Newhall Land and Farm) was designed as a planned community and has been developing for the last 25 years.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission



**Linda Alexander**  
President

**Frank Anderson**  
Vice President

**Scott Gray**  
Secretary

**Kali Merideth**  
Treasurer

June 22, 2011

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

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Attached is a resolution passed by the Central San Pedro Neighborhood Council of the City of Los Angeles relative to the first draft redistricting maps issued by your agency.

We respectfully but strongly urge that the guiding principle of maintaining the integrity of communities of interest be applied as it should be in San Pedro.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns as expressed in this resolution.

Sincerely,

Linda Alexander  
President, Central San Pedro Neighborhood Council



**Linda Alexander**  
President

**Frank Anderson**  
Vice President

**Scott Gray**  
Secretary

**Kali Merideth**  
Treasurer

## **RESOLUTION**

*Approved by the Central San Pedro Neighborhood Council in a Special Meeting*

June 22, 2011

San Pedro Bay, not being a part of the south end of the Santa Monica Bay, is a community of interest that includes the greater Los Angeles Harbor area that is inclusive of Neighborhood Councils of Los Angeles City Council District 15—Central San Pedro, Coastal San Pedro, Harbor City, Harbor Gateway North, Harbor Gateway South, Northwest San Pedro, and Wilmington—and should be included in one Congressional District, one Senate District, and one Assembly District.

Friday, June 24, 2011

To: The California State Citizens' Redistricting Commission

Re: Citizen Testimony/Feedback on Commission's First Draft Maps

From: Juan Carlos Garcia (local resident/voter)

[REDACTED]  
Pomona, CA 91768  
[REDACTED]

***Community of Interest***

My community of interest is based on two characteristics: (1) regional transit patterns of the Latino/Latino immigrant community, and (2) similar residential/labor market demographics of these cities. For a more detailed explanation of how I identified the transit patterns for this area, for the Latino/Latino immigrant community (i.e. my community of interest), please let me know, I can provide that.

The boundaries of my community of interest include the entire cities of Chino, Montclair, Pomona, Ontario, and Fontana. It *excludes* the cities of Covina, San Dimas La Verne, Rancho Cucamonga, Chino Hills, Diamond Bar, Walnut, and Industry.

**Proposed Pomona-Area Assembly District:** Thank you for keeping the cities of Pomona, Chino, Montclair, and Fontana together in this first draft State Assembly district and thank you for excluding the cities of Covina, San Dimas, Chino Hills and at least most of the city of Rancho Cucamonga. Thank you also for making sure that the Assembly district had a 50.6% Latino CVAP. Good job with this map.

**Proposed Pomona-Area Senate District:** Once again, I commend you for keeping Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario, and Fontana together and also for excluding Chino Hills and pretty much all of Rancho Cucamonga from your first draft Senate map, and also for having the Latino CVAP percentage at 51%. I'm happy with these aspects of the Senate map you've proposed for Pomona, but also I think it's too large.

I support MALDEF'S Senate District maps for Pomona *and* the west Inland Valley region.

I was able to study MALDEF'S proposed Senate maps for this area and am convinced that their proposed boundaries do a fair job of preserving the integrity of the Latino community's true voting potential in this whole region, honoring the Voting Rights Act; not just for the Pomona Valley Latino community but for the Inland Valley region as a whole.

I would ask you to please re-draw the State Senate maps so that neighboring Senate Districts in this region (not only for Pomona) have a Latino CVAP of 50% or greater.

MALDEF's Pomona-senate district looks pretty much like your proposed Pomona Senate district-but *cut in half*, at the west edge of Fontana, creating another Latino effective district with the remaining eastside portion of the district plus areas south of Fontana, etc. This other district

could also be designed to have a Latino CVAP of *at least* 50%, as demonstrated by MALDEF's maps.

### **Proposed Congressional District Map**

I was very disappointed to see the 180 degree turn to the right that the "Pomona" map took when it got to the Federal level. I was happy to see that once again you kept the Pomona, Montclair, Chino, and Ontario together but I was very disturbed that you added Chino Hills, all of Rancho Cucamonga and parts (or all) of the high-income San Antonio Heights area of the Foothills region, as well as having left out our "sister city" of Fontana. This made the Latino CVAP percentage for our congressional district drop nearly 10 points (8 to be exact), way below 50%.

For this particular draft map, I ask that you to please completely cut out Chino Hills, Rancho Cucamonga, and San Antonio Heights from the map and include the entire city of Fontana which we have much more in common with; economically, culturally, and demographically.

### **Inequality**

I would like to also take this opportunity to state once again, for the record, that as an ethnic community, Latinos, have been responsible for 90% of the state's population growth in the last 10 years (from NALEO'S Census Profile 2011), yet your first draft maps, when looking at the "bigger 'state wide' picture," proposes *no-net-growth* in representation for our community at the State Assembly level, the State Senate level, and most importantly at the Federal/Congressional level.

With all due respect, no net gain in representation in the Assembly level is outrageous but an outright decline in representation at the State Senate level is just not rational to me. Per your first draft maps, the total number of "Latino effective" Senate districts (i.e. where Latino-CVAP is 50% or greater) drops from 6 to 4 districts (NALEO).

When you consider the reality of how hard it is at grassroots level and how much resources/capital is *actually* needed to run an effective "city council election" campaign, then contrast that to how much more is needed to run an effective state-office or congressional election campaign, you'll realize how vitally important to have "Latino effective districts" in order to have a realistic, fair, chance to elect a candidate that will be sympathetic to our needs.

The importance of having minimum 50% Latino CVAP, or "Latino effective," congressional districts is magnified when you consider that most congressmen/women, once elected, serve for in Congress for generations, literally. It is virtually impossible to unseat an incumbent even if the candidate runs agendas diametrically opposed to the district's large Latino population's needs.

Please remember that such huge social inequalities have profound effects. In other words, your decisions will not occur in a vacuum of social consequences. Continued underrepresentation of our community, as proposed by the net (under) count of Latino effective statewide and congressional districts is bad for California as a whole, it's bad for the country, but most importantly it's bad for our *niños*/kids, youth, women, elders, and families.

Once again, I urge you--the State Citizens Redistricting Commission—to do what is required by the Voting Rights Act of 1965; please shine, and correct your maps to make sure that integration, not exclusion, is institutionalized in the Golden State's electoral system in 2011.

Thank you very much for your time. If you have any questions about my testimony please let me know.

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** "Gregory S. Whitney" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 16:07:51 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Gregory S. Whitney <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Newhall in Santa Clarita Valley

Message Body:

Please keep Newhall in the Santa Clarita Valley district. Newhall is where the city of Santa Clarita began and remains the primary site where the heritage of the Santa Clarita Valley is preserved. Newhall is the historical heart of Santa Clarita, Newhall is integrated with the city of Santa Clarita library system, the Hart High school district and Heritage Park. Keep our valley one district for the sake of all the people who live in Newhall.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**COASTAL**  
**SAN PEDRO**  
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

San Pedro, CA 90732

www.cspnc.org

**GOVERNING BOARD**

June Burlingame Smith  
*President*

Dean Pentcheff  
*Vice President*

Bruce Horton  
*Secretary*

John Stinson  
*Treasurer*

Cathy Beauregard

Robert Brandin

Douglas Epperhart

Chad Flynn

Robert Gelfand

Lydia Gutierrez

Charles Hawley

Claudia Kreis

Raymond Medak

Marcie Miller

Erin Strelch

Peter Warren



An official  
neighborhood  
council of the  
City of Los Angeles

*Certified December 11, 2001*

California Citizens Redistricting Commission

June 23, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

The Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council, representing 28,000 residents of the San Pedro area of the city of Los Angeles adopted the following resolution at its June meeting:

“Whereas, San Pedro has existed as a distinct political entity for more than a hundred years, first as an independent city, then as a district of the city of Los Angeles; and

“Whereas, the people of San Pedro exist as a community of interest, especially with regard to issues involving the Port of Los Angeles and its impact on San Pedro’s neighborhoods; and

“Whereas, the California Redistricting Commission has issued draft maps splitting San Pedro between State Senate and Assembly districts, thereby serving to divide rather than unite the community; and

“Whereas, the Port of Los Angeles should be included with the Congressional district, as well the State Senate and Assembly districts;

“Therefore be it resolved, the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council opposes adoption of the first draft Congressional, State Senate and Assembly district maps touching upon the San Pedro community and urges that new boundaries be drawn to include all of San Pedro and the Port of Los Angeles within the same districts.”

The three neighborhood councils in San Pedro have worked closely over the last 10 years to strengthen ties within the community. Together, we represent the 80,000 people of San Pedro. We are all greatly affected by the operations of the Port of Los Angeles. All three of the San Pedro neighborhood council areas include some portion of the port and are represented on the Port Community Advisory Committee.

The first draft maps divide each of the three neighborhood council areas between districts. If adopted, these district boundaries would serve to split our community and complicate our efforts to work with elected officials. The affected districts are Assembly: Palos Verdes East–Beach Cities (LAPVB) and Compton–Carson (LAWBC), State Senate: Santa Monica (LAPVB) and West Los Angeles–Compton (LAWBC), and Congress: Palos Verdes East–Beach Cities (PVEBC) and Hawthorne–Gardena–Compton (HTGCC).

We urge that the commission respect the boundaries of San Pedro by including all of San Pedro within the same Congressional, State Senate and Assembly districts. We also urge that the Port of Los Angeles be included within the same districts as San Pedro.

Thank you for your consideration.

June Burlingame Smith, president  
Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council

**Subject:** Port of Los Angeles

**From:** carol Ebert <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 17:25:38 -0700

**To:** <[REDACTED]>

My name is Carolyn Ebert and I am a resident of Carson, CA and a member of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) who works at the port of Los Angeles. As such I have a huge interest in how the ports will be represented for the next 10 years.

So it is with some irony that I say that your Commission may have been paying too much attention to my community of interest. I bet I am the first person in California to say that.

While I certainly appreciated the many precious hours you have spent debating whether to keep the two ports together or separate them, the alignment of the ports is far from the most significant challenge you face in drawing Los Angeles County. You face the legal hurdles of complying with the Voting Rights Act. You face the difficult task of balancing the interests of various competing communities in our very very diverse county. You face the challenge of trying to create districts that allow the average voter to understand who represents them.

Meeting these goals should take precedence over deciding who represents two landmarks that have no residents. Please remember, redistricting is about people, not places. I urge you to look at each plan independently. Decide how best to achieve the needs of the residents of Los Angeles in each plan. If the result is the ports are separated, combined or treated differently in each plan so be it. Yes, there are 10,000 people who work at the Los Angeles County Ports but don't miss the forest for the trees!

Thank you for your attention.

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Luis Alvarado <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 17:39:39 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Luis Alvarado <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Latino Speakers do not represent all Latinos

Message Body:

Hello,

I will be very brief on illustrating my two thoughts.

First, I was at the Rio Hondo hearing and was given number 111 and did not have an opportunity to voice my opinions. I was sitting next to the podium and when the time was expiring you were calling numbers of people that had left. I could have jumped and claimed to be that number but it would have been unethical.

Likewise, I feel that all the "Latino" voices that are parading at all the hearings are jumping in front of the commissioners and claiming to be representing the interest of all Latinos. Unfortunately the only Latinos I have seen at hearings are representatives of Union supported 501(c)3's who are concerned for the political power their elected officials currently wield.

I urge you to please do what you think is right for CA. Follow your heart and do what you think is right, do not fear these non-Latino groups, they are only looking out for their special interests, not that of CA as a whole.

Lastly, I live in Pico Rivera. I like what you have done with the congressional map. It is truly a representation of this community. At the hearing I heard testimony that it was wrong. Out of the three people that testified, two were City Council people that are protecting their turf. And one was right on Target. Downey should be kept together.

At the hearing you indicated tell us what to move, not just what you do not like. So, how about dislodging a portion of Bell Gardens and making Downey whole. They want out from what I can tell.

Other than that, Pico Rivera-Whittier-Downey DO belong together. Just ask any parent who has their kids in little leagues. Please keep them together.

Thanks Guys!! God Speed!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Margaret Reavey [REDACTED]

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 00:16:47 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Margaret Reavey [REDACTED]

**Subject:** don't divide San Pedro

**Message Body:**

Please do not divide separate coastal south San Pedro from the rest of San Pedro. San Pedro is part of LA City and not connected in anyway with Palos Verdes (which has it's own array of small cities). To separate a strip of San Pedro (where I live) from the rest of the town, and attach it to Palos Verdes, which shares none of our concerns, is absurd. Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Morris Griffin <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 16:07:01 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Morris Griffin <[REDACTED]>

Subject: congressional dist. 37

Message Body:

Hi

I understand there has been a re-districting plan put in place in L. Richardson's area. Please send me the changes, of the various districts.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** SAN PEDRO, CA

**From:** Grieg Asher [REDACTED]

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 16:19:07 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly object to splitting my community between multiple districts. San Pedro (LA County) is one of the oldest communities in California. Even though legally, it is part of the City of Los Angeles, residents and businesses consider it a unified community of approximately 85,000, with a strong sense of identity, common history and common future. There is no physical or cultural boundary that warrants splitting the community into two, nor any other reason to split the community into a west district and an east district. I request that the district boundaries in San Pedro be revisited, and redrawn, in order to keep the community of San Pedro together in a cohesive whole, single district, for Assembly, Senate, and Congressional districts. Further, I would suggest that if you need a north/south boundary line in the general vicinity of San Pedro, that the district boundary be moved east of the draft line, possibly to Figueroa Boulevard.

Thank you for your attention to this grave injustice,

Sincerely,

Grieg Asher

[REDACTED]  
San Pedro, CA 90731

**Subject:** Pomval

**From:** "Sam Crowe" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 16:40:41 -0700

**To:** <[REDACTED]>

Thank you for keeping the POMVAL map as it now stands. I firmly believe that Pomona should remain with Ontario, Montclair etc. as we are sister Cities and . are very much in touch with each other, Taking Pomona out of this District would be placing her with strangers. I support the Map as it is now Thank you. Annette Crowe. [REDACTED]. Ontario, Ca.

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Margaret Reavey <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 00:16:47 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Margaret Reavey <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** don't divide San Pedro

Message Body:

Please do not divide separate coastal south San Pedro from the rest of San Pedro. San Pedro is part of LA City and not connected in anyway with Palos Verdes (which has it's own array of small cities). To separate a strip of San Pedro (where I live) from the rest of the town, and attach it to Palos Verdes, which shares none of our concerns, is absurd. Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** "James V. Upton" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 19:47:58 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: James V. Upton <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Do not split the City of Santa Clarita

Message Body:

Subject: I Support Keeping the Santa Clarita Valley Whole!

Message: Commissioners:

Do not split the City of Santa Clarita into two separate congressional districts. Please add the community of Newhall into the Antelope Valley - Santa Clarita Valley congressional district.

Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Port of Los Angeles

**From:** carol Ebert <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 17:25:38 -0700

**To:** <[REDACTED]>

My name is Carolyn Ebert and I am a resident of Carson, CA and a member of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) who works at the port of Los Angeles. As such I have a huge interest in how the ports will be represented for the next 10 years.

So it is with some irony that I say that your Commission may have been paying too much attention to my community of interest. I bet I am the first person in California to say that.

While I certainly appreciated the many precious hours you have spent debating whether to keep the two ports together or separate them, the alignment of the ports is far from the most significant challenge you face in drawing Los Angeles County. You face the legal hurdles of complying with the Voting Rights Act. You face the difficult task of balancing the interests of various competing communities in our very very diverse county. You face the challenge of trying to create districts that allow the average voter to understand who represents them.

Meeting these goals should take precedence over deciding who represents two landmarks that have no residents. Please remember, redistricting is about people, not places. I urge you to look at each plan independently. Decide how best to achieve the needs of the residents of Los Angeles in each plan. If the result is the ports are separated, combined or treated differently in each plan so be it. Yes, there are 10,000 people who work at the Los Angeles County Ports but don't miss the forest for the trees!

Thank you for your attention.

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** David Warburton <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 16:20:39 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: David Warburton <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Competitive districts

Message Body:

Hello: Reviewing your initial proposal for redistricting the Santa Clarita Valley and surrounding areas, I think you have given way too much consideration to keeping the districts' political make-up the way it is already.

What ever happened to the idea of making districts (both federal and state) more competitive? As it stands now, our current office holders will breeze to re-election under your proposed districts. Given the make-up of the area, Democrats stand virtually no chance of being elected to any state or federal office (other than U.S. Senator). As a staunch Democrat, I feel my views aare virtually unrepresented by current (and future if you plan is adopted) oofficeholders.

Please make our SCV districts more competitive! Thank you for listening.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: 4 - Los Angeles

**From:** Nancy Crater <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 25 Jun 2011 01:58:14 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Nancy Crater <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting

Message Body:

As a resident of more than 50 years of the Westside of Los Angeles, I am very concerned that we are represented in the various houses of legislature. Eliminating this district is a frightening proposition because our issues are different than the more urban population

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Pasadena-Altadena

**From:** Bonnie Skolnik <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Fri, 24 Jun 2011 11:44:00 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

The two communities of Pasadena & Altadena have historical and continuing ties, translating to issues for political representation. They should be in exactly the SAME State & Federal districts.

Public transportation routes are integrated, as the populace attends many of the same functions at the same venues - whether in Pasadena or Altadena.

The two municipalities share the same school district, etc.

Groups of social & political activism are abundant in our Pasa-Alta area. It's just part of local planning.

Thank you for your serious consideration for correcting the existing maps, to reflect the correct understanding this area.

Bonnie Skolnik

[REDACTED]  
Pasadena, CA 91107