On behalf of the Citizens, Mayor and Members of the City Council of the City of Rancho Cucamonga, please see attached letter regarding the Assembly and Senate District maps.

If you have questions, please feel free to call Fabian Villenas, Principal Management Analyst at ext. 2006 or e-mail at.

Thank you,

Cherise Kuzminski
Administrative Secretary to the Assistant City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
July 11, 2011

Citizens Redistricting Commission
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: REVISE Assembly and Senate District Maps to keep Rancho Cucamonga whole and within San Bernardino County

Dear Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission:

On behalf of the 168,000 citizens of the City of Rancho Cucamonga, I strongly urge the California Citizens Redistricting Commission (Commission) to reconsider its proposed Assembly and Senate District Maps and maintain the City of Rancho Cucamonga entirely under one Assembly and one Senate District, within San Bernardino County.

At its July 6, 2011 meeting, the Rancho Cucamonga City Council took action to strongly OPPOSE the current Assembly and Senate District maps (as released on June 10th) and urge that Assembly District Map SBCUCA and Senate District Map SBBAN be revised to include the entire City of Rancho Cucamonga.

The proposed maps released by the Commission on June 10, 2011, show that a portion of Rancho Cucamonga will be under the SBCUCA Assembly District and the SBBAN Senate District, respectively. Unfortunately, the entire Northwest portion of Rancho Cucamonga (bordered by Haven Avenue and the 210 freeway) which includes approximately 33,000 residents or 20 percent of the Rancho Cucamonga’s population, is disenfranchised from effective representation with the rest of Rancho Cucamonga by being lumped into separate Senate and Assembly districts that are almost totally in Los Angeles County.

The proposed LASGF Assembly District just west of Rancho Cucamonga which contains the Northwest section of Rancho Cucamonga and neighboring Upland (both in San Bernardino County), also includes the Los Angeles County communities of La Verne, San Dimas, Glendora, Azusa, Duarte, Sierra Madre, La Canada Flintridge and even touches the San Fernando Valley. The proposed LASGF Senate District west of Rancho Cucamonga which also includes the Northwest corner of Rancho Cucamonga, includes the aforementioned cities plus Pasadena, South Pasadena, Burbank, and Glendale and again stretches out to touch the San Fernando Valley. Some of these communities are more than 50 miles from Rancho Cucamonga and have virtually no commonality or shared interests with the City.
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Clearly, the proposed Draft Maps do not meet the Commission’s stated criteria to “respect counties, cities, communities of interest, and neighborhoods, where possible.” In fact, the proposed Draft Maps bifurcate a substantial and well-established portion of our community and place it into obscurity with over a half-dozen prominent L.A. County communities. The voices of our 33,000 residents that live in the Northwest area will be completely drowned out by the 465,804 voices in the proposed Assembly District and 929,398 voices in the proposed Senate District that overwhelmingly reside in Los Angeles County.

The residents of Northwest Rancho Cucamonga share no community interests with these Los Angeles County communities. All municipal services for this area, including library, community services, community development, animal control, and others are provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga. Law enforcement services are provided through a contract with the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department, and fire and emergency response is provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District, a subsidiary district of the City. On a regional basis, transportation issues are addressed through the San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG) and CalTrans District 8. Public transit services for the San Bernardino Valley are provided by OmniTrans. The representation and services that these entities provide in no way overlap or have any connection or relationship with Los Angeles County and the San Gabriel and San Fernando Valley communities that are identified in the proposed District Maps.

The residents of Northwest Rancho Cucamonga have strong ties and a strong sense of identity with the rest of the Rancho Cucamonga community, San Bernardino County, and the Inland Empire. There are no commonalities between our residents and Los Angeles County, and the proposed Assembly and Senate District Maps needlessly split our community and our neighborhoods, effectively nullifying their voices and opportunity for strong representation.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Commission keep Rancho Cucamonga whole and entirely within San Bernardino County and REVISE Proposed Assembly District Map SBCUCA and Senate District Map SBBAN to include the ENTIRE City of Rancho Cucamonga.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to call ext. 2006 if you require any further information or have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

L. Dennis Micheli  
Mayor

William J. Alexander  
Council Member

Chuck Breguet  
Council Member

Diane Williams  
Council Member
Message Body:
Your initial proposed split is unfair to Jerry Lewis who has represented the cities of Redlands, Loma Linda, and Highland for decades. We request reconsideration of this proposed split.
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Your proposed split is unfair to Jerry Lewis who has represented the cities of Redlands, Loma Linda, and Highland for decades. He knows our cities and we ask that you reconsider the proposed split.
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Re: Support for revising ONTPM to be consistent with Commission Visualization #2  
presented June 22\textsuperscript{nd}, June 30\textsuperscript{th}, and July 2\textsuperscript{nd}

Commissioners,

On behalf of 163,000 residents of the City of Ontario, we have been tracking the challenging job the commissioners have been undertaking on behalf of the citizens of California. As we have monitored the deliberations of the commission we respectfully request that the Citizens Redistricting Commission ("Commission") revise Draft 1 lines of the "ONTPM Congressional District" and seek to keep the district more compact while respecting established communities of interest located west of Interstate 15 as outlined in the Commission Visualization #2.

We appreciate that the Commission respected Ontario as a centrally-situated community placed in the middle of State Assembly and Senate districts. We also appreciate that the Commission did not split our city, as was the case for some neighboring cities.

The new Congressional District, named ONTPM by the Commission, would be a new district for the Inland Empire as a result of the significant growth of the region. The two-county region is poised to gain significant representation at the State and Federal level which will help amplify the priorities of the City of Ontario and the Inland Empire.

Unfortunately, the new ONTPM Congressional District also divides the cities of Chino Hills to the south, and Fontana to the north of the same Congressional District.
On June 24th the Commission was presented with a “visualization” that took into account the significant testimony that was given at the June 19th Public Hearing in San Bernardino. Contained within the “visualizations” were alternatives developed by staff working with a subcommittee.

The ONTPM Visualization #2 is superior to prior drafts for the following reasons:

- The district is compact and contains most of the traditionally West Valley communities that are bordered by Kellogg Hill to the west and Interstate 15 to the east;
- The district respects the established community and business ties that exist among educational institutions at the K-12, community college, and Cal State Pomona sphere;
- The District has zero deviation while containing minimal city splits along highways.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Commission revise ONTPM to be consistent with Commission Visualization #2 presented June 22nd, June 30th, and July 2nd that includes the entire Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Chino, Montclair, Claremont, and Pomona so this region can be represented by one Member of Congress.

We appreciate the opportunity to submit this comment letter to the Commission and thank you for your service to the State of California.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Leon
Mayor
Message Body:
Don't Split Chino Hills, It's 1 city not 2, we want our own voice, if were split in 2 we have no voice

Seems like the commission is staked more with democrats, the new boundries reduce republican seats by 4, makes you wonder who is drawing the boundries
Thanks
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California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Loma Linda City Council request for reconsideration of Congressional District lines

Dear Commissioners:

The Loma Linda City Council has authorized me to communicate with you our belief that your Draft Congressional District Map has incorrectly placed Loma Linda in the Rialto-San Bernardino district, when it more naturally shares a community of interest with the City of Redlands in the Inyo-Mono-San Bernardino district. We are pleased that your First Draft Assembly and Senate District Maps each appropriately place Loma Linda and Redlands together in the same district.

Loma Linda is a city of 25,000 residents nestled east of the I-215 freeway and south of the I-10 in San Bernardino County, with Redlands to the east, San Bernardino to the north, Colton to the west, and the Riverside County line to the south. Loma Linda was incorporated as a city in 1970, but its identity as a health-conscious community was firmly established 65 years earlier, in 1905, with the founding of the Loma Linda Sanitarium, which matured into the Loma Linda University Medical Center in 1967. Loma Linda University with its century-old schools of Medicine and Nursing and its level-1 trauma center is the health care leader for the entire Inland Empire. Loma Linda is known as North America's only "Blue Zone," an honor bestowed on just five communities worldwide for the exceptional longevity of their citizens.

We believe that Loma Linda and Redlands together constitute a "community of interest," with shared historical, cultural, educational, social and economic interests. Our reasons are discussed below:

- The Cities of Redlands, Loma Linda and Highland together form the Redlands Unified School District. Loma Linda students travel to Redlands for both middle school and high school.

- Redlands is a bedroom community for Loma Linda University Medical Center. A larger proportion of the people who staff Loma Linda University and Medical Center live in the communities of Redlands, Highland and Yucaipa than in Loma Linda itself. Half of the nearly 1000 physicians that work at Loma Linda live in Redlands. Reciprocally, Loma Linda is a bedroom community for Redlands businesses as well.

- Loma Linda residents look primarily to Redlands for their shopping needs.
50% of the adult populations of Loma Linda and Redlands have college degrees, not surprising in two adjacent private university towns. Most surrounding communities are nearer to 20%.

Our two freeways (I-215 and I-10) have become boundaries that culturally and socially separate the suburban enclave of Redlands/Loma Linda to the southeast from the more urban communities of San Bernardino, Colton, Rialto and Fontana to the north and west. These are fine communities, but they are substantially different from Loma Linda, and they have significantly more challenging public safety issues common to urban settings.

Placing small suburban Loma Linda with large urban cities as you have in the Draft Congressional District would make it difficult for Loma Linda to get fair representation. Well-meaning elected representatives would, as always, have to prioritize their efforts and advocacy, and we fear that our needs would seldom get top billing. In contrast, because Redlands is so culturally aligned with Loma Linda, advocacy for one would be advocacy for both.

Historically, the train depot for Redlands was in Loma Linda. One of our two primary east-west arterial roads was initially called Colton Avenue, but the name was changed decades ago to Redlands Boulevard since most people used it to travel to Redlands. The longest residential street in Loma Linda was named after a martyred Spanish-American war hero from Redlands, Henry Lawton.

Loma Linda’s largest public park is named after a current resident of Redlands, Doctor Leonard Bailey.

Even the U.S. Postal Service has trouble distinguishing Loma Linda from Redlands. A large number of eastern Loma Linda businesses and homes have Redlands postal addresses. This anomaly makes it difficult to sort out decennial census figures between the two cities since reporting by zip code artificially boosts Redlands’ numbers at the expense of Loma Linda’s. You as the Redistricting Commission might fall prey to the same anomaly, resulting in a split of Loma Linda’s representation, but this possibility could be avoided entirely by erasing the line between Loma Linda and Redlands.

In closing, we, the Loma Linda City Council, believe that giving Loma Linda the fairest possible Federal representation requires that our City be moved to the Inyo-Mono-San Bernardino congressional district with Redlands, Highland, and Yucaipa.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Rhodes L. Rigsby, M.D., MBA
Mayor, City of Loma Linda