

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Paul Reed Arian <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 17:26:43 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Paul Reed Arian <[REDACTED]>

Subject: New Congressional District

Message Body:

I have read that the 26th Congressional District, Congressman David Dreier's, will no longer represent the city of Rancho Cucamonga. I thoroughly disapprove this decision. I realize that this decision is not final, and so I voice my opinion in hope that the committee will reconsider. Our city has been represented by Congressman Dreier for many years. He has always been attentive to our needs and has always been responsive to our inquiries. I do not believe your denying us his continued representation serves our community but rather puts us in a state of upheaval.

Respectfully yours,

Paul Reed Arigan

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Rosalyn Foster <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 16:57:33 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Rosalyn Foster <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Chino Hills

Message Body:

Please place Chino Hills in San Bernardino County where it belongs.
Chino and Chino Hills together are communities of interest because we share government and educational services; we shop, worship and enjoy entertainment within our community. And, Chino Hills is in San Bernardino County, not in LA or OC County. :)

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: shawn madrid <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 19:09:27 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: shawn madrid <[REDACTED]>

Subject: dividing the city into 2 districts

Message Body:

I am a homeowner in Rancho Cucamonga. I don't want the city divided into 2 districts. You have to live here to understand that this division is not in the best interest for everyone involved this will be harmful to our sense of community simply because la county is not familiar wiith. This county. It wll upset the foundation in wich the city was built on it was. Incorporated a planed community one city and should remain that way there is a reason why we moved to this county from. Los Angeles.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Sylvia Scott <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 18:07:19 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Sylvia Scott <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Your website lack of user-friendly abilities

Message Body:

I found your web site to be quite complicated for the average citizen to use and perhaps even those who spend a good deal of time on web sites. The Hearing schedule and calendar was exceptionally difficult to find what dates were for the Inland Empire. The actual maps are difficult to maneuver especially when you try to see your district. They are not shown in an easy to read manner. I would say that the government team who designed the web site did not want the public to understand how to use it which would mean there would be fewer challenges to the process.

Second, if this is challenged in court then it is the responsibility of the Committee chair to answer media questions. To say that the committee would limit their statements to the media shows me in advance that you realize you may not be doing your job except in the manner to turn the State into a one party State.

Unless the committee can answer specific questions to the public in a clear manner and listen to those who have concerns and not address or follow their recommendations, then it is not a committee by and for the people. It is a committee to as I said, turn CA into a one party State.

Thank you
Sylvia Scott

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Vera Eyzendooren <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 18:31:18 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Vera Eyzendooren <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting

Message Body:

It is important to keep our communities together. Right now I am not very happy with the way the proposed redistricting looks.

Do not split up Rancho Cucamonga and Upland, our community's ability to function as a whole has been a wellspring of support for San Bernardino County which will be completely undermined by the commissions current maps.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Carolyn Preschern <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 19:40:52 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Carolyn Preschern <[REDACTED]>

Subject: city boundaries

Message Body:

Please do not break up Rancho Cucamonga or any ity between districts. Boundaries set by cities or counties should remain together.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 01:58:46 -0400 (EDT)

To: [REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern,

Congressman Drier has served his district extremely well and I have enjoyed participating in his telephone conferences. I do not want to be part of

the redistricting. I live between 13th and 14th street in Upland, Ca. I feel helpless to the change. What can a citizen do? You are completely taking

my rights to openly discuss issues with Congressman Drier that affect our daily lives. Why does the cut off line have to be below 14th? Why not start

on Foothill or below 13th? Do you think that Congressman Baca will take time to discuss important issues with citizens in his district when the

changes are made? Not to many Congressman do! If the changes are made I would like to thank Congressman Drier for his dedication to his district.

I am very much oppose to the changes.

Upland Citizen,

Esther D. Farmer

[REDACTED]
Upland, Ca 91786

Phone Number [REDACTED]

Cell [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Inland Empire

From: samuel garcia <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 15:26:12 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

You must change the Congressional Inland Empire maps for a number of reason.

District 31

1) Upland is split which breaks up a community of interest. The part in LA county will get little to no attention as Upland is in San Bernardino County and 99% of the district that that will represent Upland is in LA County

2) North Fontana is split off of most of Fontana. Again breaking a community of interest.

3) African American and Latino voters are being diluted. In the case of Latino voters, an area where minorities are the majority is being diluted significantly. The commission has effectively disenfranchised the Latino population by including Rancho Cucamonga and Upland.

4) Redlands and Loma Linda have nothing in common with Rancho Cucamonga and Upland. This district appears to be seriously gerrymandered. Rancho Cucamonga and Upland have a significant boader common with Fontana and Ontaro. It is also closly aligned with Ontario which makes for a community of interest.

5) If you are trying to maintain a foothill district along the 210 fwy it has only caused many other problems and renders little benefit to the area and population. The 210 freeway is complete so there is not longer a need for congressional appropriation money and cal trans will maintain the freeway regardless of district configuration.

YOUR BEST BET IS TO CLOSE OFF THE NARROW CORRADOR IN NORTH FONTANA, MOVE ALL OF FONTANA AND RIALTO TO THE 31ST DISTRICE AND MOVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA TO THE 35TH DISTRICT. YOU SHOULD ALSO FIND A WAY TO KEEP UPLAND WHOLE.

Sam Garcia
[REDACTED]

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Catherine Lara <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 04:50:36 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Catherine Lara <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting

Message Body:

I feel it is very important that Rancho Cucamonga and Upland remain together as they are!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: "David A. Binnquist" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 20:09:46 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: David A. Binnquist <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Upland and Rancho Cucamonga

Message Body:

Upland and Rancho Cucamonga must remain together as communities of interest. Neither city has anything in common with the nearest cities of Claremont, Montclair and La Verne to the west, much less the distant city of Pasadena.

The vast majority of residents in Upland and Rancho Cucamonga work within the boundaries of San Bernardino County and shop within the region of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. Los Angeles county is about as foreign to this community as Sacramento.

As anchor communities in the region, the idea of splitting them apart between state legislative district will be disastrous to the communities ability to stay on the radar of legislators and compete evenly for resources highly sought after by neighboring power house communities.

By placing a partial section of Rancho Cucamonga and Upland in a district that stretches out to Pasadena it will insure that this community will be completely disregarded by its representation and it effectively dilutes our well knit community voice.

Do not split up Rancho Cucamonga and Upland, our community's ability to function as a whole has been a wellspring of support for San Bernardino County which will be completely undermined by the commissions current maps.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Congressional District 31 SB

From: Fabian Paredes <fb[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 01:14:59 -0700 (PDT)

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

Dear Commissioners,

I appreciate your efforts on the Congressional District 31. However, there is a slight concern with the line drawn in the city of Upland.

The current line is drawn above the foothills going north cutting off at 13th street. The new homes on 13th are comparable with the homes on 14th,

15th, 16th, etc... Just a few years ago these homes were selling over \$500,000. Of course, this is not the case today but the homes are still comparable to the homes in North Upland. It is well known in the community that any homes above Foothill Blvd. line (Route 66) are considered North of Upland.

Any homes below the foothill street line is considered South of Upland. I believe you should take a look at the Congressional District 31 SB regarding the City of Upland. I would recommend the line be cut off before 13th street at Foothill Blvd. (Route 66).

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Fabian Paredes

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Edward Reinert <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 01:04:21 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Edward Reinert <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Upland

Message Body:

I think what you're doing with Upland is abominable. All cities should have been kept intact! I don't care what silly rules you quote as an excuse to rip a city apart. That's just hearless. Upland has always been divided into 4 quadrants, above and below Foothill Blvd. and East and West of Euclid Ave. So, why didn't you consider those traditional lines as long as you decided to take an ax to Upland? WE DON'T DESERVE TO BE TREATED LIKE THIS! I've always voted for David Drier, and I always will vote for him as long as he runs for office. I live 3 houses south of 14th street, and I will continue to communicate with him, not some other yahoo that I don't know and don't care about. David will always be my Representative. I've tried and tried to find out how to complain about what you're doing, but you've done a good job of not informing the public of how to do that. The Newspaper writes articles but doesn't disclose any poceedures for placing our comments. I found your !

Web Site in a news article today for the first time. Anyway, I think what you've done with Upland stinks to the highese order.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Enrique Lara <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 04:52:23 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Enrique Lara <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting

Message Body:

It is imparrative that Upland and Rancho Cucamonga be kept together as they are!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Eufemia Reyes <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 22:24:56 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Eufemia Reyes <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Redistricting lines...not in agreement

Message Body:
Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax: (916) [REDACTED]

To the Redistricting Commission:

I was among the original authors of the 4-3-2-1 for San Bernardino County maps, which was reflected in the First Draft. Those were the Commission's best maps yet.

Unfortunately, the Commission decided to go in another direction with the congressional maps and gave the left over cities to Colton in a congressional map that separates cities across the board from Mentone to Upland. Not only do these cities lose clout for their projects by reducing the numbers of their residents in a district, but you also placed them in groups that could not be any more different. Contiguity problems with the SB congressional map show that the West End does not belong with Mid-Valley and the East Valley of San Bernardino County.

In those instances, the Final Draft of the San Bernardino County congressional maps is a failure to help empower San Bernardino County residents.

Please revert back to the First Draft and give Colton and San Bernardino County residents the representation they deserve.

Sincerely,

Eufemia Reyes
Colton, CA

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: kathleen johnson <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 02:18:56 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: kathleen johnson <[REDACTED]>

Subject: re-districting

Message Body:

It only makes sense to keep Upland and Rancho Cucamonga in the same district. We are in San Bernardino County, not the monstrous Los Angeles County

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Lydia Solis <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 21:50:34 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Lydia Solis <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting

Message Body:

As a citizen of San Bernardino County and resident of Upland and also of Rancho Cucamonga, I urge you to KEEP THE TWO CITIES IN THE SAME DISTRICT! I worked in R. Cucamonga for 40 years and lived in R. Cucamonga for 8 years. I have now lived in Upland for over 30 years. Both cities intermingle in our business, education, and socially. We are of like mind and have many things in common. Please do NOT put us in separate districts! Thank you, Lydia Solis

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: "Marjorie H. Mayo" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 22:36:08 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Marjorie H. Mayo <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Rancho Cucamonga should not be split in two!

Message Body:

It is obvious to most residents that the new redistricting is favoring the Democrats, splitting Rancho Cucamonga in two. Rancho Cucamonga has a population of 170,000+ residents, it could be a district all by itself. Why not favor the Republicans for a change and be a little more fair!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Pam Jacoby <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 05:32:43 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Pam Jacoby <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting Upland and Rancho Cucamonga

Message Body:

Why are you even thinking about this??? There is no reason to redistrict Upland and Rancho Cucamonga! We are fine the way we are.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Sally SNow <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 21:50:28 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Sally SNow <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 63rd district

Message Body:

I live in Upland and have for many years. This city is overwhelmingly conservative and the citizens who participate in city activities and issues want to keep it that way. To devide this city after decades of being one entity within the 63rd district is not acceptable. We are on the very edge of SB Co. and can barely relate to Mr. Baca, repub or dem.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: shawn madrid <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 05:40:26 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: shawn madrid <[REDACTED]>

Subject: deception the truth why they want to divide rancho cucamonga

Message Body:

La county got there fingers in everything all they want is money. Of course LA wants Northwest portion of the city. Why not take the most afflicted part of the city. What's happening is that since the house market collapsed the Asians are moving into this area most Asians like to have large parcels of land so they can cram as many family members into one home they buy the condo foreclosures cheap and like in the custom homes of alta loma just look at the new asian store moving in to that portion of the city they are independant and like to make their own rules. Its a perfect plan la will ignore this area so the asians can do what they want and not listen to the law. Example asian coridor 60 frwy city of industry. You see la is to big to moniter this area of alta loma so la and asian alta loma will be happy la will just look away while the asians do what they want to do overbuild building places that are not legal zoning of all areas. Like put an auto shop next to housing tr!

ack build not. To code. So this works perfectly for both while rancho people are saying divided community. La and the asians take hold to there own agenda

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Shirley Ott <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 21:45:33 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Shirley Ott <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting

Message Body:

Please keep Upland and Rancho Cucamonga together as District 63. We have nothing in common with those cities in Los Angeles County. Thank you

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Allen <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 17:38:17 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Allen <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Rancho Cucamonga

Message Body:

My wife and I specifically moved from LA county to Rancho Cucamonga so that we could finally live somewhere that our world view was shared by all the elected officials that we voted for. If we wanted the world the way people in Ontario and Pomona saw it we would have moved to those cities from Whittier. Why is it that this commission is placing what used to be somewhat republican cities into democrat hands. I doubt any of those 4 republicans are really republicans. Thanks to this commission we will be moving again as soon as the time is right, but looks like it will be to Arizona next time. I'm done with having liberals forced down my throat.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Susan Boyette <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 21:08:48 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Susan Boyette <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Keeping Upland and Rancho Cucamonga together

Message Body:

We must keep Rancho and Upland together as we two communities have much in common. I thought the gerrymandering would be stopped if we had a committee but it appears it is full of liberal democrats

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Tony Soto <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 22:26:13 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Tony Soto <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Not in agreement with Congressional lines...

Message Body:

Dear Commissioners:

I am a Colton City employee and a Colton resident. I have strong roots in Colton and have raised my family here for years. I am opposing the Final Draft and strongly urge to go back to the First Draft.

The awkward shape of the SB congressional district and lack of compactness should raise alarms for all the commissioners. Colton should remain whole and intact with Rialto, San Bernardino and Fontana in the Mid-Valley region. Colton has nothing in common with Upland nor Mentone. The benefits of creating a super Latino congressional district do not outweigh the negatives that come out with the overarching district that shreds most of the clout of the cities in its path.

Scrap the Final Draft for congressional districts in San Bernardino County. I support the First Draft and you should feel better about going back to it.

Sincerely,

Tony Soto
Colton, CA

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Vishnu Gokhale <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 2011 00:44:10 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Vishnu Gokhale <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting

Message Body:

Dear Sir,

Pleas maintainth the present voting District of Rancho Cucamonga and Upland as it is now.

Thanking you,

Sincerely
V. Gokale
7/29/2011

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Barbara Cox <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 19:23:13 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Barbara Cox <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Upland & Rancho Cucamonga redistricting

Message Body:

Please keep Upland & Rancho Cucamonga together.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Betty Scott <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 17:59:26 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Betty Scott <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting committee concerns on party balance and gender/cultural issues

Message Body:

First I would like to know the number of Democrats & Republicans are on the committee and what districts do they represent. Also the gender and cultural mixture of the committee. This is important for an equal balance of the work scope and what has happened in the Inland Empire does not show equal representation.

Second I would like to know why the committee split Redlands CA in half and put Jerry Lewis out of his own district. The committee would know that was being done.

There have been legitimate concerns expressed in San Bernardino and the Inland Empire, the committee disregarded them.

Why were the mountain communities of Big Bear, Crestline and Lake Arrowhead put in the communities to the NOrth when the residents of those towns work and shop in the Highland, San Bernardino, Redlands areas. They also draw from those areas for tourists as well as Orange and LA counties.

From what I have read, heard and seen I do not believe the committee selected to work through the San Bernardino and Inland Empire were working on behalf of the people. Especially when concerned citizens who express their opinions are disregarded. When you look at this for the area it looks more like a "political" move to shift the area into a one part Congressional district. From the lines drawn I do not see democracy at work.

Thank you and I would greatly appreciate a thorough reply to my questions.

Betty Scott

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Bruce Laycook <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 18:18:07 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Bruce Laycook <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redlands Congressional District

Message Body:

I think it is good that you have un-split the city. It makes much more sense to have the whole city in one congressional district.

Thank you.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Cristi Ritchey <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 17:25:15 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Cristi Ritchey <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting Proposal

Message Body:

I do not understand who made the plans on the redistricting changes, but they clearly do not have my vote. Joe Baca would not represent Rancho Cucamonga's views at all. If this is the best they can do, the commission members need to resign and allow people with a degree of intelligence take over!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Fabian Paredes <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 07:44:26 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Fabian Paredes <[REDACTED]>

Subject: LASGF Senate 25 and Assembly 41

Message Body:

I just want to congratulate you on a wonderful job with the redistricting maps. I watched while you took into careful consideration all the community of interests and contiguity. I could feel your passion to protect these communities with minimal impact. I especially appreciate the consideration of LASGF Senate 25 and Assembly 41 districts. Finally someone understands the history of the Gracious City of Upland and its connection to the San Gabriel Mountains and Foothill region.

Please keep these maps intact with no changes to the final preliminary maps for LASGF Senate district 25 and Assembly 41. It is important our community of Upland is connected with the Foothills communities that include Claremont, Laverne, etc... I hope the information that I previously submitted was helpful regarding the history, services and Upland Consumer Confidence report 2010 on ground water extracted from Claremont Heights. I hope you vote unanimously in support of the final preliminary maps. Thank you again for the excellent work.

Sincerely,
Fabian Paredes

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: Fabian Paredes [REDACTED]

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 08:16:15 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Fabian Paredes <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Congressional District 31

Message Body:

Dear Commissioners,

I appreciate your efforts on the Congressional District 31. However, there is a slight concern with the line drawn in the city of Upland.

The current line is drawn above the foothills going north cutting off at 13th street. The new homes on 13th are comparable with the homes on 14th,

15th, 16th, etc... Just a few years ago these homes were selling over \$500,000. Of course, this is not the case today but the homes are still comparable to the homes in North Upland. It is well known in the community that any homes above Foothill Blvd. line (Route 66) are considered North of Upland.

Any homes below the foothill street line is considered South of Upland. I believe you should take a look at the Congressional District 31 regarding

the City of Upland. I would recommend the line be cut off before 13th street at Foothill Blvd. (Route 66).

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Fabian Paredes

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: James Tomey <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 17:19:14 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: James Tomey <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting

Message Body:

We are very dissappointed in your thoughts about redistricting Rancho Cucamonga. Please do not do this. It is not justified.

Thank you!

Jim

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission