Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Denise Morehand <denise.morehand@citizensredistricting.com>
Date: 7/26/2011 5:54 AM
To: 

From: Denise Morehand <denise.morehand@citizensredistricting.com>
Subject: Huntington Beach Redistricting

Message Body:
I have been a resident of Huntington Beach for more than 30 years and am expressing concern over the prospect of Huntington Beach being divided. Please keep HB WHOLE!!

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Cathy Kurihara <[redacted]>
Date: 7/26/2011 8:36 AM
To: [redacted]

From: Cathy Kurihara <[redacted]>
Subject: Huntington Beach

Message Body:
My family and community are outraged that my state government would want to break up or "redistrict" our Huntington Beach family.
This is completely wrong - we do not want a North vs South mentally- we are ONE wonderful city!!

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
From: Heidi Vega <heidi.vega@citizensredistricting.com>
To: Huntington Beach

Subject: Huntington Beach

Message Body:
Please don't divide the voting district lines for North and South Huntington Beach residents. Huntington Beach is one city and should not be divided.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Stephanie Cordrey <stephanie.cordrey@citizensredistricting.com>
Date: 7/26/2011 9:20 AM
To: [redacted]

From: Stephanie Cordrey <stephanie.cordrey@citizensredistricting.com>
Subject: Redistricting Commission looking to divide HB

Message Body:
Do not divide Huntington Beach keep Huntington Beach as a whole for costal voting.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Huntington Beach is a great community, whether it is north or south! To think you are considering dividing the community in any fashion would be disastrous! I am pleading that you leave Huntington Beach the way it is....one great voting community!

Thank you.
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Brad DeWitt <braddewitt@gmail.com>
Date: 7/26/2011 10:25 AM
To: citizens@redistricting.ca.gov

From: Brad DeWitt <braddewitt@gmail.com>
Subject: Huntington Beach

Message Body:
quit messing with boundry and work on getting us out of debt. Cut pensions and stop all this pay in the future, get California back where jobs maybe will stay or come back.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Subject: division of Huntington Beach
From: Dana Whitney
Date: 7/26/2011 10:27 AM
To: [Contact Email]

Message Body:
I'm a Huntington Beach resident of 40 years and see no logical reason for its division. It is a coastal city and should be kept a whole city, never divided and the north added to other cities. I object to this reasoning and implore you to leave our city undivided.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission.
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange

From: Jeff Gillette <mailto:JeffGillette@gmail.com>
Date: 7/26/2011 10:29 AM
To: public@redistricting.com

From: Jeff Gillette <mailto:JeffGillette@gmail.com>
Subject: re-districting proposal

Message Body:
It makes no sense to split Huntington Beach into two districts. Please re-consider this proposal. We are a tight community and dividing it would be a step in the wrong direction.

Thanks for your consideration

Jeff

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
As a resident of Villa Park, I ask that you do not split up our city. I feel that things are going well for the city and feel it would not benefit Villa Park.
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Graham Crowe <graham.crowe@gmail.com>
Date: 7/26/2011 10:56 AM
To: Graham Crowe <graham.crowe@gmail.com>
Subject: WSTSA State Senate District

Message Body:
This is in regard to the WSTSA Senate district in Orange County that was the subject of debate on Friday June 22 and Sunday June 24.

On Friday, when Q2 was asked about the difference between the Option 1 and Option 2 versions of WSTSA with respect to how much of Anaheim is in each version, this was the response:
“In Option 2, the flatlands of Anaheim are reduced. There’s less of the flatlands of Anaheim in WSTSA. In Option 1, the central flatlands of Anaheim are in WSTSA.”

The only other difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is that a large chunk of Huntington Beach was added to the southwest corner of Option 2 in order to make up for the loss of Anaheim flatlands. No cities in the North County area were reunited in Option 2. It was a straight up swap between the Anaheim flats and Huntington Beach.

Commissioner Aguirre argued strongly and eloquently for Option 1, pointing out that Option 1 is the only version remaining that at least partially keeps the low income areas together in one State Senate district (although even Option 1 is somewhat diluted from prior visualizations).

Despite this, Commission Dai lobbied fellow commissioners for Option 2. Here is a direct transcript from the video of Friday June 22:
“I’d actually like to advance (Option) 2 and let me just run through the reasons why 2 is better than 1 and see if I can convince some of my fellow commissioners to at least move to 2. We had a lot of testimony that Anaheim Hills is very different from the Anaheim flats and it’s much more affluent and it’s much more similar to the areas immediately south of it, Orange and Villa Park and North Tustin and those areas. So I think that (Option) 2 does a better grouping there. You have the North County areas together which is consistent with COI. You still preserve by and large most of the COI between the flatlands of Anaheim and Santa Ana. The South OC (portion of the) district I think is reasonable. The problem (portion of the) district I think is the one that has the Little Saigon COI in it. It has a couple of different COIs and this is problematic for a number of people. We have testimony that Santa Ana didn’t really want to be with Seal Beach but we also have east Long Beach in there so we thought it made sense to put them with Seal Beach. And Seal Beach gains a little bit of northern Huntington Beach which is what we just did in the Assembly. So I think that’s a pretty reasonable reflection of all of the communities of interest and it’s a little bit better than (Option) 1.”

The assertion that the areas taken out of Anaheim are from Anaheim Hills and/or are more compatible with Anaheim Hills is inaccurate and likely misled a number of commissioners. All of the areas removed from Anaheim in Option 2 were from the flatlands and include some of the poorest sections of the city (above and below the 91 freeway). To replace them with the wealthiest portions of Huntington Beach is just as disturbing as what was being proposed in the South Bay Area Congressional district (IGW5G) on Sunday.
Here is a comparison of the areas that were removed and added in Option 2:

Removed – Approximately 55,000 people from Anaheim flatlands
Zip Codes: parts of 92801 and 92805
Median Income: $45,000
% Below Poverty Level: 20%

Added – Approximately 55,000 people in Huntington Beach
Zip Codes: Most of 92649 and part of 92647
Median Income: $80,000
% Below Poverty Level: 5%

When the vote was taken in support of Option 2 on Sunday, it seemed as if most of the commissioners were unaware of exactly what was occurring. The vote was presented as a choice between Option 2 and Option 4 (Commissioner Ward’s proposal, a variation of Option 2, which split low income communities in a different but equally effective way.) Several commissioners asked to see income distributions in the district, but that was not provided. Option 1 was never voted on (and barely even discussed on Sunday) because Commissioner Dai started right away with getting commissioners to replace it with Option 2. If this had not been done, Option 1 would have been the status quo since it was in the merged statewide plan and it would have taken 9 votes to remove it.

It is unclear what the motivation was behind the push for Option 2. Perhaps it was to placate the Little Saigon residents with a district that is more winnable for them. Perhaps it was to provide an alternative to Commissioner Ward’s proposal, but Option 4 was not close to getting 9 votes and was really not much different in its net effect. There is no community of interest testimony linking Huntington Beach with inland cities such as Santa Ana. Whatever the rationale, the end result of replacing Option 1 with Option 2 was very unfavorable to low income residents in WSTSA.

The only hope at this point is at least three commissioners from one of the parties will see the damage that has been done to WSTSA and will demand changes before supporting the final Senate plan.

--
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LOS ALAMITOS, CA 90720-5600
July 26, 2011

Gabino Aguirre
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Aguirre:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguosity of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguosness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Socal Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Socal Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]
Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Angelo Ancheta
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Ancheta:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Socal Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosity of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Socal Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Vincent P. Barabba
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Barabba:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
Commissioner Barabba  
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we acknowledge the effort to include more “inland” communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this “visualization,” and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the “Assembly SoCal Visualization,” we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in “communities of interest” and the “contiguosness of borders.” We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the “Assembly SoCal Visualization.”

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens  
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Maria Blanco
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA  95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Blanco:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguosness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguosness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more “inland” communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this “visualization,” and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the “Assembly Socal Visualization,” we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in “communities of interest” and the “contiguousness of borders.” We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the “Assembly Socal Visualization.”

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [Redacted].

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Cynthia Dal  
California Citizens Redistricting Commission  
901 P Street, Suite 154-A  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Dal:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more “inland” communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this “visualization,” and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the “Assembly Socal Visualization,” we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in “communities of interest” and the “contiguosness of borders.” We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the “Assembly Socal Visualization.”

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Michelle R. DiGuilio
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner DiGuilio:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more “inland” communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this “visualization,” and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the “Assembly Socal Visualization,” we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in “communities of interest” and the “contiguosity of borders.” We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the “Assembly Socal Visualization.”

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Jodie Filkins Webber  
California Citizens Redistricting Commission  
901 P Street, Suite 154-A  
Sacramento, CA  95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Webber:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Socal Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosity of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Socal Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Stanley Forbes
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Forbes:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosness of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosness of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more “inland” communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this “visualization,” and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the “Assembly Socal Visualization,” we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in “communities of interest” and the “contiguosity of borders.” We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the “Assembly Socal Visualization.”

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Connie Galambos Malloy
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Malloy:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"

Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguousness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations

We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguousness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Socal Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Socal Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

July 26, 2011

Libert "Gil" Ontai
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Ontai:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 "Visualizations" posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the "Congress Socal Options"
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," meet the standards of "contiguosness of boundaries" and "communities of interest" for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for "Congress Socal Option 2," we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the "Congress Socal Options 1 and 3," we urge strongly that you reject "Congress Socal Option 2" in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on "Senate Socal" and "Assembly Socal" Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about "communities of interest" and "contiguosness of boundaries." However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into "coastal" district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more “inland” communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this “visualization,” and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the “Assembly Socal Visualization,” we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in “communities of interest” and the “contiguosity of borders.” We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the “Assembly Socal Visualization.”

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]
Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 25, 2011

M. Andre Parvenu
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Parvenu:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south as Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Socal Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosity of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Socal Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Jeanne Raya
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Raya:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Socal Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguosity of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Socal Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely.

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Peter Yao
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Yao:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests are being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosity of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosity of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more “inland” communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this “visualization,” and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the “Assembly Socal Visualization,” we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in “communities of interest” and the “contiguosity of borders.” We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the “Assembly Socal Visualization.”

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at: [redacted].

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
July 26, 2011

Michael Ward  
California Citizens Redistricting Commission  
901 P Street, Suite 154-A  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Los Alamitos Comments on Current Visualizations

Dear Commissioner Ward:

We appreciate the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in balancing the many different points of view regarding the redrawing of legislative district boundaries throughout the state. To date, my colleagues on the Council have been very engaged in the effort and believe that the process is genuine with the various interests being discussed earnestly. We have reviewed the July 13 “Visualizations” posted on the Commission website and offer the following comments.

Comments on the “Congress Socal Options”
Given the plethora of priorities that must be considered by the Commission, it is our opinion that the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” meet the standards of “contiguosness of boundaries” and “communities of interest” for the residents of the City of Los Alamitos. We believe that both options are satisfactory. However, with regard to the visualization for “Congress Socal Option 2,” we have significant concerns. Specifically, the Option 2 visualization would place the City of Los Alamitos in a Congressional District dominated by the cities of Long Beach and Huntington Beach. As configured, a Representative from that proposed district would be challenged by the overwhelming concerns of multiple and large coastal communities, one of the largest harbors in the world and the ongoing concerns of the issues that traditionally face older urban communities. As we have indicated previously, those are significant considerations, but not those faced by the voters in Los Alamitos. Given the acceptable options proposed in the “Congress Socal Options 1 and 3,” we urge strongly that you reject “Congress Socal Option 2” in reaching consensus on the final maps.

Comments on “Senate Socal” and “Assembly Socal” Visualizations
We feel that these visualizations represent an effort to respect our concerns about “communities of interest” and “contiguosness of boundaries.” However, with regard to the Senate District, it appears that Los Alamitos is being moved into “coastal” district that would include beachfront communities as far south has Laguna Beach. With that said,
we acknowledge the effort to include more "inland" communities also, such as Westminster and Fountain Valley. We will continue to study this "visualization," and cannot support it fully at this time. For the moment, however, we acknowledge the attempt to balance the interests of local communities with the pressure to finalize the boundary maps.

With regard to the "Assembly Socal Visualization," we believe that a significant effort was made to factor in "communities of interest" and the "contiguousness of borders." We agree with the attempt to configure a district that includes communities with whom we have worked for decades and others whose citizen and business communities have much in common with our community. We have no objection to the "Assembly Socal Visualization."

We appreciate the efforts of you and your colleagues in considering the numerous options and interests before you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at xxxxxxxxx

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

[Signature]

Kenneth Stephens
Mayor
The Citizen Redistricting Commission has proposed to place La Habra in Senate and Assembly District that are composed solely of Los Angeles County cities. Please leave La Habra in the Orange County district that it is in now, where it belongs.

Thank you Mr. and Mrs. Hottle
As a resident of Irvine, I want to urge the Commission to make sure our city is placed in a coastal Congressional District. We have a much greater community of interest with coastal communities like Newport Beach than we do with cities in inland Orange County. We are more likely go shopping, recreating and generally spending more time along the coast than in inland areas.

Irvine and Newport Beach are joined by our common participation in youth sports teams, family activities, parks and sports fields and our dependence on the same roads such as Jamboree, MacArthur Blvd. and the 405 freeway. Also, San Diego Creek runs through Irvine and dumps into the back bay of Newport Harbor which the federal government has many responsibilities at.

Thanks for listening.
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Erminio Maganzini <erminiom@email.com>
Date: 7/26/2011 1:32 PM
To: public.remarks@crc.ca.gov

From: Erminio Maganzini <erminiom@email.com>
Subject: La Habra-Yorba Linda

Message Body:
You have created a north Orange County district called Le Habra/Yerba Linda. Interesting name! Might it be possible you could rename it after two north Orange County cities like La Habra and Yorba Linda?

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Roseanne Ziegler <reddacted>
Date: 7/26/2011 1:41 PM
To: reddacted

From: Roseanne Ziegler <reddacted>
Subject: Splitting Huntington Beach into North and South

Message Body:
I am a long time resident of Huntington Beach, living in the 92649 area code since 1983. I see the proposed division of HB into north and south for redistricting purposes as having a potential negative impact on the city. We, as a coastal city, have nothing in common with the issues of Garden Grove and Westminster. I am sure that those cities have the same feeling. Another stupid government idea.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Please DO NOT break Huntington Beach into a North/South separate voting block. We are one city with the same concerns.

Lisa Head

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Cathy Keler <cathy.keler@example.com>
Date: 7/26/2011 6:23 PM
To: <redacted>

From: Cathy Keler <cathy.keler@example.com>
Subject: We draw the lines

Message Body:
PLEASE don't lop off an appendage from the Huntington Beach body. Leave this city intact. DO NOT redraw the lines.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
I am a 40 year resident and am proud to be a Huntington Beach resident. I grew up in the southside and now am raising a family in the northside. Please leave HB intact. It is a great city, all on it's own.

Thank you,
Cindy Minato

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission
Subject: Put La Habra in district with only OC cities
From: Robert Sheridan <crea
Date: 7/26/2011 3:26 PM
To: [redacted]

7-26-11

From:
Robert Sheridan
[redacted]
La Habra, CA 90631

To:
Citizens Redistricting Commission

Please put La Habra
in a district
with only Orange County cities.

Thank You,
Robert Sheridan
As a resident of Villa Park I favor the Orange plan to be linked to Tustin, Tustin Hills and Anaheim Hills along with Orange. As a small city, our desires and needs would be totally opposed to those of Santa Ana and our voice would be lost in the politics of Loretta Sanchez.

Mary Jo Chorbagian
DEAR COMMISSION MEMBERS,

I AM WRITING BECAUSE WE DO NOT WANT THE CHANGES THE PROPOSED CHANGES THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION ARE PLANNING. WE BOUGHT OUR HOUSE IN LAHABRA BECAUSE WE WANTED TO LIVE IN ORANGE COUNTY. WE DON'T WANT TO MOVE TO STAY IN ORANGE COUNTY.

OUR OPINIONS AND VOTES WOULD BE LOST IF WE WERE REDISTRICTED WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY. I WANT THOSE I VOTE FOR TO REPRESENT ME. I DO NOT FEEL THAT WILL HAPPEN IF WE ARE SWITCHED TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

PLEASE PUT US IN A DISTRICT WITH OTHER ORANGE COUNTY CITIES.

THANK YOU.
JAMES AND CATHERINE HERMAN
LA HABRA, CA. 90631
Hi:

As residents of La Habra, CA we are quite surprised to find that our fair city in Orange County will be grouped with cities of Los Angeles County. In fact, La Habra will be the only Orange County city among a large population of Los Angeles County cities.

We understand that established boundaries cannot always be considered when redistricting. This would not pose quite as large a problem if there were a balance between Orange and Los Angeles cities. However when only one city among a group from another county are grouped, the interests of an Orange county city cannot be fairly represented.

We respectfully request that you reconsider this issue.

Dale & Pat Peterson
La Habra, CA
From: Lisa Mingear
Date: 7/26/2011 7:22 PM
To: [email address]

Please do not split up Dana Point in your redistricting

Lisa Mingear
Accurate Bookkeeping

Attachments:

DATE: - Powered by Google Docs.webarchive 336 KB
How in the world can you consider an Orange County city to have anything in common with Los Angeles County? There is more than a mountain range of differences between us. Please leave us with Brea or Anaheim, our Orange County cities to the East and South.

We paid more for this house because it was in Orange County. Now let us continue to get what we are paying for.

Ken Olson
La Habra, CA 90631
Dear Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission,

As a resident of the City of Orange, I want to thank you for your service and your attention to the needs of local communities. I have watched you struggle with how to handle our city and our desire to be kept whole inside a single congressional district.

Our city is unique. Unlike Santa Ana, which is the government seat for Orange County, or Anaheim, which has become a 24 hour tourist destination, Orange is mostly a community of quiet neighborhoods and small businesses. Putting Orange into a congressional district with Santa Ana and Anaheim would serve to minimize our voice and our ability to receive attentive representation. Therefore, it is our desire to be linked with other similar neighborhoods and smaller communities, such as Anaheim Hills, Tustin Hills and Tustin. This will allow us to work with communities of similar interests and not be dominated by much larger or more influential cities of Santa Ana and Anaheim.

When looking at where to draw the district lines I would encourage you to consider the "Orange Plan" as submitted by members of the Orange City Council today.

Thank you again for your service.

Sincerely,

Frank and Patricia Bryant

Villa Park, CA
Subject: Boundry Maps
From: "Gary Remland" <[redacted]>
Date: 7/26/2011 9:42 AM
To: <[redacted]>

Please see my letter attached. Thank You for your consideration of my opinion.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Remland
Remland Insurance Services
Orange California

--- Attachments: 

Quick Image Navigator-07-26-2011.pdf 395 KB
July 26, 2011

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

RE: Orange County State Legislative and Congressional Boundary Maps

Dear Commissioners,

As an active and concerned civic leader in Orange County and the City of Orange, I would respectfully submit the following recommendations to the CRD as it begins to finalize the state’s legislative boundary maps. These recommendations reflect my belief of what is in the best interest of the city and community I work in, and the bordering cities and communities. These cities should be grouped together as best possible.

- The City of Orange should only be represented by one congressional district. We are a small city. Based on the way the lines are drawn now, I live in one district in Orange, and my office is in another district. This makes no sense. And in addition, the city of Villa Park and Tustin are a closer representation of Orange and being like cities, rather than Santa Ana.

- Coto de Caza is too small to split into two districts. They would just get completely lost and have no unified voice to represent this small city.

- The last Board of Equalization maps seem to be without logic and very problematic for Orange County. As currently drafted, the vertical orientation of the BOE districts groups southern California cities with those on the Oregon border. So, rather than this confusing configuration, the counties of Orange, San Diego, Imperial, San Bernardino and Riverside should be grouped together, while Los Angeles has its own BOE district.

Thank you for your consideration of my recommendations. I know this is not an easy job, and I do appreciate your effort and diligence to make this as fair and accurate as possible.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Remland
July 26, 2011

Dear Commission Members:

As a resident in the City of La Habra, located in Orange County, I am strongly opposed to the Commission's plans to place La Habra in Senate and Assembly Districts comprised solely of Los Angeles County cities.

Specifically, the City of La Habra should be placed in the DB-YL (Diamond Bar-Yorba Linda) Senate District and either the DBRYL or ANAFULL (Anaheim Fullerton) Assembly District.

La Habra needs to be represented by elected officials that understand and share our local vision, goals and objectives.

I urge you to reconsider the placement of La Habra in the proposed district and realign the City with its other north Orange County communities of interest.

Sincerely,

Lisa Frear
Subject: Comments on proposed Congressional redistricting
From: "Rieff, Kim" <jemerson@nbchamber.org>
Date: 7/26/2011 9:41 AM

To: 
CC: 

Please see attached letter from Mayor Michael Henn.

Thank you.

Kim Rieff  
Mayor's Assistant  
Mayor's Office/City Clerk's Office  
Newport Beach, CA 92663

Attachments:
Comments on proposed Congressional redistricting.pdf 268 KB
July 25, 2011

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

By E-Mail

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to thank the Commission for placing Newport Beach with Costa Mesa, Huntington Beach and Laguna Beach in a coastal Congressional district. Newport Beach has a strong community of interest with these other coastal cities and shares less in common with Irvine, an inland city without coastal access.

As you finalize the Congressional district lines, I strongly urge you to keep Newport Beach, Costa Mesa and Huntington Beach together in a coastal-oriented district.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Michael Henn
Mayor
We are resendng this note, as we omitted our address in the original.

Dale & Pat Peterson
La Habra, Ca 90631

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Dale Peterson
To: 
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 9:03 PM
Subject: Redistricting

Hi:

As residents of La Habra, CA we are quite surprised to find that our fair city in Orange County will be grouped with cities of Los Angeles County. In fact, La Habra will be the only Orange County city among a large population of Los Angeles County cities.

We understand that established boundaries cannot always be considered when redistricting. This would not pose quite as large a problem if there were a balance between Orange and Los Angeles cities. However when only one city among a group from another county are grouped, the interests of an Orange county city cannot be fairly represented.

We respectfully request that you reconsider this issue.

Dale & Pat Peterson
La Habra, CA
Subject: La Habra Redistricting
From: [redacted]
Date: 7/26/2011 10:36 PM
To: [redacted]

Putting La Habra in an LA County district will severely diminish our voice on issues of concern to us. Please do not cut us out of OC; instead, put us in a district with other OC cities. We live in an OC city and those we vote for should represent us and our city!!

Mr. & Mrs. Andrew Maffucci
La Habra, CA 90631
Dear Sirs:

I have received information regarding Legislative Redistricting of La Habra, Ca. to the Los Angeles County District. I am totally opposed to that as we are an Orange County City and need to remain in the Orange County District with our neighbor cities of Brea and Fullerton.

Taking La Habra out of the Orange County District would have a distinct effect on our ability to be effectively represented on issues of concern in regards to education, public safety, transportation, land use and many other legislative issues.

Please do not vote to redistrict La Habra to the Los Angeles County District.

Thank you for your time!

Cliff & Kim Robertson
La Habra, Ca. 90631
(Home) (Cell)
Subject: Please keep La Habra, CA in Orange Couny, and not throw us into Los Angeles.
From: Lee Elmquist <[redacted]>
Date: 7/26/2011 4:13 PM
To: <[redacted]>

--Forwarded Message Attachment--
From: [redacted]
To: votersfirstactc.ca.gov
Subject: La Habra, CA (Orange County) should not be re-districted into LA County
Date: Tue, 26 Jul 2011 15:58:03 -0700

PLEASE folks, some common sense here. La Habra has always had a "community of interest" in Orange County. Our people shop here (La Habra, Brea, Fullerton) work here, go to church here and rarely do we go north "over the hill" into La Puente, Rowland Heights etc. It is another world over there, (culturally, ethnically), and these people rarely shop here, eat here, work here, go to church here etc> It is two different worlds. To have our votes thrown into LA is a real miscarriage of what you are trying to accomplish. We need to be fairly represented. Please seriously consider changing this boundary!
Sincerely, LeRoy Elmquist La Habra, CA 90631 562/[redacted]
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