

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

**From:** JOHN CHOI <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 08:43:50 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** JOHN CHOI <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** REDISTRICTING MAP

Message Body:

I live in the city of Torrance and was part of a grossly gerrymandered district that ensured Democrats would win every time. In fact it was so bad that a deceased democrat won handily. I would have liked to see more competitive races in my assembly, senate and house districts.

Quick comments. Kudos for including Palos Verdes area in the district...that was conveniently cut out before due to conservatives living there. I don't like the fact that my city was cut in half in order to carve out a safe "black" seat for south LA for all three maps. My district unfortunately will stay a "blue" district and even more so than before. I don't know why the congressional district became such geographically large and has all the rich white liberal towns in it to ensure a maintenance of a "white" democratic district while to the east is a deliberately gerrymandered one to ensure a black democrat. These two districts should have been more drawn as north and south...without regards to having a white and black district.

I have issues with maps that ensured the safety of the Sanchez sisters...carving out even a safer Orange County and East LA districts to ensure their reelection.

When I voted yes twice to create this commission, I thought we were going to have natural boundaries based on cities and not have districts that curve, zig zag and circle around spots. But it looks like race was the most important factor as safe hispanic and black districts were carved out. I would have liked it if we didn't do that and mix them in with the whites, to ensure that the best candidate emerges, and not the best white, black or hispanic candidate comes out based on the district.

Creating safe seats for whites, blacks and hispanics once again happened and these maps are not any more competitive nor fairer than the previous one.

I give this commission a thumbs down for at least how my districts was drawn.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Judy Tizon <judyt[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 18:23:34 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Judy Tizon <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Torrance

Message Body:

I appreciate the hard work the commission has done. Thank you. My one comment is that the city of Torrance is split into two districts. I live in the west part of Torrance and feel that I have a lot more in common with the rest of Torrance than I do with Beverly Hills and Malibu. I've never even been to Malibu. Why are Congressional District 33 and state Senate district 26 configured in long, skinny lines? People who live near each other have a lot more in common. I'm guessing this was done to preserve minority centers of power.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Karen Roach <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 23:49:49 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Karen Roach <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting - San Pedro

Message Body:

I live in San Pedro. What is the perimeter on the new redistricting? San Pedro has nothing in common with Watts & South Gate. We are the farthest south and should be included in RPV or Long Beach; or are the lawmakers think that San Pedro is just a port town and not as sophisticated as Redondo Beach, Torrance or RPV? Your prelim map is a JOKE!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** "Lois M. Shade" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 15:24:03 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Lois M. Shade <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Glendora Split

Message Body:

Lois M. Shade

8:17am on Saturday, July 30, 2011

Glendora already suffers from the north south split syndrome created by the South Hills that physically divide the city. Splitting the city further in the redistricting process will only add to the sometimes hostile situation and the feeling of non-inclusion with the north and seat of their government. Thus, the continuance and promotion of the derogatory term Baja Glendora when referring to the south side of the city.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Marcus PIERCE <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 15:23:01 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Marcus PIERCE <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** HERMOSA BEACH

**Message Body:**

The proposed 36th congressional district is an outrage. This is exactly what the redistricting law was supposed to prevent! The answer is simple. Everything south of the 105 freeway and everything west of the 110 freeway. No GERRYMANDERING, no PANDERING to special interests, no FAVORING one party over another. If the current blatant attempt to advantage the Democratic party is certified, I will be first in line to donate to the Republican law suit to expose your partisanship.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Polly Estabrook <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 21:46:31 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Polly Estabrook <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting Larchmont neighborhood in LA

Message Body:

There is no good sense in splitting the historical Neighborhood of Windsor Square/Hancock Park. The residents living east and west of Larchmont Boulevard form a historic, officially recognized community. The western boundary of this community of interest is and has been La Brea Avenue, and its eastern boundary is and has been Western Avenue -- for the past 100 years. Those of us east of Larchmont Boulevard will be made irrelevant in the Congressional, Assembly, and Senate elections, because we will become an appendage to electoral districts where the dominant issues are remote. Those of us west of Larchmont Boulevard will no longer have the supportive voices of our neighbors living between Larchmont and Western, because they will be removed to other districts. All of us will be distinctly marginalized. This is not acceptable.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** scott goldstein <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 16:36:57 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: scott goldstein <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Splitting Larchmont

Message Body:

There is no good sense in splitting the historical Neighborhood of Windsor Square/Hancock Park. The residents living east and west of Larchmont Boulevard form a historic, officially recognized community. The western boundary of this community of interest is and has been La Brea Avenue, and its eastern boundary is and has been Western Avenue -- for the past 100 years. Those of us east of Larchmont Boulevard will be made irrelevant in the Congressional, Assembly, and Senate elections, because we will become an appendage to electoral districts where the dominant issues are remote. Those of us west of Larchmont Boulevard will no longer have the supportive voices of our neighbors living between Larchmont and Western, because they will be removed to other districts. All of us will be distinctly marginalized. This is not acceptable.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Scott Salmon <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 17:20:47 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Scott Salmon <[REDACTED]>

Subject: PLEASE CHANGE THE LATEST CONGRESSIONAL MAP BOUNDARY WHICH DIVIDES THE COMMUNITY OF VALLEY VILLAGE CALIFORNIA

Message Body:

I live in Valley Village, located in Los Angeles, California. I am very concerned that the new map proposed earlier this week will divide Valley Village into two parts. Please redraw the line so that it follows the 170 Freeway and keeps the 25,000 stakeholders in Valley Village in one congressional district.

Respectfully,

Scott Salmon  
[REDACTED]

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission



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

**From:** Scott Schumacher <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 18:18:13 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Scott Schumacher <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Congressional district in Porter Ranch

Message Body:

Why have you split Porter Ranch (91326) in two? We should be part of the northern district.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** "Thomas B. Watson" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 17:20:00 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Thomas B. Watson <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Proposed Assembly District 50

Message Body:

The revised maps now put the Hollywood Hills into District 50. This makes no sense. The prior drafts all grouped the Hollywood Hills with West Hollywood, which makes sense. There is little in common between Hollywood Hills and North Hills, for example. Indeed, there is no geographic basis for the grouping, nor in terms of cities, nor in terms of general population and interest.

You have effectively caused a

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Bryan Bergsteinsson <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 21:40:23 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Bryan Bergsteinsson <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** boundaries

**Message Body:**

As a resident of Palos Verdes we have long been gerrymandered away from our natural community of the South Bay. How dissapointing to find that you have done it again by linking us to Santa Monica and Beverly Hills rather than to Torrance and other South Bay Communities. You must know that Palos Verdes, Torrance and the Beach communities south of LAX are a logical fit. The South Bay had zero connection to Santa Monica and BH and visa versa.

Please reconsider this misguided plan, we're no better off than we were before, what a tragedy.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** William LeGro <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 19:02:38 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: William LeGro <[REDACTED]>

Subject: lousy maps

Message Body:

You could not have done a lamer job of making your maps accessible to the public. I have a computer with all the bells and whistles, and still I can't open any of the files but the Google Earth - and that one has such faint green lines that the districts are nearly invisible. The LA Times did a far better job, but even their maps don't include the congressional district numbers. You could have easily made a PDF file - easy to download and read. But inexplicably you chose a most unfriendly and arcane method of communicating with the public on this vital issue. What in the hell is wrong with you?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** redistricting:

**From:** Lori Sambol Brody <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 09:16:16 -0700

**To:** <[REDACTED]>

I write to express my concerns regarding the redistricting. I live in Topanga, and my part of Topanga, under the current restricting proposal, is being switched to a new district, which will consist of such disparate communities as Santa Monica Mountain communities (including Topanga), Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Santa Clarita.

Redistricting principles emphasize the creation of cohesive districts that keep communities of interest together. This redistricting violates this principle.

First, the community of Topanga has been split in two, with the dividing line Topanga Canyon Blvd. Topanga is a cohesive and active community with strong concerns of fire safety, environmental preservation, and education -- Topanga has one public elementary school, and feeds into a middle school and high school in the Palisades, which will now be in a different district for me. It has an active chamber of commerce which promotes tourism. People who are active in politics reside here. Topanga is a unique community in Los Angeles. Topangans have actively demonstrated and fought against development (and won) and for the preservation of open spaces and the state park. In fact, a group of local investors have recently purchased a large piece of property to keep the land from potential development. It is essential that this close community be preserved together. In fact, *it makes no sense that the community be divided.*

Second, the current restricting plan will greatly dilute my half of Topanga's voice. The Santa Monica Mountain communities have different concerns than Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Thousand Oaks. The Santa Monica Mountains are sparsely populated and "rural" and have strong concerns of fire safety, ecological and environmental preservation, and are anti-development, while the other communities are large urban developments, full of planned communities, mini-malls, and large Westfield malls. I fear that our concerns will not be heard since the voice of the other communities will be louder and backed by more people and business interests. All the Santa Monica Mountain communities should be in the same district. Otherwise, these communities will not be able to work together to preserve open spaces, deal with fire issues, and the other unique concerns of the communities -- which Thousand Oaks and Moorpark simply do not care about.

Lastly, this redistricting implies that political concerns are more important than keeping cohesive and similar communities together. Topanga is traditionally liberal and democrat, and has traditionally been in a district which elects democratic representative. Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, and Moorpark are not.

In this political climate the ramifications are obvious: Topanga will be silenced. But that is not all. A Republican representative may have significant impact on the development of Topanga and the other Santa Monica Mountain communities, such as potentially being more pro-development and encouraging development, and limiting the protection to the state park land (which will in turn effect tourism).

Topanga, as an unincorporated area of LA County, already does not have a voice in certain elections which greatly impact the community. (Such as LA mayor.) Topanga should not be silenced more. In short, this redistricting plan is unconscionable. Please reconsider the redistricting and leave all of Topanga (and the Santa Monica mountains) in its current district.

Very truly yours,

Lori Sambol Brody

[REDACTED]  
Topanga, CA 90290

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

**From:** Carl Boyer <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 13:37:18 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Carl Boyer <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Santa Clarita senate district split

Message Body:

I don't like it, but we need to put this behind us.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Cathy Aarset <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 08:04:18 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Cathy Aarset <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Alhambra City

Message Body:

I am a resident in Alhambra. I have seen the proposed maps. Each district is different for Alhambra. Why? In one we are grouped with Diamond Bar, in another we are grouped with Maywood. I never go to these cities and know no one who lives there. Why would my concerns be grouped with others who know nothing of our concerns. We are all so far from one another. I love Adam Schiff. He has listened to us here and been involved with our city. I am more connected to Pasadena area, then what you are saying my city is connected to. These districts here make no sense to me.

Cathy Aarset

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Clent Rutledge <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 22:32:43 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Clent Rutledge <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Assembly District

Message Body:

My address is 8838 Menlo Ave., Los Angeles, Ca, 90044. With the way that the districts for state assembly have been drawn, a small little top hat has been created by cutting my area from Vermont Ave. to the 110 freeway, south of Manchester Blvd. out of what was previously the 48th. I am now part of a district that includes Watts, Willowbrook, Compton, Carson, and Wilmington. I have NO CORRELATION or CONNECTION to these communities, other than Watts and Willowbrook. The voters in my small area of this district will be badly disenfranchised by this. As I look at these lines that have been drawn, I can only ask one thing: WHO DRAWS LINES LIKE THAT? This makes no sense and I do not understand who thought this was a good idea. Thanks for deciding that WE DON'T MATTER.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission



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

**From:** "Dr. John Fleischer" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 00:45:19 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Dr. John Fleischer <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Congressional district in Burbank

Message Body:

I live in western Burbank. Our city is split by the Congressional district. This is not right. Our little city is not like Los Angeles and we should not be split in two. This helps to destroy a sense of community.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Gail Noon [REDACTED]

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 21:19:59 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Gail Noon <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Congressional districting

Message Body:

I live at the south end (Point Fermin) of San Pedro [40th St.], and I want our area to be included in Janice Hahn's Congressional district.

When the lines got changed some years ago, we ended up NOT under Jane Harman, but with Republican Dana Rohrabacher -- whom I DON'T like !!! (He does NOT share my views regarding a lot of issues - to WAY TOO pro business, for my taste)

Again, I want to be represented by Janice Hahn !!!!!!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Gregory Robert Mues <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 05:12:54 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Gregory Robert Mues <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Redistricting

Message Body:

I was looking at the maps in the Daily Breeze newspaper today here in Torrance. The proposed Assembly district for this area makes good sense - keeping the Los Angeles South Bay area intact. The Senate district involving the South Bay area looks miserably gerrymandered. Logically the Assembly South Bay district could be combined with one other Assembly district - perhaps the Inglewood district as the one most similar in its territory - and the 2 Assembly Districts could together be one Senate District. But the Congressional district is absolutely the worst gerrymander. Look at it! It is obviously the most gerrymandered octopus and makes no sense at all - except that it apparently is being drawn to protect one or more politicians. Fellow citizens, you need to go back to the drawing board for this part of the state. (And if the rest of the state has similar gerrymandering - shame on you!)

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** James D Mentzer <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 05:32:31 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: James D Mentzer <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Westchester

Message Body:

The final maps were a partial improvement over the 2001 redistricting. At least, Westchester isn't split between two senatorial and two assembly districts. However the final map of congressional districts, unlike the preliminary map released earlier, separates Westchester from the other South Bay coastal communities, which are connected by a shoestring along the beach, like the 2001 congressional districts.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Jay Martin <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sat, 30 Jul 2011 18:17:10 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Jay Martin <[REDACTED]>

Subject: US Congress Districts 44 and 33 (wrt. San Pedro)

Message Body:

-- US Congress District is 18 Miles N/S and 3 miles E/W at a mid point. Do you really want to put San Pedro on the Palos Verdes Peninsula with South Gate/Watts/Compton.

-- US Congressional District 33 is approximately 57+ miles (long via PCH) long and 1 hour 45 min travel time (google maps) and only a few miles wide in a the middle. Do you really want to put extremes of Malibu with up to the border of San Pedro?

Sincerely, Jay Martin

(On coastal border (San Pedro side) between 44 and 33)

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission