

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

**From:** "Mary A. Rouse" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 18:33:09 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Mary A. Rouse <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting map

Message Body:

Incredibly stupid to post the maps in a way that does not work with Internet Explorer. Rumor has it that a fair number of Californians rely on that program.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Susan Karasic <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Mon, 1 Aug 2011 02:26:43 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Susan Karasic <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting Map

Message Body:

We live in upper Beachwood Canyon, known as "Hollywoodland" below the sign. The current redistricting map makes no sense to us. The only main thoroughfares available to us lead to Hollywood, which is our community. We are part of Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood Association, a neighborhood group that would be split in two. The current map looks like it groups us with Burbank and Glendale, which are nice, but not our geographic community. There are no major roads to get there from where we live. Please reconsider.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Susan Roberts <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Mon, 1 Aug 2011 03:08:30 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

**From:** Susan Roberts <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Do Not Split the Historic Greater Wilshire Neighborhood in Half

Message Body:

I am concerned about the demarcations you have made for Windsor Square, Los Angeles and the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council in Los Angeles. Please reconsider the redistricting maps with the following considerations:

1. State Board of Equalization. Please return us to the LA district for the State Board of Equalization. We lie at the midpoint of Los Angeles, but you have inexplicably removed us and placed us in a district called East, where we claim no community of interest.
- b. Congressional Districts. In each of the 3 options, you have divided us in half at Plymouth Boulevard. We belong with WLADT. The westernmost boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Avenue.
- c. Assembly Districts. In both of the two options, you have divided us in half at Plymouth Boulevard. We belong with LAMWS or with LADNT, but the entirety of Greater Wilshire from La Brea Avenue to Western Avenue must be included in one or the other, not both.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Comments on final maps

**From:** James Flourney <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 19:23:30 -0700

**To:** <[REDACTED]>

Assembly and Congress

Thank you for fixing rosemead

However you may have overlooked that the Whittier Narrows recreation area is in unincorporated Los Angeles County NOT City of South El monte

There is no connection between South El Monte and Montebello/ Pico Rivera South of Whittier Narrows Dam

The area between the Cities FLOODS into a LAKE

South El Monte has a Community of Interest with Rosemead and especially El Monte

It has none with the area where you have placed it.

91733 residents need to be in a San Gabriel Valley district, not an LA basin district

As a general comment the commission seems to ignore dead end roads

Along the 210 corridor and as we have mentioned, Castaic

Roads leading into the foothills have been cut off

Constituents have been seperated from their community of interest including them in a district on the other side of a MOUNAIN with no connection and no access to their representative.

Equality of a district to an exact voter number is no excuse for effectively disenfranchising thousands of voters.

Jim flourney

**Subject:** Final Redistricting Maps

**From:** Houg Tom <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 13:55:42 -0700

**To:** [REDACTED]

Under the guise of preventing discrimination, the California redistricting process was corrupted by a deliberate attempt to privilege particular racial groups who reliably vote for the Democratic Party. This formula was articulated well by Democratic political consultant Paul Mitchell: "First, [the commission] tried to get majority-minority districts. They worked on those first; then a lot of the shape of the rest is the remaining population." In other words, Democrats on the commission made it their highest priority to maximize the political power of racial groups who would vote for Democratic candidates, while the rest of the map consisted of whatever was left over.

How was this strategy justified? By claiming that the Voting Rights Act demands affirmative-action-style preferential treatment in redistricting, rather than the mere prevention of intentional marginalization on the basis of race. The goal of commission Democrats was to justify explicitly partisan redistricting by hiding behind a distorted interpretation of federal law, and illicitly appealing to people's shared desire to avoid racial prejudice.

This methodology, however, violates the U.S. Constitution by giving greater weight to the votes of now-privileged minority groups. It promotes unequal treatment in the name of preventing the same. To say we must create special districts for Latinos, Asians, and Blacks while diluting the clout of other citizens is a form of bigotry that should not be tolerated in a society claiming to concern itself with justice.

Truth be told, race should be irrelevant in the redistricting process. Establishing race-based districts is antithetical to the creation of a color-blind society. Commissioners should dispense with focus on the outward appearance of California voters, and instead consider the "communities of interest" our state constitution deems a legitimate basis for redistricting. Legislative boundaries should be drawn with a strong emphasis on shared socio-economic concerns, community assets, geography, etc. And cities should be kept intact, except where they exceed the size of a district.

The gerrymandering produced for the San Gabriel Valley makes it obvious that securing Democrat-voting racial blocks elsewhere in the region guided the process. For Assembly, cities like Arcadia and San Marino - which have historically had everything in common with Pasadena-area communities - became dog meat for other districts, while remote eastern cities like San Dimas, Upland, Claremont, and La Verne were inexplicably brought into the Pasadena fold. A similar condition prevailed for State Senate. And for Congress, even Pasadena itself was splintered into two pieces.

These anomalies were not the natural imperfections of a good-faith redistricting effort, but consequences of a process whose fundamental premises were wrong. Segregating voters

by tribe is both primitive and regressive. We can do better. The drafting of legislative boundaries should now be undertaken by individuals who refuse to establish racial fiefdoms to a particular party's advantage.

Tom Houg  
South Pasadena, CA

**Subject:** Fw: Redistricting comment about Arcadia and San Marino

**From:** LAUREL BULLOCK <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 22:14:01 -0700 (PDT)

**To:** [REDACTED]

--- On **Thu, 7/28/11**, Laura Wilcox <[REDACTED]> wrote:

From: Laura Wilcox <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting comment about Arcadia and San Marino

To:

Date: Thursday, July 28, 2011, 2:47 PM

Ladies,

Please read this letter and sign your name and address and email this back to

"[REDACTED]" if you agree that Arcadia and San Marino should not be redistricted.

Dear Commission Members:

Please redraw Arcadia and San Marino to be included with the common communities in the San

Gabriel Foothill Mountains (LASGF). Why is Arcadia being gerrymandered around between neighboring cities of Sierra Madre & Monrovia? This makes no sense! Arcadia with San Marino are being divided and forced to join other cities farther south with which we have nothing in common. This is wrong! Why are those communities excluded while such far away places as San Dimas and Upland are included in the LASGF district?

-

Arcadia & San Marino share a common interest with other foothill communities with east-west

transportation on the 210 Foothill freeway, public traffic roads such as Huntington Dr, and the construction of the Gold Line

Foothill Extension which will connect Pasadena, **Arcadia**, and Monrovia.

-

Arcadia & San Marino have intercity contracts and agreements with other foothill communities for law

enforcement, fire protection, medical services, and upper watershed management & conservation

-

Arcadia & San Marino have an entirely different socio-economic base, environmental issues,

quality of living standards, and contributions to local 'communities of interest' than the cities farther south.

-  
Arcadia's & San Marino's unity and strength is in knowing that they're a major foothill neighbor with ties to local cities that share mutual support and co-dependence of the equal flow of resources and employment in the northern vicinity.

-  
Arcadia & San Marino are already known for its largely diverse population of ethnic groups which wellmeets the Voting Rights Act standards.

For the reasons state above, please redraw Arcadia and San Marino to be included in the San Gabriel Foothill Mountain area (LASGF) in the assembly, senate, and congressional districts.

I find these maps are drawn in a much more community minded way:

<http://library.constantcontact.com/download/get/file/1102752268675-116/Fuller+--+Congress.pdf>

<http://library.constantcontact.com/download/get/file/1102752268675-117/Fuller+--+State+Senate.pdf>

<http://library.constantcontact.com/download/get/file/1102752268675-115/Fuller+--+Assembly.pdf>

I urge you to follow the guidelines for the commission to hold together *A community of interest [which] is a contiguous population which shares common social and economic interests ...for purposes of its effective and fair representation*

Regards,

Laurel Bullock

  
Arcadia, Ca 91007

--  
Laura Wilcox  
Personal Life Coach

**Subject:** Help!

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 22:24:01 -0400 (EDT)

**To:** [REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been a resident of the Greater Wilshire neighborhood for over twenty years. It is a wonderful place where we make a real effort to keep the feeling of a proudly historic neighborhood alive within Los Angeles.

A minor miracle.

I will keep it brief and simple: our neighborhood, which has historically run from La Brea on the west to Western on the east, will be chopped to pieces by your decision.

A neighborhood which WORKS will be damaged and left powerless. Our efforts to keep the historical core of LA's past alive and well will be weakened beyond recall.

PLEASE listen to the voices of neighbors like me, who have raised families while trying to keep faith with a responsibility to the history of our remarkable city. Do NOT weaken our solidarity and our efforts by breaking us apart.

Thank you for your consideration of this vital issue

Dr. Laura Ferguson

[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, CA 90004

**Subject:** Maintaining District Boundaries

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

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 21:48:37 -0700 (PDT)

**To:** [REDACTED]

Forwarded:

**From:** Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** July 16, 2011 1:45:28 PM PDT  
**To:** GWNC News <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** California Redistricting Threatens to Split Greater Wilshire Area  
**Reply-To:** [REDACTED]

Dear Greater Wilshire Stakeholders --

We need your help so that we are not completely marginalized in future California elections. Please forward this message to the California redistricting commission. Ask them to fix our boundaries. The address to send your email is [REDACTED]

1. **Who We Are.** We are voters who live in the community known as Greater Wilshire in Los Angeles. Our community includes 15 residential associations with histories dating back nearly 100 years. Our two largest and best known neighborhoods are Hancock Park and Windsor Square. Our eastern boundary is Western Avenue. Our western boundary is La Brea Avenue. You have proposed to split us in half at Plymouth Boulevard in your draft redistricting maps.

2. **The Redistricting Mission.** You are obliged to keep our century-old neighborhood intact in your redistricting effort, pursuant to the following governing rule: "*The geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, neighborhood, or community of interest shall be respected to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions. Communities of interest shall not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.*"

**3. Required Corrections to Draft Maps:**

- a. **State Board of Equalization.** Please return us to the LA district for the State Board of Equalization. We lie at the midpoint of Los Angeles, but you have inexplicably removed us and placed us in a district called East, where we claim no community of interest.
- b. **Congressional Districts.** In each of the 3 options, you have divided us in half at Plymouth Boulevard. We belong with WLADT. The westernmost boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Avenue.
- c. **Assembly Districts.** In both of the 2 options, you have divided us in half at Plymouth Boulevard. We belong with LAMWS or with LADNT, but the entirety of Greater Wilshire from La Brea Avenue to Western Avenue must be included in one or the other, not both.

Please note that this item will be included on the August 10 GWNC agenda for discussion and a board vote.

Signed, Your Greater Wilshire Neighbors

John Welborne, Jane Usher, Liz Fuller, Jack Humphreville, Owen Smith, Wendy Savage, Cindy Chvatal-Keane, John Gresham

**Subject:** Protect South LA - Don't Divide my Community

**From:** "Dr. See Love" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 02:02:00 -0700

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

Sent from my iPad

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

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

**Date:** Mon, 1 Aug 2011 05:43:38 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: David Dansky <[REDACTED]>

Subject: districting

Message Body:

Hi,

I just found the proposed redistricting for the Hollywood Hills. We are part of Hollywood and the rest of the Santa Monica mountains. How can you separate us and put us with the Angeles Forrest? What kind of sense does that make. Our needs are more in line with Hollywood then Pasadena. Please rethink this and change it.

Thank you,

David Dansky

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Jan Kimbrough <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 17:16:02 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Jan Kimbrough <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Valley Village split

Message Body:

Hello,

Please do not split Valley Village into two separate Congressional districts. It will confuse the identity of this community and unnecessarily create a myriad of problems down the line. The natural boundary of the 170 freeway is a better choice. Thank you.

Jan Kimbrough  
Valley Village resident

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

**From:** Linda Mele <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Sun, 31 Jul 2011 21:57:48 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Linda Mele <[REDACTED]>

Subject: LA Congressional Districts

Message Body:

I am profoundly disappointed in the districting lines your commission has drawn for congressional seats in the coastal areas of Los Angeles County, and I would prefer your "Congress LA 1.2" version rather than what you have presented. The three key points for you to reconsider are as follows:

1) The congressional district you have drawn is so geographically gerry-mandered that Google does not even include the proposed Highway 1 connection as an option if one wished to drive from Rolling Hills in the south to Agoura or Malibu or Beverly Hills to the north. The small sliver of coastal area connecting north and south is not a viable coastal connector between these communities.

2) You have ignored input from many coastal communities who expressed clearly how those communities relate in an east/west fashion to the communities on their corridors to the freeways. On the one hand, residents of the South Bay have clearly defined their community as the area from Westchester south to the Palos Verdes Peninsula and east to Gardena and Hawthorne. The coastal obstacles of the airport and the marina prevent true community north of that point. On the other hand, residents in the north, including the mayor of Malibu whom you quoted in one of your broadcast meetings, have expressed that they have community with the Santa Monica mountain area, Santa Monica and West LA and do not wish to be associated with communities south of the airport. I am mystified as to why the commission would choose the current option given the clear input from residents in all areas of this district.

3) You have split not only Torrance, but also the South Bay, in half. Because Torrance is the heart and the commercial hub of the South Bay, the lines you have drawn have separated the eastern and western halves of the complete South Bay community, a community that deserves fair representation. As it stands, with the South Bay split in pieces that are attached to larger, more intact outside communities, you have damaged the South Bay's ability to elect someone from their community for congress.

I am disappointed that the public commission did not listened to the community and did not go with the 1.2 version of the district.

Sincerely,  
Linda Mele  
Torrance

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission