

Subject: District 36 Do not change

From: "Joseph Lordeon" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 2011 13:13:30 -0700

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

My name is Joseph Lordeon [REDACTED]

Please do not change the boundaries.

Thank You

JAL

Subject: Request

From: Jeff Valdez <jeff@valdezproductions.com>

Date: Thu, 07 Jul 2011 18:47:25 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Please use the 1st map that was created for redistricting, I believe it is the most fair.

Thank you

Jeff Valdez

Subject: redistricting

From: teal s <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 2011 22:28:44 -0700 (PDT)

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

I was so hopeful when I saw that the district boundaries where going to be drawn according to geographical standards not political ones.

Please go with the recommendations of the redistricting committee. It does not make sense for districts to wind & loop their way across preferred sections of towns or even county to county just to keep an incumbent in office.

Teal

Subject: Redistricting

From: "Frank Tallerico" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 2011 12:11:58 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

To: The Honorable Members of the California Redistricting Commission

The recently published re-drawn maps for the political districts for Northern California's interior counties continues to isolate this region from its geographically located neighbors that were first drawn many, many years ago. (Most recently after the 1990 census.)

1. I again reiterate, that the east-west connection is not culturally connected with lifestyle nor the customs and culture of the interior counties. (The I-5 corridor remains and maintains the connectivity of these counties.)

2. The rather dry climate of the interior is very different that the cool, wet coastal counties. This climatic difference lends to a greater diversity of interests, employment opportunities, cultural and customs.

3. As stated in the law, numbers alone should not set the parameters for these districts . (Communities of interests, culture, customs, connectivity, and natural trading partners are only a partial list,)

I urge the Commission the return to the 1990 districts maps for a more accurate division to meet the requirements of the law.

Subject: I/We are in Favor of and Support the Southern California Coastal Districts Per First Draft Maps

From: RJ <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 2011 09:42:40 -0700

To: [REDACTED] "R.D. Hernandez" <[REDACTED]>

I/we implore the commission to keep the Southern California coastal districts as they are in their general form as of the draft maps that exist as of the first draft. The coastal districts need to stay coastal districts because otherwise coastal needs will be at a deadlock with inland needs and nothing will ever get done. At the most local level we must have a saturation of needs that covers a diverse population. When coastal communities need clean up of beaches the inland communities will fight that saying we need clean up of vacant land. Nothing will happen and at the next recession we will not be in a position, as a whole state, to do the work that needs to be done going forward.

I and others commend you for establishing the coastal districts as they are. Small changes might make sense but to change them beyond a slight modification of the border would be disastrous long term and not solely resulting in the aforementioned.

Thank You