

From: Alan Sarkisian [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2011 5:32 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: redistricting

Gentlepersons,

I believe that the Knabe redistricting plan is the best plan for Torrance and the county as a whole. Major disruptions in representation and splitting up communities of interest will occur if the Knabe plan is not adopted.

Very truly yours,

Alan H. Sarkisian

[REDACTED]
Torrance, CA

From: Andystern1 [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 11:02 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: an email from former City of Malibu Mayor Andy Stern

Good morning. My name is Andy Stern. I am a former 2 time Mayor for the City of Malibu and served on the City Council of Malibu for 8 years. I'm writing today about a matter of great urgency—the redistricting of Los Angeles County supervisorial district boundaries.

A district can be created without resorting to gerrymandering tactics that would force 3.5 million residents countywide into new districts while tearing apart communities with clear common interests.

- The Voting Rights Act is a cornerstone of our democracy, which requires that we protect the voting rights of minorities. This can be accomplished without dismembering established communities of interest.
- Plans T1 and S2 would each move nearly 3.5 million people from one supervisorial district to another, destroying established relationships and seriously setting back progress on important community issues.
- The Third District unites three adjacent, interlocking communities of interest: the greater Westside, the San Fernando Valley and the Las Virgenes region, all of them bound together by the Santa Monica Mountain range. This region is topographically, geographically, economically and socially cohesive and compact. It should be kept together.

Dividing communities

Plans T1 and S2 would divide the San Fernando Valley into three supervisorial districts instead of two at present. This would be a serious setback for the Valley, which has fought hard to maintain its own identity.

Mass transit

Plans T1 and S2 could undermine the progress our region has made towards rapid transit and could threaten our ability to expeditiously complete the subway to the Westside and the Exposition Light Rail to Santa Monica.

Homelessness

Plans T1 and S2 threaten to reverse the pioneering and highly effective work done to combat homelessness in Hollywood, the Westside and the San Fernando Valley through permanent supportive housing

Health care for the uninsured

Plans T1 and S2 could undermine the network of public-private partnership clinics now serving the Valley, Hollywood and the Westside, potentially compromising health care access for thousands of uninsured residents.

The environment

The Third District includes some of the county's greatest environmental and recreational resources, including Griffith Park and the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. Because of the district's beautiful natural setting, its residents share an interest in resolving environmental problems. Keeping the mountains in a district that is compact and environmentally conscious will help ensure political leadership that is sensitive to these issues.

Social services

Plan T1 could easily disrupt social services networks. These networks include both public and private non-profit agencies that provide such wide-ranging services as mental health assistance, family preservation, CalFresh (formerly food stamps) and legal services for the poor. Plans T1 and S2 could quickly dismantle these partnerships, causing some of our most vulnerable residents to fall through holes in the safety net.

Juvenile Probation

Plan T1 would remove three juvenile probation camps from the Third District, threatening the progress we've made in improving outcomes

for incarcerated youth.

Emergency preparedness

The Third District, as home to the entire Santa Monica Mountains range, is no stranger to natural disasters. Our communities have made huge strides in learning from, preparing for and guarding against wildfires, floods and other emergency conditions. Keeping the Santa Monica Mountains as the centerpiece of a compact district would help ensure political leadership that is sensitive to these issues.

Rivers and watersheds

The Third District includes a large portion of the L.A. River Watershed (in the Valley) and the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed. Keeping these together in one compact, environmentally conscious district would help ensure political leadership that understands the need to resolve watershed issues countywide.

As the old saying goes, don't fix what is not broke. Going forward with the 2 proposed plans will put politics as usual in place of effective government. Please do not do it.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 1:16 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Letter from Los Feliz Improvement Association
Attachments: 2011 0512 supervisorial Redistricting Commission.pdf

Please see attached letter sent last May to the Supervisorial Boundary Review Committee. Our views have not changed, and we urge you to maintain the current District 3 boundaries as before.

Sincerely yours,
Donald A. Seligman, D.D.S.
President, Los Feliz Improvement Association



OFFICERS
2010-2011

President
DONALD SELIGMAN
First Vice President
VACANT
Second Vice President
CHRIS LAIB
Coordinating Secretary
JORDAN SUSMAN
Recording Secretary
TESS NELSON
Treasurer
DONNA KOLB

Directors

George Abrahamian
Marta Alcumbrac
Nyla Arslanian
Margie Bird
Marilyn Bush*
Dennis Chew
Sandra Collier
Marian Dodge*
Tom Ford
Terry Hughes*
Lynne T. Jewell
David Kalemkarian
Margret Lohfeld
Norman Mennes
Hilary Misiano
David Roberti
Patricia Ruben
Jennifer Schlosberg
Debbie Simons
Mary Beth Sorensen
Angela Stewart
Mark Stong
June Teal
Michael Tunick
Valerie Vanaman
Demian Wyma
Donna Zenor*

*Past President

Los Feliz Improvement Association

P.O. Box 29395, Los Angeles, CA 90029
(323) 660-1914
www.LFIA.org

May 12, 2011

Curt Pedersen, Chairman of the Boundary Review Committee
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

Los Feliz is renowned as an historic district in Los Angeles with well defined boundaries and concerns. SurveyLA, a recent mapping of distinct Los Angeles neighborhoods by the Los Angeles Times, has correctly described its boundaries which coincide with those of the Los Feliz Improvement Association, an organization that has represented thousands of Los Feliz residents for nearly 100 years (map following). Our neighborhood has also been intimately associated with Griffith Park lands for over 200 years, and we have assumed the primary citizen responsibility for the park's stewardship for most of the park's existence.

For the last decade, since the last redistricting, our small neighborhood has been part of the County Supervisorial District 3. We have appreciated being included with all the communities associated with the Santa Monica Mountains which have compatible concerns and interests. We have found this district to be unusually harmonious, cohesive and coherent, and it should be preserved.

We strongly urge you to maintain the current boundaries of District 3, and to include the Los Feliz community as well as Griffith Park intact within these supervisorial district boundaries.

Sincerely yours,

Donald A. Seligman, D.D.S.
President

cc. Alisa Katz
Ron Ostrow, President, Greater Griffith Park Neighborhood Council





Los Feliz Boundaries:

West: Canyon Drive to from Griffith Park to Franklin Avenue, and Western Avenue between Franklin Avenue and Hollywood Boulevard.

North: Griffith Park

East: Los Angeles River between Griffith Park and Hyperion Avenue, then Hyperion Avenue between the Los Angeles River and Fountain Avenue

South: Franklin Avenue between Canyon Drive and Western Avenue, Hollywood Boulevard and the Fountain Avenue between Western Avenue and Hyperion Avenue.

From: Lee Renger [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 2:43 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Revising districts

I live In Stokes Canyon in Calabasas (unincorporated) and strongly oppose redistricting plans T1 and S2. I wish to keep Zev Yaroslovsky as my Supervisor. He understands the problems we have in this rural area and has been instrumental in solving many of them.

Herman Lee Renger

[REDACTED]
Calabasas, CA 91302
[REDACTED]

From: Nancy Rae Stone [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 3:21 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting comment: Do not approve currently proposed maps for new district plans

Dear Supervisors:

I have reviewed the two maps that have been proposed for future LA County Supervisorial districts and do not believe that either one improves upon the current district boundaries. In fact, the need to shift large numbers of residents into new districts (and into districts where they did not vote for their representative), coupled with the fragmentation of existing communities suggests that the current boundaries should be retained and slightly adjusted if population figures warrant an update.

The County has the good fortune of being able to fashion its own maps -- no citizen appointed panel has been charged with this important task. And yet it seems that the individuals involved with the responsibility of creating the new districts lack the knowledge of how our communities relate to themselves and to one another. While those fashioning the maps may be well-versed in the numbers of types of voters, they seem unable to grasp the importance of community identity and of the relationship of voters to their supervisor and district. The new plan could actually alienate voters from their county government which I must believe was not a goal of those involved in creating the new county maps.

I respectfully write to request that you vote to reject the proposed district maps and instead seek a new plan -- one that better reflects the communities that you represent and one that does not disenfranchise large portions of the county's voters.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Best-

Nancy Rae Stone
[REDACTED]

LA CA

From: pam pacht [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 12:40 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: RETAIN OUR DISTRICTS

Importance: High

Dear Supervisors:

I have reviewed the two maps that have been proposed for future LA County Supervisorial districts and do not believe that either one improves upon the current district boundaries. In fact, the need to shift large numbers of residents into new districts (and into districts where they did not vote for their representative), coupled with the fragmentation of existing communities suggests that the current boundaries should be retained and slightly adjusted if population figures warrant an update.

*The County has the good fortune of being able to fashion its own maps -- no citizen appointed panel has been charged with this important task. And yet it seems that the individuals involved with the responsibility of creating the new districts lack the knowledge of how our communities relate to themselves and to one another. While those fashioning the maps may be well-versed in the numbers of types of voters, they seem unable to grasp the importance of community identity and of the relationship of voters to their supervisor and district. The new plan could actually **alienate** voters from their county government which I must believe was not a goal of those involved in creating the new county maps.*

I respectfully write to request that you vote to reject the proposed district maps and instead seek a new plan -- one that better reflects the communities that you represent and one that does not disenfranchise large portions of the county's voters. Zev Yaroslavski has served us well and placed high priority and created an infrastructure to protect our core interests and values.....

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Pamela Pacht

Pam Pacht, C.L.C.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Save the Earth... it's the only planet with chocolate!!!!

 **Reduce Reuse Recycle - Please consider the earth before printing this email** 