

August 3, 2011

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
500 West Temple Street, Room 383  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

I strongly support the proposed A-2 redistricting plan, which is more cost effective and presents the least disruption to my community. The S-1 plan would be very disruptive and impact many more citizens. Keeping my community as part of the Fourth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County, in the final outcome of the redistricting process, would not only benefit the citizens in my area, but would also allow us to keep a Supervisor who is familiar with my community and its needs. This is most important to the unincorporated areas since they have no city government.

We do not want to see our neighborhoods, communities and cities divided into separate districts. The Fourth District boundaries, as currently drawn, should be maintained as much as possible. Split communities and changed districts could result in disruptions in the service, quality and timeliness we have come to expect from the County.

I hope the Board of Supervisors will seriously consider this input, as any redistricting changes would have a huge impact on my community. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, *Edmée N. Trance*

[Redacted Street Address]

Street Address

*Rowland HTS CA 91748*

City

**From:** Medina, Katherine on behalf of ExecutiveOffice  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 17, 2011 4:41 PM  
**To:** Johnson, Angie; Artonian, Narek; Duron, Guadalupe; De Jesus, Emma  
**Subject:** FW: Redistricting

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the Executive Office's Public Response e-mail for your review/information.

---

**From:** Margaret Limon [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2011 3:24 PM  
**To:** ExecutiveOffice  
**Subject:** Redistricting

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street, Rm. 383  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

I support the proposed redistricting plan, S1, submitted by Marqueece Harris-Dawson, Jackie Dupont-Walker and Tunua Thrash. I strongly believe this map should be approved by at the upcoming Board of Supervisors meeting. It is my belief that communities with shared interests and services should also have shared representation. The current boundaries do not support this notion.

I do not support the status quo.

The above listed maps support socio-economic diversity by keeping working class communities together. They also provide boundaries that are in line with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act by keeping ethnic communities from being fragmented and they do not displace any supervisor from his/her district and the newer districts remain compact.

Please consider keeping neighborhoods, communities and cities of common interest together. Please use the boundaries as currently drawn in the S1 proposal. Thank you for your time.

--  
Cordially

Margaret Limon

August 3, 2011

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
500 West Temple Street, Room 383  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

I strongly support the proposed A-2 redistricting plan, which is more cost effective and presents the least disruption to my community. The S-1 plan would be very disruptive and impact many more citizens. Keeping my community as part of the Fourth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County, in the final outcome of the redistricting process, would not only benefit the citizens in my area, but would also allow us to keep a Supervisor who is familiar with my community and its needs. This is most important to the unincorporated areas since they have no city government.

We do not want to see our neighborhoods, communities and cities divided into separate districts. The Fourth District boundaries, as currently drawn, should be maintained as much as possible. Split communities and changed districts could result in disruptions in the service, quality and timeliness we have come to expect from the County.

I hope the Board of Supervisors will seriously consider this input, as any redistricting changes would have a huge impact on my community. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, *Marc Trance*



*Rowland HTS,*

*CA, 91748*

Street Address

City

[REDACTED]  
Rowland Heights, CA 91748  
August 15, 2011

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
500 West Temple Street, Room 383  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

I strongly support the proposed A-2 redistricting plan which is more cost effective and presents the least disruption to my community. The S-1 plan would be very disruptive and would impact many more citizens. I would like to keep our present supervisor in the Fourth District who is already familiar with my community and its needs.

My desire is that the Fourth District boundaries remain the same as currently drawn.

I hope the Board of Supervisors will seriously consider this input. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Gloria Palacios

**From:** Jana Weber [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 17, 2011 9:35 AM  
**To:** CommServ  
**Subject:** Redistricting LA County 2011

As a 20 year West San Fernando Valley resident, I support the proposed plan by Supervisor Ridley-Thomas called "Community Empowerment Plan S2" because it changes my existing boundary from District west 5 to another district that is an actual part of my community. The other two proposals do not do this for my area and lump us into the Santa Clarita Valley portion of Los Angeles County and out of the San Fernando Valley districts.

Even though I am a citizen of Los Angeles County, it is clear that my concerns as a Western San Fernando Valley resident would be better understood and represented by a supervisor from my area instead of one that has a vast majority of its people live in the Santa Clarita Valley. Sadly keeping the boundary as it currently is in my area, would leave me and my neighbors at a huge disadvantage to have our concerns met and cared for.

Well I do understand that divisions must be made somewhere, they should be kept more inline to represent location instead of race or other criteria. I find it strange that an area like Pacoima which is geographically closer to SCV is included in the SFV and our area is not. I choose to live in the West San Fernando Valley for a variety of reasons, but mainly out of choice and do so despite high prices and challenged schools.

Please adjust the boundary in our area to reflect the real differences and needs of citizens in both valleys.

Sincerely,  
Jana Weber

[REDACTED] West Hills, CA 91304