



Dedicated to Providing Quality
Water & Wastewater Service

President
Lee Renger
Director, Division 3

Vice President
Joseph M. Bowman
Director, Division 4

Secretary
Charles P. Caspary
Director, Division 1

Treasurer
Barry S. Steinhardt
Director, Division 5

Glen D. Peterson
Director, Division 2
MWD Representative

John R. Mundy
General Manager

Wayne K. Lemieux
Counsel

HEADQUARTERS
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302
(818) 251-2100
Fax (818) 251-2109

WESTLAKE
FILTRATION PLANT
(818) 251-2370
Fax (818) 251-2379

TAPIA WATER
RECLAMATION FACILITY
(818) 251-2300
Fax (818) 251-2309

RANCHO LAS VIRGENES
COMPOSTING FACILITY
(818) 251-2340
Fax (818) 251-2349

www.lvmwd.com

MEMBER AGENCY OF THE
METROPOLITAN WATER
DISTRICT
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

September 20, 2011

Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
Room 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: County Redistricting - Support for Proposal A-3

Dear Los Angeles County Supervisors:

The Board of Directors of Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) writes to express its support for county redistricting proposal A-3. The LVMWD Board voted to adopt this position at its meeting of September 13.

In adopting its support position for A-3, the LVMWD Board considered the importance of maintaining the existing sphere of influence among the communities that comprise the Las Virgenes – Conejo Council of Governments and the Santa Monica Bay communities. The Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, the Malibu Creek Watershed, the L.A. River headwaters and the cities of Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu and Westlake Village share many common interests and concerns. We believe those issues are best addressed by a Supervisor who represents the proposed A-3 District.

The other proposals being considered have the potential for fragmenting contiguous communities while adding new areas with different needs, with the potential of placing a supervisor at odds with factions within his or her respective district, a situation which is best avoided.

LVMWD serves some 67,000 residents with potable water, wastewater treatment, recycled water service and it operates a composting facility that benefits the region's environment. We would appreciate each county supervisor recognizing the importance of respecting the established regional working relationships that currently exist among special districts and city and county public agencies that ultimately benefit our mutual constituents. As such, we believe proposal A-3 comes closest to meeting those criteria. We respectfully ask the supervisors to support that proposal.

Sincerely,

Lee Renger
President of the Board of Directors



From: Lou LaMonte [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 1:07 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: Lou LaMonte
Subject: County Redistricting Maps

September 20, 2011
Executive Office
Board of Supervisors
Room 383
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

Dear Supervisors,

After the wholesale redistricting that has occurred at the state level, where Malibu has been combined with areas that we have no common community of interests at all. I thought, that at least at the county level, where we have nurtured and sustained beneficial relationships with the county and our traditional neighbors on both sides of the Santa Monica Mountains, we could count on the good sense of our supervisors to recognize our common geographic interests.

Supervisor Knabe's A3 amended map does.

The T1 and S2 maps do not seem to consider the fact that Malibu's issues are vastly different than the other beach communities we have been lumped together with.

It seems to me and the vast majority of my constituents, that maintaining as close as possible, the existing 3rd district lines would continue the success we have achieved by working with our natural neighbors.

We have come together with the help of Supervisor Yaroslavsky on issues as critical as our combined environmental efforts in the Malibu Watershed as well as basic Public Safety issues like Police and Fire protection and of course all of our joint efforts to make the 101 to PCH Traffic Corridors as safe as possible. The T1 and S2 proposed district maps do not achieve these same results, Supervisor Knabe's A3 amended map does.

I know that the primary reason for your existence as the Board of Supervisors is to serve the citizens. To give us the right to choose the representatives that would best serve all our interests. This is a very difficult task; one way to make it a little easier would be to recognize what already works. Our present 3rd. district works very well the way it is now.

As I have said before, "We ain't broke, Please don't fix us."

Thank you for your consideration.

Lou La Monte
Malibu City Councilmember
[REDACTED]

From: Susan Ellis [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 10:41 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: OPPOSITION TO T-1 AND S-2

Dear Supervisors,

I sent the email letter below to you on September 1, and though I have not added anything other than this introduction, am sending it again in order to reiterate my position for the September 27 hearing, since I am unable to attend due to my work schedule. This is such an important issue with long-lasting consequences - T-1 and S-2 must be rejected.

Dear Supervisors,

This letter is to convey my absolute opposition to the adoption of the gerrymandered T-1 and S-2 maps. Both of these maps would destroy partnerships developed over the last 20 years in the Santa Monica Mountains and Coastal Watershed - partnerships that protect and preserve magnificent environmental and recreational resources and need to stay intact in order to continue to protect and preserve for future generations.

T-1 and S-2 do not respect communities of interest. Among the issues that make it vital to keep our communities of interest together is emergency preparedness. The Santa Monica Mountain range has unique public safety challenges including wildfires and floods, which need cohesiveness to ensure leadership sensitive to these issues.

T-1 and S-2 would move over 3 million people from one district to another, resulting in people being reassigned to a supervisor they did not elect. This is just plain wrong.

T-1 and S-2 would adversely affect the Third District, which has made great strides over the past two decades, and therefore must be rejected.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Susan R. Ellis

[REDACTED]
Calabasas, CA 91302