

Redistricting

From: Arnold Newman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:10 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistricting

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

Our constituents strongly oppose the redistricting plan of the third district.

This would fracture the cohesive valley community which shares a common concern and history and partnership with West L.A.

We urge you to reject maps T1 and S2.

Sincerely,

Arnold Newman, President

Oak Forest Canyon Homeowners Association

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:05 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting the San Fernando Valley

To the Commission:

I am NOT in favor of changing the valley district from 2 to 3 representatives. The valley is fine the way it is, we don't need another politician in the valley to complicate things.

Arthur Salter
[REDACTED]
Studio City, 91604

From: Barbara Goodhill [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:00 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistrcting of SF Valley

Maps T1 and S2 should be rejected. The San Fernando Valley and West Los Angeles need to be part of one District.

Thank you,
Barbara Goodhill

[REDACTED]
Sherman Oaks

From: barbara kaye [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:32 AM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistricting - Sherman Oaks

As a resident of Sherman Oaks, I urge that Maps T1 and S2 be rejected. The San Fernando Valley and West Los Angeles need to be part of one District. Thank you.

Barbara Kaye
Sherman Oaks Homeowner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 10:45 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: Yaroslavsky, Zev; Krisiloff, Flora Gil; [REDACTED]
Subject: Request to Preserve Third District
Attachments: bcc.RedistrictingIssues.8.29.11.doc

[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Members of the Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

August 29, 2011

Subject: Request to Preserve Third District

Dear Supervisors,

I am very concerned about the redistricting proposals for the Third District and respectfully request that it be preserved as currently configured. Our District unites three adjacent, interlocking communities of interest: the greater Westside, the San Fernando Valley and the Las Virgenes region. Bound by the Santa Monica Mountains, these communities are cohesive in many respects – topographically, geographically, economically, and socially. They should be kept together. The Third District currently operates most effectively. The plans being considered would cause disruption and impede progress on many levels. These proposals would destroy established relationships which have taken years to form and would set back progress on important community issues. Populations would be shifted without benefit. In fact, the San Fernando Valley would be split into three supervisorial districts and seriously weakened.

So often we hear about dysfunction in government. This cannot be said for the Third District. It operates smoothly and at a high level. As the saying goes, “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” The Third District doesn’t need fixing. Please allow the Third District to remain effective and intact.

Sincerely,
Bette Harris

[REDACTED]

From: Bill Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:02 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: re-districting

To the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors,

I'm a longtime homeowner and resident of Sherman Oaks (since 1974). I've worked in the film business all my adult live, mostly here in the Valley.

I was very unhappy to learn of the proposals to redistrict Sherman Oaks and the Valley into a non-contiguous monstrosity. The proposed districts look like old-fashioned gerrymandering, a relic of the "boss politics" that I had hoped was long in our past.

The present boundaries make sense geographically, economically and logically! These plans will have the effect of depriving us of our voice in the future of the area.

Please reject the T1 and S2 maps, and keep our district intact.

Respectfully,

Bill Taylor

Sherman Oaks, CA

We need your help concerning redistricting of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. Our District is currently composed of the San Fernando Valley and West Los Angeles.

There are two proposals being discussed by the Board of Supervisors that would disenfranchise Sherman Oaks and the San Fernando Valley. Both plans would divide the Valley into three Districts and put Sherman Oaks in a District that goes south to Long Beach.

There is an upcoming Hearing of the Board of Supervisors. We need you to send an e-mail to the Board of Supervisors urging that Maps T1 and S2 be rejected. The San Fernando Valley and West Los Angeles need to be part of one District.

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 8:40 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Draw a Second Latino District

FYI

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 2:13 AM
To: Gloria Molina
Cc: SecondDistrict; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: Draw a Second Latino District

To the L.A. County Board of Supervisors,

As you may already know, between 2000 and 2010, the Latino population in Los Angeles County grew by nearly 500,000, while the non-Latino population lost nearly 150,000 people. Latinos now make up almost half the county's population.

Yet, the majority of the County Supervisors - specifically you, Supervisors Mike Antonovich, Don Knabe, and Zev Yaroslavski, OPPOSE creating a second Latino supervisorial district. Each of you seem to be more interested in preserving your currently comfortable district lines instead of meeting these population changes head on and accept the trend that is happening everyday!

The reason is because:

1. **It's just, and it's the law.** Support the creation of a second Latino district because it better respects Los Angeles County's population and the Federal Voting Rights Act.
2. **Latino voters have a long memory.** The Latino community will interpret self-interested votes to deny a second Latino district as hostile actions against the Latino community. Remind them that the Latino community has a long memory should these Supervisors ever want to run for future offices.
3. **Don't waste taxpayer money.** Los Angeles County lost a costly lawsuit the last time it tried to ignore the Federal Voting Rights Act. Don't waste taxpayer money by triggering another successful lawsuit!

From what I also understand, the Supervisors are on the verge of again adopting a map that DISRESPECTS the Latino community and it's population growth! Moreover, all of you are on the verge of violating the Voting Rights Act by failing to create a new Latino district when ALL OF YOU KNOW that it is warranted! The Advisory Commission presented to you all several proposed maps creating such a second Latino-majority district yet three of you (and you know who you are!) rejected each of the proposals!

Stop being typical politicians by sitting idly by and doing nothing to enhance our democracy! I demand that you acknowledge this very important voting rights issue once and for all and respect the growing Latino community!

Thank you,

Carlos Echevarria

El Segundo, Ca.

From: CommServ
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Not in favor of redistricting

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:42 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Not in favor of redistricting

As a long time resident of Topanga, I am not in favor of becoming a part of the fourth district that has been proposed. I want to stay in third district with Zev Yaroslavsky as my supervisor.

Thank you,
Catherine S. Grasso

[REDACTED]

From: CHANTELL HASKINS [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 10:46 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Topanga/Santa Monica Redistricting

Elected Officials,

I have lived in Topanga for 12 years and have felt that the level of commitment from the current Supervisor has been well in keeping with the needs of a unique community like Topanga. I am not sure how and why there has been a redistricting that has moved Topanga into an area of the county that has nothing in common with the Santa Monica Mountain residents and with a Supervisor that is unfamiliar with the unique challenges of the area.

It seems that "we the people" continue to be traded off like sheep to serve some local officials agenda while doing nothing for the community. There are very few instances where one can see their elected officials commitment to the area where one lives but that is what I feel I have enjoyed for the last 12 years. I do not want that to end.

Please reconsider your plans and keep Topanga and Santa Monica Mountain territory allocated to the district it currently exist in. The carving up of the county to best serve some one's political agenda and not serving the people of that area is unseemly to say the least.

It is time for everyone to use common sense and make the right decision.

Thank you for your time and efforts with this matter.

Chantell D Haskins
[REDACTED]
Topanga, CA 90290

[REDACTED]

From: christian [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:11 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Urging you to:

REJECT Maps T1 and S2; The Valley and W. LA need to be part of one District.

From: AChryssie [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:51 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: (no subject)

I am opposed to the redistricting of 3rd.supervisors district. Christine Allen.Member of Studio City Residents Assoc. 8/30/2011

From: CommServ
To: Deborah Kent Clark
Subject: RE: Redistricting Sherman Oaks

-----Original Message-----

From: Deborah Kent Clark [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:46 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: b [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistricting Sherman Oaks

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We are residents of Sherman Oaks and we want to urge you to reconsider the proposed District Maps T1 and S2. Please reject this redistricting. Sherman Oaks needs to continue to be districted with West Los Angeles. We will be lost if grouped with such a huge area as to include a city so far south as Long Beach.

Ironically, just last night, we decided to stop being disappointed in the quality of stores and restaurants in our stretch of Ventura Blvd. in Sherman Oaks, and intend on leading a movement to "revitalize" our particular area. It is a time in the United States to stop waiting for government to decide to do these types of projects. We are going to participate in bringing a higher level of tenants to the area, which of course will bring in more revenue, and will be working to make the area cleaner and more attractive. If we are included in a much larger district, it will be difficult to obtain County and City support.

Thank you for considering our urgent request.

Sincerely,

Deborah and Daniel Clark

From: Diane McDowell [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:05 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting

As a representative of the Laughlin PARK Homeowners Association, and a member of the Board of Directors, I would like to express my extreme disagreement with the redistricting plans being put forth. District Three, as presently established, is working. Any change would be counter to the wishes of the long established residents of our district.

Diane McDowell
Laughlin Park

From: CommServ
To: Faith
Subject: RE: Maps T1 and S2

-----Original Message-----

From: Faith [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 1:07 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Maps T1 and S2

As a property owner in Sherman Oaks, I oppose the proposed redistricting of Sherman Oaks. I support keeping Sherman Oaks in District 3 with the San Fernando Valley, as it has more in common with that area than it does with southern communities along the coast to Long Beach.
Please keep Sherman Oaks with its present district.

Faith Yang
Longbow Drive
Sherman Oaks

Sent from my iPad

From: holly [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:23 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sherman Oaks

Hello,

Please reject Maps T1 and S2!! The Valley and West LA need to be part of one district!

Thank you,

Holly Brown

[REDACTED]
support with a conscience

"Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter."
~Martin Luther King Jr.

"To avoid causing terror to living beings, let the disciple refrain from eating meat."
~Buddha

From: Jay Weitzler [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:39 AM
To: CommServ
Cc: Bob Anderson
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REDISTRICTING

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street

TO THE HON. BOARD MEMBERS,

As a longtime (34 years) resident of Sherman Oaks who is active in the community, I would like to express my complete opposition to the redistricting proposals contained in plans T1 and S2. If either of these plans are adopted, our community would be forced to be joined with others with whom we have very little in common. Our community is quite active, both politically and community-based, and it would be impossible for us to consider community improvements and common goals should we have to initiate contacts with others who are located as far as 40 miles away and whom have their own, and perhaps very different, views on improving their own locales. It would not be a positive development for either geographical end of the proposed districts. As of now, we have neighborhood associations that have long established relationships and share common goals; to be forced to start building new relationships will be almost impossible considering the long distances and varied areas contained in the proposals.

The Amended A3 redistricting plan is a far more positive plan since it enables communities that are extremely diverse but are contiguous and who share common economic, environmental and transportation concerns to be able to effectively work with the Supervisors in order to improve our quality of life. We have lines of communication with the Board and with each other that will make for far more effective representation for the citizens of our neighborhoods and allow us to continue to build upon past efforts.

Thank you for considering this letter and for supporting the Amended A3 Plan

Jay C. Weitzler

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90064
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: CommServ
To: Jean Burg
Subject: RE: Redistricting

-----Original Message-----

From: Jean Burg [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 1:05 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistricting

To the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors: As a long time resident of Sherman Oaks I strongly object to your redistricting proposals of MapsT1 and S2

The San Fernando Valley and West Los Angeles should be in one District.

Sincerely, Patricia J. Burg

From: Joseph Neustein [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:39 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: redistricting

Please do not break up my Sherman Oaks district. Do not spread it out to Long Beach, please.

Thank you.

Joseph Neustein

From: K Callan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:43 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Please reject Maps T1 and S2

Please reject Maps T 1 and S 2 redistricting Sherman Oaks and the SFValley. We have NOTHING in common with Long Beach.

Thank you.

Katherine Callan

Sent from K's iPad

From: Robert Shahine [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:14 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Re-districting

Please note, I am opposed to the plan to redraw the boundaries of the 3rd Supervisors district.

There are important matters to be addressed and I think all districts and the taxpayers would be better served if your energy was directed at solving more important issues.

Thank you.

Kathleen Shahine
Member of Studio City Residents Association

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:59 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistricting

I strongly oppose the redistricting maps of T1 and T 2

Lee Fournier

[REDACTED]

Sherman Oaks, CA 91401-6032

From: Leslie Elen [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:34 AM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistricting Proposals

I wish to encourage the Board of Supervisors to reject Maps T1 and S2. The San Fernando Valley and West Los Angeles need to be part of one District.

Disenfranchising Sherman Oaks and the San Fernando Valley would serve no practical purpose. Both plans would divide the Valley into three Districts and put Sherman Oaks in a District that goes south to Long Beach which makes no sense.

Leslie Elen

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:39 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting of the San Fernando Valley

Dear Sir/Madam: I strongly object to the redistricting of the San Fernando Valley in which the Santa Monica Mountains would be divided into two districts. We have worked so hard to preserve the Santa Monica Mountains, and they are best protected by being in one district.

Further, I object in general to the Valley's being split into three districts. The Valley deserves to have strong representation and being divided into smaller units dilutes the power of our supervisors.

Thank you, Lynette Berg Robe

Lynette Berg Robe, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Studio City, CA 91604
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

*Certified Family Law Specialist,
California Board of Legal Specialization of the State
Bar of California

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:47 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting

I strongly urge that maps T1 and S2 be rejected. Both plans are poorly structured and would result in disenfranchising a large number of residents.

Mark Lewis
[REDACTED]
Sherman Oaks,
Ca

From: Michele Gendelman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:40 AM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Maps T1, S2/Proposed Redistricting of L. A. County by Board of Supervisors

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

My husband and I are Sherman Oaks property owners, taxpayers, and registered voters, and we are very concerned about this proposed redistricting. The Valley should be ONE district, along with West Los Angeles. The very idea of redistricting into three entities is an exercise in bureaucratic boondoggling, and to place Sherman Oaks in a district that is part of Long Beach is simply ludicrous. I have friends who reside in Long Beach and visit there several times per year; while there are many fine areas of Long Beach, about the only thing it and Sherman Oaks share is proximity to the 405.

We hope that the Board will reject this proposal and leave the Valley/West Los Angeles district as it is.

Oh, and just in case I didn't make this point strongly enough above, WE VOTE.

Sincerely,

Michele Gendelman and Andrew Guerdat

[REDACTED]
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: CommServ
To: Mike Kichaven
Subject: RE: Reject maps T1 & S2

-----Original Message-----

From: Mike Kichaven [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:46 AM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Reject maps T1 & S2

Sherman Oaks and Long Beach have NOTHING in common.

I strongly urge you to REJECT MAPS T1 AND S2. The San Fernando Valley and West Los Angeles need to be part of one district.

I'll be watching closely to see your decision.

Mike Kichaven

[REDACTED]
S.O. Ca. 91423
[REDACTED]

From: Nicholas Vrataric [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:43 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: RE: Redistricting Los Angeles County Supervisorial Districts



August 30, 2011

Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

As the executive director of the CLARE Foundation, a 40-year-old Santa Monica nonprofit providing compassionate treatment and recovery services for alcoholism and substance abuse to individuals, families, and the community, I am writing to express my concern about the proposed redistricting plans that would drastically alter the political landscape of Los Angeles County.

I join Third District Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky in expressing my support for the federal Voting Rights Act, which protects the ability of every member of our community to have a voice in electing public officials that will serve our needs. As the leader of a social service organization that relies on vital partnerships throughout the Third District, however, I am alarmed that both redistricting plans call for changes that would needlessly dismantle our Third District community. Redistricting Plans T1 and S2 would both move nearly 3.5 million people from one supervisorial district to another, destroying established relationships and seriously setting back progress on important community issues.

CLARE is an organization that works closely with other agencies and funders throughout the Third District, and I am inclined to oppose any plan that threatens to destroy decades of cooperation and jeopardize progress we have made in the crucial areas of homelessness, medical care, transportation, and so much more. Over 83% of our clients are homeless at the time of entry into our programs, and we understand the important role that affordable, supportive housing plays in the future of our fight against homelessness. Yet, Plans T1 and S2 threaten to reverse the pioneering and highly effective work being done to combat homelessness in the Westside, Hollywood, and the San Fernando Valley through permanent supportive housing.

Additionally, plans T1 and S2 could undermine the network of public-private partnership clinics now serving the Westside, Hollywood, and the Valley, potentially compromising health care access for thousands of uninsured residents. In addition to negative ramifications for the overall health of our community members, this compromise could keep millions of people from receiving the substance abuse treatment they need.

Finally, plan T1 could easily disrupt social services networks, which are vital to the work we do and to the survival of our community. These networks include both public and private non-profit agencies, like CLARE, that provide such wide-ranging services as substance abuse treatment, 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. CLARE is dedicated to building strong partnerships with other community organizations to ensure that no member of our community slips through the cracks, and the proposed redistricting plans could cripple our ability to maintain these partnerships and uphold this duty.

The Third District of Los Angeles County 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 in order to ensure that citizens of our community have access to the services, support, and future they deserve.

Sincerely,



Nicholas Vrataric
Executive Director
CLARE Foundation

This message was sent to commserv@bos.lacounty.gov from:

Tamara Pompey | 909 pico blvd | santa monica, ca 90405

[Manage Your Subscription](#)

Email Marketing by



From: Bill Brandt [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:59 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Los Angles Re Districting

Pam Kerman and Bill Brandt urge you to keep Sherman Oaks in the Valley District.

It makes no sense to have one district that encompasses Long Beach and Sherman Oaks. Whatever problems we have are Valley related, i.e. police, garbage, streets, and homeless people.

Vote no on plans 1 & 2.

You can reach us at [REDACTED], Sherman Oaks, Ca 91403 or [REDACTED]

Thank you

From: pam.friedman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:54 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting Objection

To whom it may concern:

I object to a further bifurcation of the San Fernando Valley or the Santa Monica Mountains. Two supervisory districts are more than enough. If it were possible to consolidate the Valley into a single entity I would vote for that option.

Please consider every opportunity to keeping the Valley and the Santa Monica Mountains under the auspices as few people as possible.

Thank you,

Pamela Friedman
[REDACTED]
Studio City, CA 91604

Pamela Friedman
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

See Our Governance, Risk and Compliance
[REDACTED]

From: CommServ
To: Paul Glickler
Subject: RE: redistricting

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Glickler [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:27 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: redistricting

I have been a resident of Topanga for over 30 years. During the time in which we have been part of the 3rd Supervisorial District, Supervisor Yaroslavsky and his staff have been very attentive to the needs of our community. Before that, when we were included in a district that is now mostly the 4th District, our concerns seemed to be mostly ignored.

Proposed redistricting plan T1, which removes us from Supervisor Yaroslavsky's district would be a great loss to our community.

Paul Glickler

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:18 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting - A3 or T1 or S2

Dear Board:

I am a long-time resident of Sherman Oaks and a member of the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association. By profession I am a journalist, author and screenwriter.
I'm writing to urge you to adopt Redistricting Plan A3 for Sherman Oaks and reject plans S2 and T1.

A3 is the only plan that makes any sense. It keeps representation for myself and my neighbors within boundaries we are all familiar with and have ties to and can make the most of. The other two make no sense. They extend south and curl around to areas we seldom visit let alone have ties and mutual concerns with. They seem gerrymandered in the worst degree, a political ploy which I thought was to be reduced with the new redistricting.

They also split Sherman Oaks into other districts, fracturing common interest and ability to get things done.

I hope you will have the good sense and political integrity to realize the problems inherent in approving S2 or T1 for Sherman Oaks, and to see the obvious wisdom of keeping Sherman Oaks in tact and connected to its productive relationships. Approving S2 or T1, rather than A3, would be a disaster.

Sincerely,

Robert K. Wilcox

[REDACTED]
Sherman Oaks, Ca. 91423

From: Roz Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:43 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: REDISTRICTING THE VALLEY

Two proposals under discussion by the Board of Supervisors will disenfranchise Sherman Oaks and divide the Valley into three Districts putting Sherman Oaks in a District that goes south to Long Beach. This destroys our power as a political unit, and we expect you to reject Maps T1 and S2. Thank you.

--

Roz Brown

[REDACTED]
**Sherman Oaks East Valley
Adult Center**

[REDACTED]
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423


[REDACTED]
and

**Robert M. Wilkinson
Multipurpose Senior Center**

[REDACTED]
Northridge, CA 91324
[REDACTED]

From: CommServ
To: Ruth
Subject: RE: Redistricting

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruth [mailto:
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:08 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting

No-no no redistribution.

From: Soozin Kazick [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:28 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: redistricting maps

I urge the Board to reject the redistricting of maps T1 and S2. The San Fernando Valley and West LA need to be one district.

Soozin Kazick

From: Stephen Cooper [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:22 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Supervisorial redistricting

Dear Supervisors:

I see that you want to redraw the supervisorial districts in order to add an additional Hispanic seat. This makes no sense to me. I read that 48% of LA County is Hispanic, but I also understand that 25 - 30% of the Hispanic population is illegally in this country. Therefore roughly 20% of the County population is legal Hispanic residents. There is already one (out of five) Hispanic district and that seems appropriate. There is nothing wrong with a Hispanic candidate in any district, but to specifically carve out a district just to facilitate only the election of a Hispanic candidate seems wrong.

Thank you,

Stephen Cooper

From: CommServ
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SD3

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Jacobsen [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 2:28 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: SD3

Dear Honorable Board Members:

I urge you to adopt the amended plan A3 for SD3. Plans T1 and S2 are unacceptable for me, and I urge you to reject those two plans. I concur with the reasons given by the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association in its letter to you.

Regards,

Stephen Jacobsen
[REDACTED]
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

From: Steve Kinyoun [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:01 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Leave Sherman Oaks alone

I urge you to reject Maps T1 and S2. Everything has been working just fine, Please leave West Hollywood and Sherman Oaks together
Steve & Philip

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:21 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting Topanga

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Steven Sherman and I'm a resident of Topanga, California. I want Zev to continue to be my Supervisor and want to continue to be represented in the 3rd District as I am now. Many thanks!

All the best wishes,

Steven Sherman
[REDACTED]
Topanga, CA 90290

From: Tomm Wells [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:56 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Proposed District Changes

I am against the possible changes to the San Fernando Valley from 2 districts into 3.

We have enough identity problems as it is, and I think this would make it worse.

Thank you,

Tomm Wells

[REDACTED]
Studio City, CA 91604
[REDACTED]