



SPIRITT
Family Services
Since 1972

July 28, 2011

**Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
856 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012**

Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts is now possible. There are five supervisorial districts—and this number most likely will not change in the near future since, as recently as **2001**, voters rejected a ballot measure to expand supervisorial representation to **seven** districts.

As you know, in Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, I wish to voice my strong support for the S-1 Plan, also known as the African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.

The S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of underrepresentation of Latinos at the ballot box, and supports civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the S-1 Plan has the support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

Currently, Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos.

SPIRITT Families Services provides family based services to over 6,000 individuals annually residing in the greater San Gabriel Valley region of Los Angeles County. At present, our services impact families in three Supervisorial Districts (One, Four and Five). The majority of our clients live well below the Federal poverty level and nearly

Skills (for)
Prevention
Intervention
Recovery
Individual
Treatment (&
Training

Board of Directors

Roger Stoltenberg
President
Israel Cobos
Vice President
Diane Innes
Secretary
Kevin Scherff
Treasurer
Layla A. Avila
Raul Avila
BaoKim Coleman, Ed. D., MBA
Rosemarie Gallegos
Rosie Lim, M.D.
Harold Schieve

Executive Director

Elvia Torres

SPIRITT CENTERS

13135 Barton Road
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90605
Administration
(562) 903-7000
Fax (562) 903-7677

9401 S. Painter Ave.
Whittier, CA 90605
(562) 698-9436

1505 S. Sunflower Ave.
Glendora, CA 91740
(626) 335-8153

2000 Tyler Ave.
South El Monte, CA 91733
(626) 442-1400
Drug & Alcohol
(626) 442-4788

147 S. 6th Ave.
La Puente, CA 91746
(626) 968-0041

84% are Latino. I believe it is our civic responsibility as a service provider to ensure the Latino voice is heard.

Therefore, I strongly urge you to adopt the S-1 Plan. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary at elviat@spiritt.org or (562) 903-7000.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Elvia Torres', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Elvia Torres
Executive Director
SPIRITT Family Services

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.


Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ



LOS ANGELES, CA. 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.


Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Steve Quinonez

Sincerely,



LA CA 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Arthur S. Sorensen

Sincerely,

Arthur S. Sorensen

Los Angeles CA 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely, OMAR QUINONES

LA, Ca, 90001



Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

As a member of the Florence Firestone Community Leaders (FFCL) and a resident since 1954, I have a vested interest with over 50 years with my Community and over 40 years of military service. Serving in Vietnam and Iraq, I have always felt that serving my Country and my Community is my first priority. Doing what is preeminent for the majority and our children. Letting non-inhabitants prevaricate our future is not why I serve and is definitely not the American way. **I have discussed the Amended S-1 Plan with other FFCL members. Consensus this plan best serve our Community.**

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.


The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely



William O. Allen (Retired USA)

[Redacted]

Los Angeles California 90001

[Redacted]

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.


The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



[REDACTED]
Bell Gardens, CA 90201

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Rosalva Monto

Bell Gardens, CA 90201

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.


The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,




Los Angeles, CA 90012

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.


The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "David I. Lublin", written over a horizontal line.

Tasadena ca 91104

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



[REDACTED]
El Monte, CA 91732

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.



The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



Pomona, CA 91767

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.


The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



Downey, CA 90242

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



Covina, CA. 91723

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



whittier - CA 90602

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.


Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Rafael Galdamez


Downey, CA 90241

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



LA CA. 90001.

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



Los Angeles Ca 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Jose Antonio Chia Jr.

~~Jose A. Chia Jr.~~

Los Angeles, CA. 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Silvestre Araujo

Los Angeles, CA 90011

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Ramiro Mendez


Los Angeles CA 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

IS/D
willaw



LOS ANGELES, CA 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

maria Peraboj
7/18
Los Angeles CA 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,


Rafael Acevedo


Los Angeles CA. 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Edgardo Subgado


LOS ANGELES CA 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.


The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



Louis Alvarez

[Redacted]

Los Angeles, CA

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely, 



Los Angeles CA 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.


The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,



MARIA CARTER



LA CA. 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Luiz E. Valenzuela 

LA CA/IF 90001

August 2, 2011

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts and keeping a competitive African-American district intact is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, **I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.**

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen. Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely, *Oraceli Jimenez*

[Redacted signature block]

Los Angeles CA 90001

From: Walter Kiang <walterkiang@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 8:20 AM
To: CommServ
Cc: Walterkiang@yahoo.com
Subject: Boundary Revision for District 4

Dear Sir:


I am a resident of Rowland Heights since 2006. I am for the integrity of the political boundary for our small community of rowland Heights, which should be, in my opinion, totally included in the District 4. The reasons are obvious!

sincerely,

Walter T. Kiang, AICP
LLB, MPL, MURP, MS, MPA

President

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Rowland Heights, CA 91748-4160
[REDACTED]



Executive Board

Blanca Espinoza
Interim President
Eastman Healthy Start

Dede Vidales
Vice-President, Public Relations
Garfield Alumni Foundation, Inc.

Raquel Cardenas
Secretary / Treasurer
Manny's El Loco Restaurant

Jose Barajas
Parliamentarian
Law Office of Michael Singer Inc.

Board of Directors

Marissa Castro-Salvati
Southern California Edison

Andy Carrasco
The Gas Co.

Eddie Torres Jr.
Eass L.A. Custom Signs

Cindy Galdean
Cindy Galdean Productions

Josue Garcia
New Melody Media Group

Ruben Sanchez
Barrio Planners Inc./Eastside
Business Assistance Center

Joe Sandoval
The Niteguide Magazine

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

August 5, 2011

Dear Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee:

I write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines in Los Angeles County. Results from the 2010 U.S. Census unequivocally show the existence of at least two compact Latino communities within the county constituting at least half of the voting age citizens. In other words, the creation of two or more Latino-majority supervisorial districts is now possible.

As you know, at the Los Angeles County, the Boundary Review Committee is responsible for determining the borders of the five supervisorial districts. Though several worthy proposals have been submitted for their consideration, I wish to voice my strong support for the Amended S-1 Plan, also known as the Latino/African American Coalition Map—which would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact.

The Amended S-1 Plan meets all necessary case law standards. But it also achieves another equally important obligation—it honestly addresses Los Angeles County's history of racial discrimination at the ballot box, and it does so in the spirit of civic collaboration and good governance as evidenced by the fact that the Amended S-1 Plan enjoys support of organizations beyond the Latino community.

The unpleasant but incontrovertible truth is that voting in Los Angeles County has historically been polarized along ethnic lines, and primarily between Latinos versus non-Latinos. This was true in 1991, when the county's district lines were redrawn to fairly allow for Latino representation—but only because the U.S. Supreme Court forced the county's hand as a result of the *Garza vs. County of Los Angeles* case, which doggedly chronicled the institutionalized, systemic racism perpetuated for generations against the county's Latinos.

Now it is 2011, and Latinos irrefutably represent a clear majority of Los Angeles County's voting age citizens. Yet a 2008 report co-authored by David I. Lublin and Gary Segura and titled "An Evaluation of the Electoral and Behavioral Impact of Majority-Minority Districts" scientifically proves what many Latinos have known anecdotally for generations—that voting in Los Angeles County is still polarized among ethnic lines, and particularly between Latinos and non-Latinos. To put it bluntly, racial discrimination at the ballot box is not a thing of the past.

Taken together, these facts demonstrate a compelling need for at least two majority-Latino supervisorial districts. Indeed, I believe that this unfulfilled need would constitute *de facto* disenfranchisement—which is exactly the opposite of the Boundary Review Committee's mission. It is no exaggeration to say in fact that the people of Los Angeles County are relying on the committee to ensure that disenfranchisement in any form does not happen.

Yet this is exactly what happened when the committee failed to support the Amended S-1 Plan. This outcome is particularly true when taking into account Latinos' generally lower

4716 Cesar E. Chavez Ave. Los Angeles, CA. 90022

☎ Phone: (323) 263-2005 Fax: (323) 263-2006

Email us at: [REDACTED]

Visit our website at www.elacoc.com

socioeconomic status combined with the game-changing effects of the infamous U.S. Supreme Court's *Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission* ruling in January of 2010, which allowed for unlimited corporate funding of independent political broadcasts in candidate elections.

As such, because the Amended S-1 Plan would fulfill not just the letter but the spirit of the Boundary Review Committee's mission, I strongly urge you to adopt it. Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and for considering its message. Please feel free to contact me in the future if necessary.

Sincerely,

Eddie Torres, Jr.
Member – Board of Directors
East Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce

4716 Cesar E. Chavez Ave. Los Angeles, CA. 90022

☎ Phone: (323) 263-2005 Fax: (323) 263-2006

Email us at: [REDACTED]

Visit our website at www.elacoc.com

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:13 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Altadena and Antonovich

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:59 AM
To: Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Altadena and Antonovich

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

From: Coleen Sterritt [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 9:35 AM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Altadena and Antonovich

To the Board of Supervisors:

Please keep Altadena in the Fifth District!!!
Sup. Mike Antonovich is truly connected to our community and listens to our concerns.

I've been a resident of Altadena since 1997 and Pasadena since 1994.
Sup. Antonovich has served us well. Let us remain in his district as a whole community.

Thank you,

Coleen Sterritt
████████████████████
Altadena, CA 91001

.

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:12 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Altadena Re-Districting

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:07 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Altadena Re-Districting

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

From: Mark Collins [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 5:16 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Altadena Re-Districting

My wife and I are disturbed you are considering changing Altadena from the 5th district to another district, or to some mish-mash where our representation will be compromised because Michael Antonovich understands Altadena and its current needs.

We don't need Altadena split up, nor do we want on-the-job training for a new Supervisor.

Leave Altadena (alone) in the 5th District!!

Mark and Sandra Collins

[REDACTED]
Altadena, Ca. 91001

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 8:38 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Boundary Redistricting Plans

FYI

From: Johnson, Tammy
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 4:43 PM
To: Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Boundary Redistricting Plans

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

Ms. Tammy Johnson
Customer Service Center
Senior Board Specialist
500 West Temple St, Room 383
Los Angeles, CA 90012
([REDACTED] Work)

From: Carolyn Seitz [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 4:36 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Boundary Redistricting Plans

To the Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for all of the effort the County team put into the community outreach and thinking that led to the development of a recommendation by the Boundary Review Committee to your Board.

As a resident and business owner in Altadena, and as someone active in this community, I respectfully request that the Board consider only plans that keep Altadena in one jurisdiction, that keep Altadena united with its immediate neighbors, Pasadena, Sierra Madre, La Canada and the unincorporated areas around us as it gives us the best opportunity to share services and resources when we're dealing with our common interests and issues, and that keep us in the Fifth Supervisorial District.

As I understand it, the plan that accomplishes these goals is known as A2, that recommended by the Boundary Review Committee.

Please take action in support of this plan or if you find it unacceptable to do that, then another plan as long as it accomplishes the same goal, unity of interest, unity of representation across communities that share crime, social issues, environmental issues, so we can continue to work together as neighbors should, and with one Supervisor assisting us and supporting us in our

efforts.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Carolyn Ingram Seitz

[REDACTED]

Altadena, California 91003-0265

[REDACTED]

From: Walter Kiang <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 8:32 AM
To: CommServ
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: Boundary Revision for District 4

Dear Sir:

I am a resident of Rowland Heights since 2006. I am for the integrity of the political boundary for our little, small community of Rowland Heights within the LA County, which should be, in my opinion, totally to be included in one District, that is, the District 4. The reasons are so obvious. The population composition and the commonalities of the residents in Rowland Heights are so similar with its surrounding small communities, such as, Cities of Walnut and Diamond Bar, and the unincorporated community of Hacienda Heights.

Your favorable decision to our petition would be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

WALTER T. KIANG, AICP
LLB, MPL, MURP, MS, MPA

PRESIDENT
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Rowland Heights, CA 91748-4160
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:56 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: create a second Latino-majority supervisorial district

FYI

From: gisulys sanchez [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 9:12 AM
To: Gloria Molina; SecondDistrict; Yaroslavsky, Zev; AskDon; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: create a second Latino-majority supervisorial district

L.A. County Supervisor

This e-mail is for let you know that in relation to the last act where the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Advisory Commission recommended a map to the five Board members that fails to create a second Latino-majority supervisorial district as required by the federal Voting Rights Act, and considering that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Advisory Commission recommended a map to the five Board members that fails to create a second Latino-majority supervisorial district as required by the federal Voting Rights Act , We ask for **Respect to the Federal Voting Rights Act and Avoid a Potentially EXPENSIVE Lawsuit the County is Guaranteed to Lose, We Support the creation of a second Latino district** because it better respects Los Angeles County's population and the Federal Voting Rights Act. 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!

sincerely

Imelda and Daniel Sanchez

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:15 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:48 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 9:52 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Jasmine Torres
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:17 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:39 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 12:15 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Cc: rubena@juno.com
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 7, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,
Ruben Avitia



Monterey Park, CA 91754

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:17 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:39 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Sonia Martin-Solis [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 12:22 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Sonia Martin-Solis

[REDACTED]
Alhambra, 91803

Sonia Martin-Solis
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:17 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA COUNTY REDISTRICTING PLAN S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:39 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA COUNTY REDISTRICTING PLAN S1

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 1:30 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA COUNTY REDISTRICTING PLAN S1

Honorable Los Angeles County 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 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. Also, I strongly believe that it better respects Los Angeles County's population; and, Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act by keeping ethnic communities from being fragmented..

The above listed maps support socio-economic diversity by keeping working class communities together. The S1 proposal does 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 and consideration of my request.

Sincerely

C. GLORIA DURAN

[REDACTED]
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

[REDACTED]
Past School Board Member - 16 years
Los Nietos School District
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:17 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:39 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Maribel Galan [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 1:31 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 7, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Maribel Galan

Maribel Galan
Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:19 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:16 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Sergio Flores [mailto:s████████████████████]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 3:26 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Cc: tony90701@yahoo.com
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Sergio Flores

[REDACTED]
Montebello CA 90640

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:19 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:16 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Emeka Ugwu [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 5:35 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 7, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

John Emeka Ugwu



Pico Rivera, CA 90660

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:19 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:15 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Ness Sosa [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 6:57 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Venessa Sosa
[REDACTED]
Whittier Ca, 90606

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:20 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:15 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Nidia [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 11:16 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Cc: ramonmendezv@aol.com
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 7, 2011

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street, Rm. 383

Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Name: Nidia Cos

Street Address: 

City/Zip: Los Angeles, 90002

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:15 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:48 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 9:56 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 8,2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Name: Berenice Torres

Street Address:



City/Zip: Wilmington, CA 90744

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:15 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:48 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 9:52 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Name: Roberto Barranon

Street Address: [REDACTED]

City/Zip: Lakewood, CA 90713

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:15 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:42 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Linda Fierro [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 2:00 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Linda Fierro



Commerce, Ca. 90040

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:16 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:41 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: M A Flores [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 7:50 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Marco Flores


Los Angeles ca 90007

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:17 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:40 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Margie Granado [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 10:31 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Margaret Granado

[REDACTED]
Whittier, CA 90606

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:21 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA COUNTY REDISTRICTING PLAN SI

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:14 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA COUNTY REDISTRICTING PLAN SI

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 9:25 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA COUNTY REDISTRICTING PLAN SI

August 8, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Name: Maribel Castillo

Street Address: [REDACTED]

City/Zip: Rowland Heights, CA 91748

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:16 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Los Angeles County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:41 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Los Angeles County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Bruce A Lee [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 8:11 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Los Angeles County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

Dear Supervisors:

As a homeowner and resident living in unincorporated Los Angeles County territory, 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 and adopted 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 principle. I do not support the continuation of the status quo in time of changed demographics since the last redistricting of the County.

The Plan S1 map supports 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. The S1 proposal does not displace any supervisor from his/her district. Furthermore, 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 in considering my position in the decision.

Sincerely,

Bruce A Lee

[REDACTED]
Whittier, CA 90601-1050
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 8:22 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Please redraw 2nd Latino supervisor district

FYI

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 10:44 AM
To: Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: Please redraw 2nd Latino supervisor district

Dear Supervisors: I ask that you please considering drawing a 2nd majority Latino district as you redraw the political boundaries for LA County. I ask that you consider:

- 1) Demographic changes which have been happening in LA County since the last census.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.
- 4) Please do not waste taxpayer money. Los Angeles County lost a costly lawsuit the last time it tried to ignore the Federal Voting Rights Act. Please do not waste taxpayer money by triggering another lawsuit.

Thank you for your time.

Victor M. Chavez
Alhambra

[Groupon™ Official Site](#)
[1 ridiculously huge coupon a day. Get 50-90% off your city's best!](#)
[Groupon.com](#)

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 2:12 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Please

FYI

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 1:23 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: Please

Message for the body

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: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:18 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: re:2nd Latino District

FYI

From: JOSE CASTILLO [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:21 PM
To: Yaroslavsky, Zev; Gloria Molina; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: re:2nd Latino District

Dear County Supervisor:

You need to adopt the recommendation of the advisory commission that recommends that a second Latino-Majority supervisorial district be created as required by the Federal Voting Rights Act.

The larger Latino population in LA County needs representation that meets and addresses their needs.

You are guaranteed to have a lawsuit filed against you if you don't do the right thing!!

Also when your position comes up for re-election you can bet that you will have a stronger opposition!!

DO THE RIGHT THING!!!

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:13 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting Plan

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:02 AM
To: Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting Plan

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

From: Gregory Middleton [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 9:47 AM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Redistricting Plan

Board of Supervisors,

Until just recently I did not read the mounds of paper associated with this redistricting proposal. I was not fully aware of the intent behind such a complicated shifting of the districts. As usual most citizens do not show up to vote on such matters simply because of the need to read through mounds of papers just to understand what is being considered.

After reading just a portion of the proposal it appears that the intent is to make things fair and just for the citizens based upon racial distributions and thereby make sure that each race is equally represented by an elected official that represents their needs and concerns better.

Looking at the racial make-up of the districts it is easy to see that the large population of Hispanics is not equally and equitably represented. This is a problem and somehow needs to be fixed. In order to fix the problem other situations needs to be taken into account as well.

For example if our town of Altadena would be split between two separate districts I feel it would cause us personally more problems than it would solutions. If we would have to deal with separate district representatives for county services and representation it would be akin to dividing a household with a family and asking them to use separate utilities. This would be more chaotic than keeping the family together where they can operate as a unified team.

In considering what is at stake I urge that you keep Altadena as it currently stands fully as a town under district 5 and draw the lines where individual small towns are not split into pieces in order to preserve the integrity of the community, which is a family of citizens.

Thanks for your thoughtful consideration.

Greg Middleton
Altadena Citizen.

[REDACTED]

Best Regards,

Joseph Derthick

[Redacted]

Cell: [Redacted] Fax: ([Redacted])
[Redacted] Long Beach CA 90802

[Redacted]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:18 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:39 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
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: Griselda Ceja [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 2:02 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Redistricting

Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 7, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely, griselda ceja rodriguez

Name : griselda ceja rodriguez

Street Address : [REDACTED]

City/Zip : south gate CA

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:19 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:29 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
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: L Sanchez [mailto:p[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 3:02 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Cc: tony90701@yahoo.com
Subject: Redistricting

Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Guadalupe Sanchez


Hacienda Heights, CA 91745

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:20 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:15 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
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: Eva Ramirez [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 6:05 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Redistricting

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

From: Don Knabe
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 4:58 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

[REDACTED]

From: Bob Leslie - Denison [mailto:b[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 4:40 PM
To: Don Knabe
Subject: Redistricting

Don:

Thank you for the notice of time for the hearing on Tuesday. Unfortunately, I won't be able to make the hearing, but I can assure you I am in favor of Plan A2. There are enough problems at this time without causing more disruption. I believe the adjustments should be made with as little shifting around as possible.

Burton Chace started Marina del Rey and the Fourth District should continue to be responsible for it. So far, the Fourth District has done a good job. Keep it up!!!

Good luck.

Bob Leslie

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:26 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: redistricting

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:15 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
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: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2011 7:42 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: redistricting

Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Faith Brandstetter

[REDACTED]

Gardena, CA 90249

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 8:37 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

Importance: High

FYI

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Gloria Molina; SecondDistrict; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Michael D. Antonovich; AskDon
Cc: ceo@norwalkchamber.com; chamber@cerritos.org
Subject: Redistricting
Importance: High

To the Honorable Members of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

As an independent businessman & President of the Norwalk Chamber of Commerce, I feel compelled to weigh in on the two (2) proposed plans before you. I took time for live testimony at the July 13th BRC meeting, but feel that my opinions were either ignored or lost amongst the other commentary presented that day.

- 1) I have been raised, educated, worked & lived in what is now the current 4th District for the past 50 years.
- 2) While diverse in socio-economic & ethnic make-up, the 4th District has over the years developed many interdependent relationships between the various cities, ethnic communities, businesses & non-profits that comprise the current District boundaries.
- 3) Don Kanabe & his predecessor Dean Dana have shown what great leadership is by establishing an incredible network of offices & staff members that respond quickly to any issues, no matter what the size. The Supervisor has always become personally involved whenever possible.
- 4) Census data should be used to realign current District boundaries (Plan A2) with minimal disruption to existing relationships & programs already in place. Any change in Supervisor will create an environment of confusion in the affected community, having to realign district staff & learn about new constituent's needs. If it isn't broken, then don't try to fix it.
- 5) **Census data should not be used to "reinvent the wheel" as a power grab that can destroy communities which have become interdependent over the past 20 plus years (Plan S1). I can see no other reason to even consider this plan. It is highly divisive to all communities & serves no other purpose than an attempt at political power redistribution. Do not play politics with your constituents, represent us.**

Unfortunately I am unable to attend your Tuesday August 9th meeting where these plans will be discussed in further detail. Please consider entering my comments on the official record next Tuesday as a concerned constituent & business community leader.

Best Regards,

Joseph Derthick
[REDACTED]

Cell: ([REDACTED]) | Fax: ([REDACTED])
[REDACTED] 720 Long Beach CA 90802

[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:11 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:08 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting

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

From: Jeff Maljian [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 7:43 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Redistricting

To whom it may concern,

We are writing requesting that as the process continues for redistricting, that Altadena remain in the 5th district when the final plan is adopted. We urge you to consider our request.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Susan Maljian

[REDACTED]
Altadena
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:11 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:08 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting

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

From: HAROLD J BISSNER [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 5:49 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject:

Regarding redistricting. Altadena shares a common school district with both Pasadena and Sierra Madre. Additionally our geography and economies are tied in many aspects to JPL and Cal Tech to name just two institutions.

Altadena must remain in the Fifth.

Sincerely and with great concern,

Harold Bissner

[REDACTED]
Harold James Bissner III
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:12 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:03 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting

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

From: michael reilly [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 11:02 AM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject:

To whom it may concern

Please take into consideration my opposition to this proposed redistricting of our Altadena area and the subsequent change in County Supervisors this would more than likely cause.

My wife and I have lived in the Altadena area since 1997 and have been extremely happy with the way Supervisor Antonovich, Republican (I am a Socialist and my wife is a card carrying Democrat) has managed the district. During this time there have been a number of contentious issues that needed to be addressed. These would have affected the quality of life for residents of this area to varying degrees. I am please to say that despite the negative press of late about the corrupt nature of local politics in some parts of Southern California, Supervisor Antonovich's office and the local Altadena Town Council handled these matters in such a manner as to truly represent the interests of the community they were elected to represent.

I see no logical reason, aside from political maneuvering (which may have some justification in the South West and North East of the county) why our Altadena district should not be allowed to continue it's reasonably harmonious course with it's present oversight. The Unincorporated area that is Altadena is fairly evenly split between Blacks and Whites, with a fairly small Hispanic and Asian population.

A large population of Hispanic people live south of Woodbury Ave, which is in incorporated Pasadena and not Altadena, so it would appear that logically if proportional representation is truly the aim of the boundary commission any line redrawn in this area to accommodate a demographic shift favoring Hispanics would arguably be south of Woodbury Ave. Many of our neighbors feel much the same way as my wife and I do, and feel that our voices and opinions should be heard in this matter. As an aside, I find the idea that forms of tribalism being required to address the notion of fairness in a modern society a sad commentary on the progress of the human condition.

Please understand this community is not given to seeking to be contentious about every proposal that arises, but in this matter, I for one as a resident and homeowner in this community will not take lightly any decision that goes against the interests and wishes of the community at large. I have spoken to quite a number of people in this area and the consensus is that we resent that our community could be used as a pawn in some political game and will take serious issue with those who would choose to do so in serving their self interest at our expense.

Michael Reilly

[REDACTED]
Altadena California 91001

email: [REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:11 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: REDRESTRICTING PROPOSAL

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:09 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: REDRESTRICTING PROPOSAL

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

From: Steven Durham [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:40 AM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: REDRESTRICTING PROPOSAL

Altadena is a unique, established community that has been well served over a long period of time by the 5th District, and Supervisor Antonovich. There is no good reason to disrupt our lives and well being by “re-districting” for what appears an accommodation of a specific ethnic group, and in essence... “stacking the ballot box.”

Altadena has been, and remains a homogeneous blend of ethnic groups, with not one favored over the other. To make changes that would be disruptive - for that purpose, would be unfair, impractical, and racist. Changing or splitting existing district boundaries is a waste of tax money, and will only create dissention and tensions in an unincorporated area that has demonstrated tolerance over the years.

DO NOT MAKE ANY CHANGES TO OUR EXISTING 5TH DISTRICT WHICH WOULD CREATE A DEVIDE BOTH IN ALTADENA, AND ALL THE SERVICES AND COMMON SHARED ISSUES WE HAVE WITH OUR DISCTICT NEIGHBORS!!! THIS IS WRONG AND MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN.

Steven M. Durham

████████████████████
FAX: ██████████

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:12 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Request to Keep Altadena in 5th District

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:04 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Request to Keep Altadena in 5th District

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

From: Clark Hansen [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 12:16 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Request to Keep Altadena in 5th District

I'd like to request that the Board of Supervisors allow Altadena to continue to be in the Fifth Supervisorial District.

I've lived in Altadena for the past 22 years, the last 20 of them at 281 East Pentagon Street.

Thank you for considering my request and adding my name to others in favor of keeping Altadena in the fifth.

--Clark Hansen
[REDACTED]

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:54 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Status quo wanted

FYI

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:38 AM
To: Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Status quo wanted

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 7:35 AM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Status quo wanted

I am against splitting the communities of Pasadena, Altadena and Glendale to be placed under Supervisor Gloria Modina's district. We have a common interest and would like to remain under Supervisor Michael Antonovich's district.

Joan Clay Manley
Altadena Resident

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:21 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:13 AM
To: Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Cc: Cieplik, Michael
Subject: FW: Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:49 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 8, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Juan Diaz

[REDACTED]
Paramount, Ca. 90723

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 8:03 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Support a Second Latino District!

FYI

From: Ana Valdez [mailto:va[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 5:13 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: Support a Second Latino District!

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!

Ana Valdez

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:20 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Support for Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:14 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Support for Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 9:08 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Support for Redistricting Plan S1

August 8, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Madeline Shapiro

[REDACTED]
Whittier CA 90605

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:18 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Support

FYI

From: C. T. Weber [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:28 AM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: Support

Supervisor Antonovich,

I am writing to ask the Board of Supervisors to create two Latina(o) supervisorial districts in Los Angeles County.
Thank you.

C. T. Weber
Peace and Freedom Party of California
State Chairperson

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:16 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Supporting Redistricting

FYI

From: Medina, Katherine **On Behalf Of** ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:41 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Supporting Redistricting

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

From: John [mailto:]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 3:49 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Supporting Redistricting

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Gilbert "Johnny" Saenz



La Puente, CA. 91744

{Sent from my iPhone}

August 8, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Phillip Ramirez


Los Angeles, CA 90001

EDWARD F. CLARK
4267 MARINA CITY DRIVE # 108
MARINA DEL REY, CA. 90295

Mr. Curt Pederson, Chairman

L.A. County Boundary Review Committee

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street Room 381B

Los Angeles, CA. 90012


Dear Mr. Pederson;

I respectfully request that you and the Review Committee continue Marina Del Rey within the boundary under the supervision of Donald Knabe as proposed in plan A-2.

Supervisor Knabe is sensitive to our needs at the Marina City Club. Any change in representation would place extreme hardship on all of us. It is my feeling that a new Supervisor would have great difficulty in understanding the complexity of our relationship with the County, Beaches and Harbor and the major leaseholder Essex.

Thank you.

Respectfully,


Edward F. Clark

CC: S. Cooley

J. Noguez

L. Bacca

From: Lee Doyle [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 5:39 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Plan A-2

To all Supervisors,
we are in favor of Plan A-2, Please vote accordingly.

Margaret & Lee Doyle

[REDACTED]

Walnut, CA 91789 (County of Los angeles, Rowland Heights district)

Subject: RE: Keep Antonovich

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:54 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Keep Antonovich

FYI

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

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:36 AM
To: Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Keep Antonovich

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

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


From: Rachel Figura [mailto:
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 11:30 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Keep Antonovich

Hi, good evening,

I'm a resident of Altadena and encourage you to keep Michael Antonovich as our supervisor.

We are happy with his non-bias support and need him with us!

Thank you,
Rachel Figura


Altadena, Ca. 91001

From: CommServ
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:16 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

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

From: Medina, Katherine On Behalf Of ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:41 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

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

From: Marco Flores [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 8:06 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

August 6, 2011

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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

m a flores


Deliver me from the workers of iniquity,
and save me from bloody men.

-59-

*For identification purposes only

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message is intended to be viewed only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited without my prior permission. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee of agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, or if you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message and any copies of it from your computer system.

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

From: CommServ
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:15 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

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

From: Medina, Katherine On Behalf Of ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:42 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

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

From: Diaz, Lleonel [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 1:23 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 6, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Leonel Diaz


Los Angeles CA 90001

Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:14 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

FYI

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

From: Medina, Katherine On Behalf Of ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:48 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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

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

From: Cuevas, Irma [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 9:59 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

Subject: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

August 8, 2011

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

RE: LA County Redistricting Plan S1

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 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. The S1 proposal does 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.

Sincerely,

Irma Cuevas


Artesia, CA 90701

From: CommServ
To: Phyllis Schoen
Subject: RE: Redistricting LA County 2011

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

From: Phyllis Schoen [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 9:34 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting LA County 2011

I have viewed your maps of districts, current and proposed, but do not see any street names. Where can I see or read the actual current and proposed boundaries with these names so as to see what would happen to my neighborhood???

From: CommServ
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Redistricting Plan A-2

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 5:41 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting Plan A-2

I am a resident of the Fourth District. In July,2011 I attended a Redistricting hearing and made a presentation to support minimal change. I am asking your Board to refrain from moving millions of residents out of their districts. Such a move would split neighborhoods and communities that have been linked together for many years.

I support the plan known as A-2.

Carol Gardner

From: CommServ
Subject: RE: Redistricting plan

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:12 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting plan

FYI

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

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:06 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting plan

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

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

From: Cynthia Tilleman [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 12:22 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Redistricting plan

To whom it may concern:

Please leave the boundaries for Altadena as they stand, we are happy with the services for our community and with Michael Antonivich. We have lived in Altadena for 13 years would like to remain here.

Best, Cynthia Tilleman

[REDACTED]
Altadena, Ca. 91001

From: CommServ
Subject: RE: Redistricting plan

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:12 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting plan

FYI

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

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:06 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting plan

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

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

From: Cynthia Tilleman [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 12:22 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Redistricting plan

To whom it may concern:

Please leave the boundaries for Altadena as they stand, we are happy with the services for our community and with Michael Antonovich. We have lived in Altadena for 13 years would like to remain here.

Best, Cynthia Tilleman

[REDACTED]
Altadena, Ca. 91001

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

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 10:48 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting

I support plan A2.

Kathryn Marshall

From: CommServ
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: RE: Redistricting

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:12 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

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

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 11:06 AM
To: 'molina@bos.lacounty.gov'; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; 'don@bos.lacounty.gov'; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting

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

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

From: Chuck Johnson [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 1:57 PM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Redistricting

I am a resident of Altadena and I am against the proposed redistricting.

From: CommServ
Subject: RE: Redistricting

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:54 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Redistricting

FYI

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

From: Zarate, Marisol
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:39 AM
To: Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Redistricting

The following e-mail is being forwarded to you from the BOS Customer Service Center e-mail for your review/information.

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

From: Bob Warner [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 9:20 AM
To: BOS Customer Service Center
Subject: Redistricting

Dear Sir or Madam,

My wife and I have run a small private school in Altadena for the past 27 years and have appreciated the work of Supervisor Antonovich in our area. Please approve the recommended plan to leave Altadena in the 5th District.

Sincerely,
Robert Warner

Sent from my iPhone

From: CommServ
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Rowland Heights A-2 Plan

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 3:48 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: saverowlandheights@gmail.com
Subject: Rowland Heights A-2 Plan

Dear County Supervisory Committee:

As 46-year residents of Rowland Heights (57 yo and 81 yo), we strongly recommend the approval of the A-2 Plan. The county planning commission meetings that were held in Rowland Heights concerning the proposed apartment complex rezoning showed our resolve with over 500 citizens in attendance. Even though we are in an unincorporated area of the county, we do have a voice.

Yours truly,

Maria and Christina Fernandez
[REDACTED]
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

From: CommServ
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: RE: Supporting Redistricting

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:16 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: FW: Supporting Redistricting

FYI

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

From: Medina, Katherine On Behalf Of ExecutiveOffice
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 12:42 PM
To: Michael D. Antonovich
Subject: FW: Supporting Redistricting

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

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

From: John [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 3:37 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Supporting Redistricting

To Tony Mendoza;

I support the new LA County Redistricting Plan.

Sincerely, Gilbert "Johnny" Saenz

P.S.; here is my address to include my signature.

████████████████████
La Puente, CA. 91744

{Sent from my iPhone}

From: Bill Partridge <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 5:03 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting LA County 2011

My name is William E. Partridge, I live at [REDACTED] Torrance, 90505.
For the past 35 years that we have lived here we have enjoyed the services rendered and responsiveness of the Supervisor's staff. Any issues or problems concerning County facilities or services are handled in a prompt manner and problems are resolved. We are extremely content with the District as currently configured and would prefer for the District to remain essentially as it is, understanding that certain adjustments must be made in order to accommodate the population. But, since the population hasn't changed all that dramatically over the past 10 years, I would think that any boundary changes could be made without drastic shifts of population.
We like our supervisor and the staff and would prefer to continue to be part of our same district, as we have for the past 30 plus years.
Thank you,
Bill and Audrey Partridge

From: JIM STEWART <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 2:03 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting

I am a resident of Hacienda Heights, represented by Supervisor Don Knabe. From what I have read, one redistricting plan, would affect 3,000,000, whereas the other, A2, would only affect 150,000. Obviously, the latter plan would be the most appropriate. Mr. Knabe has been an outstanding supervisor, and has a high profile in Hacienda Hts. He is easily accesible. Being unincorporated, I feel he has been very supportive of our community.

Sincerely,
Jean Stewart

[REDACTED]
Hacienda hts, CA 91745

League of United Latin American Citizens



Santa Ana LULAC Council #147

Established: National - 1929 | Santa Ana - 1946

Orange County LULAC District #1

PO Box 1810, Santa Ana, CA 92702-1810

August 4, 2011

Hon. Michael D. Antonovich
5th District Supervisor
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
500 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisor Antonovich:

Over the past several months, Santa Ana LULAC Council #147 has taken the lead of community groups and individuals in Orange County to put its efforts in the redistricting of county supervisorial seats. Although our participation has been welcomed; we fully recognize that our input has been set aside. Quite frankly, it has been ignored by the county redistricting committee, composed of the chiefs of staff for the county supervisors. The Board of Supervisors will be holding their own public hearing later this month on the recommended plans. I bring to your attention that the recommended plans do not include LULAC's plan or any plan submitted by the public.

This is the reason Santa Ana LULAC is writing this letter of support on behalf of the Latino community in Los Angeles County, to emphasize the tremendous demographic changes of county residents as evidenced by the 2010 U.S. Census results. Between 2000 and 2010, the Latino population in Los Angeles County grew by nearly half a million residents, while the non-Latino population lost nearly 150,000 people. Latinos now make up almost half the population of Los Angeles County.

Santa Ana LULAC urges the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to draw a second Latino-majority district as required by the Voting Rights Act. As the Board is well aware, it was some twenty years ago that the County lost a Voting Rights Act lawsuit that proved the supervisors had intentionally sought to prevent the creation of a Latino district.

Although the Supervisor's Advisory Commission was presented with several proposed maps creating a second Latino-majority district, it is noted representatives appointed by Supervisors Antonovich, Knabe, and Yaroslavsky rejected each of those proposals.

Please review the history of redistricting in Los Angeles County; the county government lost a costly lawsuit the last time it tried to ignore the Federal Voting Rights Act. We ask that the Board of Supervisors does not again waste taxpayer money by triggering another successful lawsuit.

Please contact me if you have any questions; I can be reached at zekeher@yahoo.com or by telephone (cell) at 714-661-4428.

Sincerely,

/s/ Zeke Hernandez
President
Santa Ana LULAC #147
Past California LULAC State Director

Marsha Williams

Long Beach, CA 90814

August 7, 2011

The Honorable Don Knabe
Supervisor, Fourth District
500 West Temple Street, Room 822
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Redistricting

Dear Supervisor Knabe:

I very much wish that I could be there in person at the upcoming board meeting regarding the redistricting issues relative to the Fourth District. Although being there in person is not possible, I sincerely hope that this letter will be duly considered and read openly during public comment.

I wish to voice my wholehearted support for redistricting Plan A2 and urge all members of the board to vote on behalf of this plan. Plan A2 is far less disruptive to the residents and constituents not only of the current fourth district, but of those in other districts that would be moved into the 4th. As a Black woman residing in the Belmont Heights area, I am very pleased both to live in the 4th district and to have voted for Supervisor Knabe in the last several elections. The staff of this office has always been very expedient and helpful in all personal matters I have brought to their attention.

Further, I find it to be nearly blatant racism that those who propose plan S1 wish to do so in order to create a second Latino district. Why, in this day and age are people reverting to the creation of ethnic silos instead of a continuous integration of cultures and ethnicities across the county? Frankly, Plan S1 smacks of the worse form of potential political gerrymandering in order to create an electoral power base. As an independent-minded tax payer, I am vehemently opposed to Plan S1 and what I perceive to be the shenanigans and political posturing behind it. Again, I urge the entire board to unanimously approve redistricting Plan A2.

Sincerely,



Marsha Williams