

**From:** Brenda Jahn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 11:46 AM  
**To:** CommServ  
**Subject:** Boundary Review Committee

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We recommend Plan A-2 for the Fourth District which is the least disruptive plan and respects the wishes of the people.

Brenda & Peter Jahn  
Whittier, CA

**From:** Michael D. Antonovich  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 8:34 AM  
**To:** CommServ  
**Subject:** FW: Comment in support of proposed redistricting plan - Altadena district unchanged.

fyi

---

**From:** Zarate, Marisol  
**Sent:** Friday, August 05, 2011 9:46 AM  
**To:** Gloria Molina; The Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas; Yaroslavsky, Zev; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich  
**Subject:** FW: Comment in support of proposed redistricting plan - Altadena district unchanged.

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

---

**From:** Warren Skidmore [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 04, 2011 11:45 PM  
**To:** BOS Customer Service Center  
**Subject:** Comment in support of proposed redistricting plan - Altadena district unchanged.

To the LA County Board of Supervisors,

I want to note my support for not changing the district boundaries for Altadena, Pasadena and Sierra Madre in the redistricting plan.

Sincerely,

Warren Skidmore, Altadena resident, [REDACTED] Altadena, CA 91001.

Dr. Warren Skidmore,

[REDACTED]  
Pasadena,  
CA 91105, USA

[REDACTED]  
TMT office  
TMT Fax

**From:** Michael D. Antonovich  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 8:34 AM  
**To:** CommServ  
**Subject:** FW: Stop Gerrymandering To Prevent The Creation of A Second Largely-Latino District in Los Angeles County

fyi

---

**From:** Tom Sanchez [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 03, 2011 2:25 PM  
**To:** Yaroslavsky, Zev  
**Cc:** molina@bos.lacounty.org; Don Knabe; Michael D. Antonovich; seconddistrict@bos.lacounty.org  
**Subject:** Stop Gerrymandering To Prevent The Creation of A Second Largely-Latino District in Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Yaroslavsky:

I was appalled to find out that you, Supervisor Knabe, and Supervisor Antonovich refused to approve any redistricting map that would create a another largely-Latino district for Los Angeles County. I can understand any political reasons for not doing this but doing so disenfranchises up to half a million new Latino residents in Los Angeles County of their fair, entitled representation by Los Angeles County government. I thought such measures went out with the Civil Rights Era. I cannot believe your political future would be threatened by the re-creation of L.A. County maps to show a new largely-Latino district resulting from the 2010 Census data. I hope I've been mistaken. If not, know that many of those extra half million new Latino residents of Los Angeles County will add their numbers to the community that existed before 2010 to ensure that the Latino community in Los Angeles County gets the fair, equitable representation that it is entitled to have.

Yours respectfully,

Tom Sanchez  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, CA 90031  
[REDACTED]

**From:** Michael D. Antonovich  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 1:50 PM  
**To:** CommServ  
**Subject:** FW: Support the creation of a second Latino district!

FYI

---

**From:** Beatriz Myers [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 1:41 PM  
**To:** Michael D. Antonovich  
**Subject:** Support the creation of a second Latino district!

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 county's population.

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!

PLEASE DRAW A SECOND LATINO DISTRICT.

Respectfully,  
Beatriz Myers

SHARON M.Y. LOWE, ESQUIRE

LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

Email [REDACTED]  
Mobile: (323)459-7931

August 8, 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 while it would create two supervisorial districts with populations that would be both majority Latino and geographically compact, it also is comprised of the County's API and diverse ethnic immigrant neighborhoods that share similar economic development, social and cultural needs, issues, and experiences of development as the region's emerging neighborhoods and electorate.

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 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,



---

Sharon M.Y. Lowe, Esq.  
Environmental Justice Community Planner

**From:** michael diaz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 10:22 AM  
**To:** CommServ  
**Subject:** marina city club

The proposed boundaries (A-2) retain Marina Del Rey in the Fourth Supervisorial District represented by Don Knabe. Any change in the boundaries will place an extreme hardship on us here at the Marina City Club in Marina Del Rey.

- Michael Diaz



# MONTEBELLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education

123 South Montebello Boulevard, Montebello, California 90640  
(323) 887-7900, ext. 2201 • Fax: (323) 887-5890

August 5, 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 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.

### **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

EDWIN CHAU, President  
HECTOR A. CHACON, Vice President  
MARCELLA CALDERON, Clerk  
GERRI GUZMAN, Member  
DAVID VELA, Member

### **ADMINISTRATION**

ROBERT G. HENKE, Superintendent of Schools  
CLEVE A. PELL, Superintendent of Schools  
ARTHUR P. REVUELTA, Deputy Superintendent  
CHERYL A. PLOTKIN, Assistant Superintendent – Business Services  
JILL E. ROJAS, Interim Assistant Superintendent – Human Resources  
DEBORAH DE LA TORRE, Interim Assistant Superintendent – Instructional Services  
MICHAEL G. COBARRUBIAS, Interim Assistant Superintendent, Pupil & Community Services

Board of Supervisors/Boundary Review Committee  
August 5, 2011  
Page 2

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 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,



David Vela  
Board Member  
Montebello Unified School District

**From:** CommServ  
**To:** Michael D. Antonovich  
**Subject:** RE: CITIZENS/REDISTRICTION

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich  
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2011 8:34 AM  
To: CommServ  
Subject: FW: CITIZENS/REDISTRICTION

fyi

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

From: EARIS VAILS [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 4:44 PM  
To: Michael D. Antonovich  
Subject: CITIZENS/REDISTRICTION

Hi I am a Democrat and I am not satisfied with what has happened to the BLACK RACE. Every since Judge C. Carter signed off on Affirmative Action and Clinton open the borders and Bush said that we did not want to work, my BLACK MEN have not been getting any jobs. You have not been watching out for them.

All of the Democrats have not done well by US "Blacks". All the companies have hired all HISPANICS. Now why did you let that happen???? Every where you look from A-Z it is only one race that have a job, from Gardening to Housekeeping to Security to Truck Driving to Hospital to Construction, Don't you people feel any SHAME????

Looks like you don't. All of this is not RIGHT.

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO DO ABOUT THIS???? BECAUSE NEXT TIME I WILL TAKE IT TO THE STREETS TO GO AGAINST ALL DEMOCRATS.

We have families that need to be fed and we are ALL LEGAL here.

One more thing WHY DO AMERICAN have to speak SPANISH???

And why should this REDISTRICKING include people that are not CITIZENS????? They "ILegals" have come to the USA and have gotten their AMERICAN DREAM. They get housing, money, jobs etc., and the AMERICANS are on the outside and not even looking in.

Why is the GOVERNMENT not putting these people in jail for hiring these people.  
"THEY DON'T HAVE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS" how are they helping society???

And when the stadium is build downtown I fell AFFIRMATIVE ACTION should be put into the contract for those contractors to assure that BLACK and AMERICANS will get the jobs.

Ms Earis Vails [REDACTED]

**From:** CommServ  
**Subject:** RE: Keep what we have

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

**From:** Mary Lou [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 9:54 AM  
**To:** CommServ  
**Subject:** Keep what we have

there is enough problems in L A county lets not changes the ones that work. Don has done a good job for us if it's not broke don't fix it.

Thank you Mary Lou Maury

**From:** CommServ  
**Subject:** RE: Redistricting

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich  
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2011 8:35 AM  
To: CommServ  
Subject: FW: Redistricting

fyi

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

From: PreciaG [mailto:████████████████████]  
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2011 4:12 PM  
To: Michael D. Antonovich  
Subject: Redistricting

Message for the body  
Thank for all do for us  
Please insist that they redraw voting  
District to give the Latinos their fair  
Voting rights

Sent from my iPhone  
Ramona Preciado

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** CommServ  
**Subject:** RE: Redistricting

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

From: Michael D. Antonovich  
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2011 8:35 AM  
To: CommServ  
Subject: FW: Redistricting

fyi

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

From: Gilbert Preciseo [mailto:  
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2011 3:58 PM  
To: Michael D. Antonovich  
Subject: Redistricting

Thank for all do for us  
Please insist that they redraw voting  
District to give the Latinos their fair  
Voting rights

Sent from my iPhone  
Gilbert Preciado

Sent from my iPhone

# Pomona Habla/Speaks Community Coalition

August 8, 2011

Los Angeles County Review Committee and  
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Hall of Administration  
500 W. Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Los Angeles County Review Committee and Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

Pomona Habla/Speaks Community Coalition was formed over three years ago by San Gabriel and Pomona Valley community organizations and leaders in order to aid the poor and immigrant communities of Pomona in their goal of bettering Pomona City Policies that negatively affected their daily lives. Our community coalition is committed to the core principles enshrined in the intent of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 of equal electoral opportunities, or racial fairness.

With the above in mind, we write to you today with great concern about redistricting plans currently under consideration which would affect supervisorial district lines at 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, 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 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 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 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 S-1 Plan. This outcome is particularly true when taking into account Latinos' generally lower 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 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.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Arturo Jimenez', written in a cursive style.

On Behalf of Pomona Habla/Speaks  
Arturo Jimenez  
ArtJimenez@Verizon.net