

From: Andrew Mukhey [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 7:48 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Regarding redistricting

Importance: High

Hello Councilmen,

I am against both T1 and S1 redistricting plans. The Third district should be left alone as is. Respectfully,
Andrew Mukhey, LA 90049

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 9:39 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: I support Zev Yaroslavsky's attached message

Please read and support Zev Yaroslavsky's positions and analysis in the message linked below--

commserv@bos.lacounty.gov.

Arthur Vogelsang

[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90046

From: bing feng [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 9:42 AM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Redistricting Plan for Rowland Heights

Dear sirs,

I have attended several of the hearings of the redistricting committee and watched the process with concern. I was very relieved when I heard the committee was recommending plan A-2 because I think it is the one that makes the most sense. As a number of other speakers have pointed out, A-2 impacts the fewest number of people and I think that is important due to the financial problems many families are currently experiencing because of the recession. Residents living in unincorporated area who are moved to a new district would be especially impacted. Please listen to your constituents. Do not make drastic changes to the current supervisor districts against the will of the people.

Bing-Nan Feng

[REDACTED]
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 7:17 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: redistricting

For those who are REALLY concerned,

The San Fernando Valley is and has been diverse so many years. Family and friends live in the Valley and any redistricting is not advantageous to us. Breaking our collective harmony and dividing us is not a benefit to anyone except those running for office. Do not step on us we may not be so easy to push over this time. Thank you, Bob Jacobi
Jacobi Building Materials.

A valley business since 1959.....

From: David Burtch [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 2:04 PM
To: CommServ
Cc: Yaroslavsky, Zev
Subject: County Supervisor re-districting

To whom it may concern:

I am looking at the two proposals for re-districting the supervisorial districts. The very first thing that strikes me is that both proposals violate the very first and most fundamental concept of any political district and that is the concept of grouping communities of interest and geography. I see my district, currently the 3rd district which encompasses almost 100% of the San Fernando Valley being divided into 3 districts, each lumped in with distant communities with no common interest or geography. I see the largest part of the Valley being combined with beach communities as far away as Long Beach. I see both of these proposals as ridiculously gerrymandered districts, obviously gerrymandered for some political purpose other than serving the constituents of LA County. It would make much more sense to make minor adjustments to the current districts according to population changes since the last census and call it a day. The San Fernando Valley is one community of interest as well as a geographical community and should be in one common district. I urge that you reject each of the other proposals and begin with fine tuning our current districts in such a way as to bring the balance of the Valley into the 3rd district.

Sincerely,

David Burtch

[REDACTED]
Woodland Hills, CA. 91367

DAVID BURTCH
VICE PRESIDENT

[REDACTED]
WWW.AMERITELINC.COM



From: elena estrin [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 5:49 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting Comment: Do Not Approve the Currently Proposed Maps for New District Areas

Dear Supervisors:

I do not believe that either of the two maps proposed for future LA County Supervisorial districts improves upon the current district boundaries. The proposed new districts shift large numbers of residents into new districts that they did not have any say in voting for their representatives, and fragments existing communities that have been working collaboratively for many years. These collaborative relationships take years to develop and the proposed new districts will tear these efforts apart and set back progress. If any changes need to be made, they should begin with the current boundaries and slightly adjust those boundaries if population figures warrant an update

The County has the good fortune of being able to fashion its own maps -- no citizen appointed panel has been charged with this important task. And yet it seems that the individuals involved with the responsibility of creating the new districts lack the knowledge of how our communities relate to themselves and to one another. While those fashioning the maps may be well-versed in the numbers of types of voters, they seem unable to grasp the importance of community identity and of the relationship of voters to their supervisor and district. The new plan could actually alienate voters from their county government which I must believe was not a goal of those involved in creating the new county maps.

Please vote to reject the proposed district maps and instead seek a new plan -- one that better reflects the communities that you represent and one that does not disenfranchise large portions of the county's voters.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elena Estrin

From: Eng Lieu [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 1:24 PM
To: ExecutiveOffice
Subject: Strongly against T-1 & support A-3
Attachments: Letter-2.doc; Letter-3.doc

We're residents of Hacienda Heights.

Please see that the attached letter is sent to all 5 [supervisors](#).

Sincerely yours,
Fong-Yi & Eng-Hwa-Lieu

Letter #2

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to give testify.

The Boundary Commission and its staff spent many months obtaining input from a large number of residents throughout the County, and many hours analyzing the various plans submitted. It concluded that Plan A-2 was the best choice because it moved the least number of people and caused the least disruption. I wholeheartedly agree that they made the right recommendation. Many of the plans submitted seemed to be the epitome of gerrymandering at its worst.

In these hard economic times people need consistency, not massive change. I urge you to do what is right for the residents of the County, not what is political. Please approve plan A-2.

Letter #3

I have attended several of the hearings of the redistricting committee and watched the process with concern. I was very relieved when I heard the committee was recommending plan A-2 because I think it is the one that makes the most sense. As a number of other speakers have pointed out, A-2 impacts the fewest number of people and I think that is important due to the financial problems many families are currently experiencing because of the recession. Residents living in unincorporated area who are moved to a new district would be especially impacted.

Please listen to your constituents. Do not make drastic changes to the current supervisor districts against the will of the people.

From: CommServ
To: Robert F. Phillips
Subject: RE: Opposed to T1 and S2

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

From: Robert F. Phillips [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 11:14 AM
To: CommServ
Subject: Opposed to T1 and S2

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I have been a Topanga resident and homeowner for 11 years. I've always followed the local politics with great interest and have usually admired the Board's decisions and actions given the conflicting needs and interest groups they must address and satisfy.

Because of my general favorable attitude toward our local governance I've seldom spoken out other than to cast my ballot in every election. However, I feel that I must communicate my vehement objection to the redistricting plans T1 and S2. I know the district maps have to be updated to reflect population shifts. Nonetheless, the maps presented in T1 and S2 are not the best that can be done.

I don't have the answer to how the new maps should look but I urge you to re-think the plans.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,
Robert Phillips

Robert F. Phillips
[REDACTED]

From: Rosemary Mcmillan [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 7:20 PM
To: CommServ
Subject: Redistricting Comments: PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE CURRENTLY PROPOSED MAPS FOR NEW DISTRICT AREAS

RE: DO NOT APPROVE THE CURRENTLY PROPOSED MAPS FOR NEW DISTRICT AREA. OPPOSE THE TWO CURRENT PLANS, T1 AND S2.

Dear Supervisors:

We are writing you to request that you vote to REJECT the proposed district maps, T1 and S2, and instead find a new plan.....one that reflects the communities that you represent and one that does NOT disenfranchise large portions of the county's voters.

We are OPPOSED to the two current plans, T1 and S2.....they are counterproductive to the governance of our district and the County as a whole. They would destroy established relationships and set back progress on important community issues...

Thank you for your consideration
Rosemary and Fred McMillan

Letter #1

Honorable Supervisors,

My name is Simona Huang. I am a resident of Rowland Heights and I am appearing here today to ask you to select plan A-2 as recommended by the Boundary Redistricting Committee. It is far superior to plan S-1 and all of the other plans that have been suggested because it relocates the fewest number of people. Plan S-1 would move approximately 3.4 million people into new districts and for what reason?

Our current districts work fine as constituted. Plan A-2 provides the minimal amount of disruption while still meeting the goal of having approximately the same number of constituents in each district. Times are tough right now, residents do not need all the uncertainty and problems that would be created by a massive relocation of district boundaries.