

Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Special Meeting (10/20/2021)

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
5.a.	Lena Ayvazian	Favor	Federal Compliance Consulting LLC, letter dated May 14, 2021.	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	Allison M Flashberg	Other	We have a big concern with aligning our communities with much of the southern San Fernando Valley. We are an equestrian area and have more common interests with Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Encino/Studio City, etc. We have a year round concern of wildfires due to the surrounding canyons, fierce winds, etc. Please consider alignment with like concerned entities. We are far more rural, offering unique challenges that are not as high a priority for the "city like" communities of the Valley. Thank you for the consideration.	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Cindy bloom	Oppose	I feel that the general area of the San Fernando Valley is too large of an area with different needs and interests. If the SVF is broken up into the NW SFV and NE SVF to attain the population numbers, please set the boundaries according to community feedback. My feedback is that the NE SFV shares many of the same interests as the Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita, and Burbank/Glendale/Pasadena. We unfortunately share high fire hazard severity zones, are adjacent to the Angeles National Forest, have horsekeeping properties and	10/18/2021	n/a

			businesses, and will be impacted from the proposed high speed train. Therefore, I would advocate splitting the NW and NE SV at an appropriate point where our interests diverge. Additionally, I would advocate to keep the NE SFV within Supervisor Barger's district. She has served us well, and she and her staff are very responsive and capable.		
5.b.	Denise Anderson	Oppose	-	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	Dina L Fisher	Other	As an 11-year resident of Chatsworth Lake Manor and active member of the Chatsworth Lake Manor Town Council, I am adamantly opposed to my community being removed from the 5th District. I've seen maps that would place my rural community in the 4th district with highly urbanized communities of the San Fernando Valley. My community has spent years building strong working relationships with other rural communities in the 5th District, including Acton, Kagel Canyon, Twin Lakes, Agua Dulce, and others in the Antelope Valley. Together our informal coalition of rural unincorporated communities have solved common problems not shared by the highly urban areas in District 4. Our Town Council and community members have carefully developed a strong relationship with District 5's deputies, who deeply understand our community's needs and have worked with us intimately to solve pressing problems. I strongly urge that	10/18/2021	n/a

			Chatsworth Lake Manor be kept in the 5th district with other rural communities, where we belong. It would be a grave disservice to the citizenry here for redistricting to destroy the strong relationships we've painstakingly cultivated throughout District 5.		
5.b.	Dina L Fisher	Other	<p>From Chatsworth Lake Manor Town Council clmcitizens@gmail.com</p> <p>10-18-21</p> <p>TOPIC - Revised Communities of Interest (COIs) Maps</p> <p>We feel strongly that Chatsworth Lake Manor must remain within the 5th District of the County of Los Angeles. We currently reside in the County of Los Angeles 5th Supervisory District with Supervisor Katherine Barger and her administration representing us. There are some who advocate that we in Chatsworth Lake Manor should be redistricted to the 4th District which includes almost all of the San Fernando Valley within the City of Los Angeles. We at the Chatsworth Lake Manor Town Council are unanimously opposed to this idea.</p> <p>We have little in common with the highly urbanized San Fernando Valley, which is becoming more densely populated at a faster pace than ever. We have a very different community agenda and service needs in our rural community. Unlike the city, we have septic systems, not a sewer system. We have propane tanks, no natural gas distribution. We are in a mountainous, very high-risk fire zone, our electrical distribution from So Cal Edison is the</p>	10/18/2021	n/a

		<p>most shut off and at-fire-risk electrical distribution circuit in the entire Southern California Edison service area.</p> <p>We have developed a very close and effective relationship with our local 5th District Field Deputies who are well versed and attentive to the needs of our community, doggedly pursue our issues and look out for our community interests. Lake Manor has never been better represented than it is presently by the 5th District. It is a new paradigm for our community, which has previously had a long history of decades of neglect by our government agencies.</p> <p>The 5th District includes more unincorporated areas than any other district. As a result of that, the 5th District, unlike any other district, has reached out to unincorporated communities to urge them to organize Rural Town Councils so that the community can communicate their needs and be more effectively served by the County government. This program was introduced by former 5th District Supervisor Mike Antonovitch. As a result we have been able to join forces with other unincorporated areas in the 5th District such as Twin Lakes, Kagel Canyon, Agua Dulce and so forth in joint meetings sponsored by the County with representatives from these communities and work together with the County to help address common issues. For example, we successfully formed a collation of unincorporated rural communities to massively improve the PSPS (Public Safety Power Shutoff) situation, thus bettering the daily lives of our community members.</p> <p>Due to the specific suggestion and encouragement from the 5th District,</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Chatsworth Lake Manor Community formed and elected the Chatsworth Lake Manor Citizens Committee Rural Town Council which went on to address multiple community issues over the years such as: Property rezoning errors , preserving the Ecology Pond, Mail Theft, Squatters in Abandoned Houses, Illegal Marijuana Dispensaries, Illegal Dumping, working with Southern California Edison representative to harden our power grid to mitigate wildfire risk with less impact to our community, close communication with the LA County Fire Department Liaison during major fire events, better response by L A County Sheriff's Department to community calls, and working with the County to sponsor a community arts project to name a few. This has been possible through the dedicated and close relationship we have developed with our Field Deputies from the 5th District Jason Maruca and Jarrod Degonia.</p> <p>In conclusion, we want to make our voices heard by stating clearly that we want to remain within the 5th District. We strongly feel we have accomplished much already and will continue to be best represented and most effectively served by 5th District in the future.</p> <p>Sincerely , J. Kip Drabeck, President</p> <p>On behalf of Chatsworth Lake Manor Town Council J. Kip Drabeck , Cherokee O'Dea, Dina Fisher, Robin Hild, Dianna Sprout</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

5.b.	Donna M Lauber	Oppose	<p>High fire hazard canyon where the CREEK FIRE disaster was. Horse people community Agricultural ranch district SCE area. City folks don't blend well with agricultural communities period! Your creating endless conflicts, lawsuits, and building and safety complaints. Makes NO sense! In fires, horse people help each other evacuate. City people don't have a clue and it would be a catastrophic mess to expect this to work. Your opening a Pandora's box! Don't do it!!!!</p>	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	James Horan	Oppose	<p>The rural nature of this community, Kagel Canyon, is very important to maintain. We have many shared interests with District 5, and as a homeowner who's lived here for nearly 20 years, and who loves the nature of this community, I strongly believe we should not be pulled out of it.</p>	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jeff Leeson	Oppose	<p>I live in Kagel Canyon and don't think our community should be part of the San Fernando Valley area. Our region is more closely related in character and function to the Santa Clarita Valley and Antelope Valley. We are a rural community, in unincorporated County, and our utility services are provided by non-city entities. We have very little in common with our neighbors in the valley, but share more in common with other adjoining regions.</p>	10/18/2021	n/a

5.b.	John K Gallegos	Oppose	<p>We have SCE and not DWP like the rest of the Valley.</p> <p>We are unincorporated like many towns above the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys</p> <p>We are in high fire zones unlike much of the Valley</p> <p>We are in horse country</p>	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	John Kasprzak	Favor	<p>Including Kagel Canyon with the rest of San Fernando valley makes no sense, we share little in common. We are zoned for horses, have SCE, not DWP, have the sheriff, are a fire zone, etc</p>	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Kelly E Decker	Oppose	<p>I am a resident of Kagel Canyon, which has historically been a part of the Fifth Supervisorial District. The current map shows our community grouped with the rest of the San Fernando Valley. With respect to keeping together "Communities of Interest," we should NOT be paired with the SFV. Kagel Canyon is an unincorporated community in the Angeles National Forest. Our interests and concerns are more in line with those of other ANF communities and the rural areas towards the north of us. Our primary concerns are maintaining the rural character of our equestrian community and preventing/preparing against wildfires as we are a wildland-urban interface. We have Edison and not DWP as our electricity provider, and we have wells and septic systems instead of city services. Because we are unincorporated, our only representation at the local level has been with the Fifth District, and we wish to keep it that way for the future.</p>	10/19/2021	n/a

			<p>Please redraw the map to move Kagel Canyon into the northern segment with the rest of the ANF.</p> <p>Thank you, Kelly Decker</p>		
5.b.	Kristin C Sabo	Oppose	<p>The North East San Fernando Valley is extremely different than much of the rest of the San Fernando Valley and should be it's own Community of Interest. We share issues like fire danger (fire preparation, fire evacuation including evacuation of large animals), issues directly related to being a Foothill community along the Angeles National Forest, rural lifestyles, farm animals, equestrian issues, water issues, issues with larger parcels and related land use, wind-related issues, etc. We should not be lumped together with the entire San Fernando Valley.</p>	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	Ksenia Yurganova	Oppose	-	10/18/2021	n/a

5.b.	Larry J Dieli	Oppose	I am a resident of Kagel Canyon, an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. I live in Angeles National Forest, a high hazardous fire area. We are in a Los Angeles Countywater district for our water supply, not a member of the Metropolitan Water district.This is a horse area. All of the properties are on septic tanks. We have a local private trash collector company. In short, our issues are different from the citizens of Los Angeles City.	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Laura Quick	Oppose	We have SCE and not DWP like the rest of the Valley. We are unincorporated like many towns above the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys We are in high fire zones unlike much of the Valley We are in horse country	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	Lena Ayvazian	Oppose	""Comply with the Voting Rights Act (do not dilute minority voting strength)" What does my City Council Decide "Housing ? Libraries ? Parks and community centers ? Street maintenance ? Policing ? Land use and zoning (environmental impacts, housing affordability) ? and more...By: Asian American Advancing Justice;" MAP K2.5 simply fails in aspects noted above by failing to make Canoga Park whole. 6600 Topanga Canyon Boulevard, Canoga Park, California - CA 91303, an Address WE All know of, Topanga Mall, California's first indoor mall in CANOGA PARK. Yet, Canoga Park has been splintered and disfranchised throughout the years, from the West to West Hills, South removing Canoga Park's history of Topanga Mall to what is now named on the map as "Warner Center", not a city. Warner Center Project pushed to	10/18/2021	n/a

			include Canoga Park, including my residence so growth can take place. However, K2.5 removes the natural border of the River and still keeps many within the guidelines of Warner Center Project. Investors and Warner Center control much of Canoga Park that is now removed from Warner Center, yet, Warner Center holds the benefit of the properties within Canoga Park. Please, I ask that you reconsider the map of 57666 or at the minimum please do not disfranchise Canoga Park from its roots and history.		
5.b.	Lyles Perkins	Favor	Keep equestrian areas together as they compromise an historical community of interest that has been established for years. Kagel Canyon, Shadow Hills, Sunland, Lake View Terrace, Big and Little Tujunga Sylmar etc. There are different fire safety issues, zoning issues and traffic safety issues involved with equestrian areas that can not be understood by community leasers outside of horse keeping zones. .	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Marlene Rader	Favor	I live in the North East San Fernando Valley, and have nothing uncommon with the south valley. I live in a high fire are in the Foothill we're a small community with horses. Our commonality is more suited with Acton, Newhall, Aqua Dulca, the rural community. We also have issues with Utilitie, water wells etc. I ask to be kept us in 5th District, they understand our need & issues. hank You	10/18/2021	n/a

5.b.	Matthew Karic	Favor	Please do not include Kagel Canyon in lower San Fernando, we share few of the same needs and issues. We are unincorporated. This would be a mistake for our community.	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Michael N Anderson	Oppose	We have SCE and not DWP like the rest of the Valley. We are unincorporated like many towns above the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys We are in high fire zones unlike much of the Valley We are in horse country Our community is different from the communities surrounding our neighborhood. We cannot be lumped into a district with a community that has a different political outlook or different needs.	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Michele Y deLorimier	Oppose	We in Kagel Canyon are unincorporated like Santa Clarita and some towns in the antelope Valley. We are high fire hazard severity. And we are an equine community. We now need to be represented in the community of similar stakes, similar community of interest. It makes no sense for Kagrl Canyon to be included in the San Fernando Valley community because we share so little in common.	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	Rick Rader	Favor	I want to be in the 5th district because living in the foothill's with horses and a high fire hazard is more like Acton, and up in those area's. We have nothing in-common with areas like Sherman Oaks, Encino, etc. we are in the unincorporated county similar to acton. Thank you	10/18/2021	n/a

5.b.	Sally J Headapohl	Oppose	<p>We have SCE and not DWP like the rest of the Valley.</p> <p>We are unincorporated like many towns above the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys.</p> <p>We are in high fire zones unlike much of the Valley.</p> <p>We are in horse country.</p>	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Steven Weinberg	Favor	<p>On behalf of the residents and stakeholders of the Franklin Coldwater District of the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council, I support Map K 2.5 and specifically, uniting the NC by way of the inclusion of Franklin Coldwater in CD 5. Thank you very much. Respectfully, Steven L. Weinberg, board member, BABCNC representing the Franklin Coldwater District.</p>	10/17/2021	View attachment
5.b.	Susanna Morelli	Oppose	<p>We have SCE and not DWP like the rest of the Valley.</p> <p>We are unincorporated like many towns above the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys.</p> <p>We are in high fire zones unlike much of the Valley.</p> <p>We are in horse country.</p>	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Valerie C Thornton	Favor	<p>I don't mind being assigned to a different district. I didn't much like our commissioner anyway!</p>	10/18/2021	n/a

5.b.	William R Slocum	Oppose	<p>The Northeast San Fernando Valley has more in common with the Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita Valley especially when it comes to Southern California Edison service, High Fire issues, Horse owner issues, unincorporated status and other foothill community issues. Please keep us in District 5.</p>	10/18/2021	n/a
5.c.	Debbie Skilken	Oppose	<p>Hello I am a owner and board member of the Warner Gardens HOA and we are located off of Vanowen directly across from the former Rocketdyne Site in Canoga Park , currently in district 3 and part of Warner Center. When it was an advantage for you to have us part of Warner Center, we were a part of Warner Center now you want to separate us for reasons not acceptable. I am here to oppose K2.5. Please consider the 57666 map it is more compact and will make it easier to serve its citizens. Blumenfield and his team have been strongly connected and have invested years of serviceto Canoga Park. We would like to remain in District 3. Thank you for your attention to our request.</p>	10/18/2021	n/a
5.c.	Henry Fung	Other	<p>With regard to my plan (OP 005) as other redistricting plan creators have given their feedback on why they drew the lines the way they are, I will provide some background. The plan creates one San Gabriel Valley district which maximizes Asian American participation. Approximately 30% of the SD 1 population is Asian American, the highest percentage of any of the districts. It reflects the San Gabriel Valley as I see it, to include the definition as created by the San Gabriel Valley COG of cities that are also not part of another COG. Thus the district stretches from La Canada Flintridge to Pomona. Glendale is included primarily for population concerns as the Foothill</p>	10/18/2021	n/a

		<p>Boulevard corridor in the La Crescenta, Montrose. and La Canada Flintridge area is one community of interest.</p> <p>The purpose of SD 2 is to maintain a historically African American-influenced district, although the population of Blacks in LA County is too low to create their own district, and displacement of the Black community such that joining disparate areas such as the Antelope Valley, Altadena/NW Pasadena, South LA, and View Park/Windsor Hills would not be compact. It still connects communities with a large African American community like Carson, Compton, Crenshaw, Inglewood and Ladera Heights together. All have a tradition of strong Black leadership despite changing demographics in some of the cities like Carson and Compton and so would create opportunities for a future Black supervisor.</p> <p>To create two Latino districts SD 3 uses the foundation of Molina Plan T-1 from the 2011 redistricting by creating an I-5 corridor uniting San Fernando and Downey. It includes Downtown LA and the Eastside. One interesting note is that the Southeast LA cities included, like Bell, South Gate, and Cudahy are all in LAUSD which allows the SELA cities to join as a community of interest. As recently expressed through the vote for the Metro Board of Directors seat for the Gateway Cities, the core SELA cities (Maywood-South Gate) see themselves as distinct from the other Gateway Cities, so splitting the Gateway Cities up may not be as inappropriate as may originally seem.</p> <p>SD 4 maintains the core of existing SD 4 as a crescent shaped district, although not to the ridiculous level of connecting Diamond Bar and El Segundo as the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>current SD 4. It includes more of the coastline to Santa Monica and Pacific Palisades and also the Gateway Cities east of I-605. It does not split the City of Long Beach. It includes both the County's largest recreational harbor in Marina Del Rey and the nation's largest port in the Port of LA and Long Beach.</p> <p>The new SD 5 is a large district covering everything from the Antelope Valley to Malibu. While it may seem excessively large it concentrates the County's rural communities in one district. This allows rural issues to receive special focus such as horse keeping, wildfire danger, and farming and ranching. It also includes the county's largest institutions of higher education in Cal State Northridge and UCLA.</p> <p>A few features of this plan are minimal deviation from an equal split of the county, not splitting any cities or unincorporated areas with the exception of the City of Los Angeles, and keeping as many of the communities of the City of Los Angeles whole while using freeways and waterways as delineators. The plan also tries to ensure that each district has some high income and low income communities in there and is not uniformly poor or rich. For example, SD 1 includes San Marino and Diamond Bar but also Pomona and El Monte; SD 2 Culver City and Hancock Park but South LA and Compton; SD 3 Downtown LA and Mount Washington but also Florence-Firestone and Sun Valley; SD 4 Palos Verdes and Santa Monica but also Hawaiian Gardens and Wilmington; SD 5 Malibu and Cheviot Hills but also the Antelope Valley.</p> <p>It is challenging to draw both a SGV and SFV district without exceeding the population limit, not creating two</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Latino-majority districts, or disenfranchising the Antelope Valley. This plan prioritizes the SGV from being split but admittedly splits the SFV into the Latino-dominant central SFV and the more affluent, Whiter West Valley. It uses I-405 as a simple boundary as much as possible.</p> <p>Also, unlike current SD 3 with a minimal unincorporated population, all districts share in the UA population. SD 1 has UA communities in the Covina Islands, South San Gabriel, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, and La Crescenta. SD 2 has Westmont, West Athens, Athens, Rosewood, and Willowbrook. SD 3 has Universal City, East LA, and Florence-Firestone. SD 4 has Marina Del Rey, Los Nietos, and South Whittier. SD 5 has the Santa Monica Mountains, Newhall Ranch, and the unincorporated portions of North County.</p> <p>As I may not be able to speak to the plan when ARCBridge presents, I hope this comment provides additional information and background. I do not expect that my plan be adopted as is but it is another data point to help the commission tackle the redistricting issue. I would like to also praise ARCBridge for doing a good job at providing information and meeting the commission's needs. Any concern about going with a less experienced firm like ARCBridge should hopefully be alleviated by this time.</p> <p>Henry Fung</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

5.c.	Ilyanne Morden Kichaven	Favor	<p>I am writing in support of the proposed K2.5 map. Although I am a commissioner for the SVPC, I am writing as a 60 year resident of Sherman Oaks and a four way constituent of District 4,. I state that it is imperative to change the boundaries and keep the South Valley Cities as one district. I served for two decades as Executive Director, LA for SAG-AFTRA in the Miracle Mile and own rental property adjacent to mid-Wilshire Blvd. I reside in Sherman Oaks and have a small business in Sherman Oaks. Simply put, the current district does not work. The needs are too varied and the priorities are different. Further, the communities in the current district and dramatically different. It is imperative that there be like minded communities in one district. Map 2.5 allows for this. The Commission should not be concerned by current elected desires. The council persons knew at the time of their election that redistricting would take place. Further, redistricting must be done by the will of the people, not the elected. Thank you for your time. Ilyanne Morden Kichaven</p>	10/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Joanne M Suwara	Other	<p>The residents living in in Calabasas respectfully request that the five cities in the Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments (Calabasas, Malibu, Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills and Westlake Village) remain together in the same legislative district. We share common interests, are served by the same County Sheriff's station and fire department, and we are all located at the foot of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. Our distinct area should be represented as one distinct voice — whether that voice is in Congress, in Sacramento or in downtown Los Angeles.</p>	10/18/2021	n/a

			<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Joanne Suwara The Calabasas Coalition</p>		
5.c.	Katharine E Paull	Other	<p>When the unincorporated community of Kagel Canyon formed a water district 85 years ago, it was put in Supervisorial District 5 and remained there through only five Supervisors, who became familiar with our situations, which include an aged water system, fire prevention, and interface with the Angeles National Forest, where part of our community lies. Our archives have records and correspondence between our Community and its five Supervisors through the years. In the 50 plus years that I have lived here, I have met three of the last Supervisors, who have visited us. We have much in common with other communities to the east also abutting the Forest as opposed to the suburbs that make up the San Fernando Valley. Many of us have interfaced with Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, and Le Crescenta especially with housing development in the remaining open space in rural areas in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. Moving to a different Supervisorial District representing the rest of the Valley would mean educating the new Supervisor about a very small area of their district, which is quite different from the rest of it.</p>	10/19/2021	n/a

5.c.	Kim Orlando	Oppose	<p>When listening to the meetings to date, it a seems to be all about race, specific groups and divisions. I live in Wilshire Vista, which is presently in CD 10. People of multiple races and religions live here. In our Community, we have worked for decades to create unity, safety and community spirit. Prior to Covid, we had yearly community street events. We have an Association Board, who work to keep the community informed and supported. Recently, the heritage buildings on the western edge of Wilshire Vista received Historic Register designation, which sets to tone for the rest of the historic, walkable, pedestrian and family-friendly neighborhood. I vehemently oppose the redistricting proposal, which will split our community into two districts. Cynically, the historically-designated portion of WV and Little Ethiopia have been put into CD 5. Functioning as a whole community will be made very difficult if we are in two different CD's. Again, strongly opposed to this destructive proposal.</p>	10/17/2021	n/a
5.c.	Susan Friend letourneur	Oppose	-	10/18/2021	n/a
5.b.	nancy J verna	Oppose	<p>The Kagel Canyon area is a rural community nestled in the Angeles National Forest. We are currently unincorporated LA Co. and would rather it stay unincorporated. I feel that our area is so unique that it really could only be represented by the county of Los Angeles. We have a long standing 15 year relationship with Supervisor Kathryn Barger's Office.</p>	10/19/2021	n/a

			Also, SCE has put a lot of work into our canyon to make it safe from fire. We would rather not lose SCE as our electric provider. As you know we are in high fire zones unlike much of the Valley. We are horse country and believe that we are best served by remaining in District 5. Please consider this request. Nancy Verna		
5.c.	JESSE ROSAS	Oppose	CD 1 need to stay same as it is because it has a business improvement district areas in Lincoln Hight on North Broadway St. Highland Park on N Figueroa St and Pico Union on Washington Blvd. all the efforts from the Community and Business will lost	10/19/2021	n/a
5.b.	Charles Trotter	Oppose	Horse country, so cal Edison, rural,	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	Leah A Shirokoff	Oppose	Kagel Canyon should be treated as a separate area from the San Fernando Valley. It is already a difficulty because we have a Sylmar Zip code. We have no city, we are mostly in the Angeles National Forest, we are in a high fire danger area and Sheriffs police our area. Don't put us in the wrong boat.	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	Steve Anderson	Oppose	-	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	Mirth I White	Oppose	I have been a resident of Kagel Canyon for over 20 years and, prior to that, lived in the Toluca Lake area. Kagel Canyon is rural and has vastly different issues than the city areas. I oppose any redistricting plan that removes Kagel Canyon from other similar rural communities with community of interest. For example, the canyon does not tap into city water and sewage - residents have individual septic tanks. It is serviced by SCE not Water and Power. The area is zoned for horses and there are numerous ranches. The area is home to wildlife not found in the City including numerous bird species and is subject to environmental protection. Because the canyon has	10/20/2021	n/a

			open space and abuts the forest there are also issues with hunters and drag racers. Finally, this is considered a high fire risk area which raises other unique concerns including obtaining permits to cut oaks, difficulties buying insurance, and brush clearance. Further, the new accessory dwelling laws do not apply to our area due to the fire severity designation. Our area's issues are similar to other rural communities and the residents utilize different shops, contractors, insurers, veterinarians, parks, and utilities than the city communities. Please consider this in your redistricting plans.		
5.b.	Sarah J Olson	Oppose	Our community is served by SCE NOT DWP. We are UNINCORPORATED We are in a HIGH FIRE ZONE We are in a DENSE HORSE COMMUNITY VIGOROUSLY OPPOSE THIS ITEM	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	Michael Shaw	Oppose	I oppose because we have SCE and not DWP like the rest of the Valley, we are unincorporated like many towns above the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys, we are in high fire zones unlike much of the Valley, we are in horse country	10/20/2021	n/a
5.a.	VIC V FELEKIAN	Oppose	-	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	VIC V FELEKIAN	Oppose	WE ARE A RURAL COMMUNITY HERE AT Kagel Canyon AND DO NOT WANT ANYTHING TO CHANGE IN OUR COMMUNITY.	10/20/2021	n/a
5.c.	VIC V FELEKIAN	Oppose	-	10/20/2021	n/a
5.d.	VIC V FELEKIAN	Oppose	-	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	Kimberly Fuentes	Other	My name is Kimberly Fuentes, and I am the Policy and Communications Director for California LULAC. Our organization has worked to create an independent, transparent, and fair	10/20/2021	n/a

			<p>redistricting process on the state and local level in CA.</p> <p>First, thank you to the Commission and staff for embracing their civic duty and doing so in an honorable fashion. As this Commission embarks on the next phase of the redistricting process and begins to map the different COI testimony it received, please keep in mind that the COI collection process is a community-driven process:</p> <p>The Commission should listen, implement, and respect the Community's wishes and wants it expressed during the COI testimonial process.</p> <p>During this Commission's last hearing, several Commissioners opined about communities that asked to be kept together. In doing so, it appeared as though some commissioners were injecting their own opinions about how certain communities should be and should not be grouped.</p> <p>Democracy and redistricting depend on the community having the opportunity to choose their representatives and part of that process is testifying before this Commission about how they define their community and what areas they want to be grouped with.</p> <p>As the Commission continues to make decisions and evaluate the COI maps presented by Arcbridge, please do so based on the community's testimony and not the commissioner's opinions.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your time.</p>		
5.b.	Jan Kelly	Oppose	-	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jose Del Rio III	Other	<p>First, thank you to the Commission and staff for embracing their civic duty and doing so in an honorable fashion. As this Commission embarks on the next</p>	10/20/2021	n/a

			<p>phase of the redistricting process and begins to map the different COI testimony it received, please keep in mind that the COI collection process is a community-driven process:</p> <p>The Commission should listen, implement, and respect the Community wishes and wants it expressed during the COI testimonial process.</p> <p>During this Commission’s last hearing, several Commissioners opined about communities that asked to be kept together. In doing so, it appeared as though some commissioner’s were injecting their own opinions about how certain communities should be and should not be grouped.</p> <p>Democracy and redistricting depend on the community having the opportunity to choose their representatives and part of that process is testifying before this Commission about how they define their community and what areas they want to be grouped with .</p> <p>As the Commission continues to make decisions and evaluate the COI maps presented by Arcbridge, please do so based on the community’s testimony and not the commissioner's opinions.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your time.</p>		
5.b.	Lucy Demirjian	Other	The City of South Pasadena has reviewed the maps and intends to provide comment at a later date.	10/20/2021	n/a
5.c.	Lucy Demirjian	Other	The City of South Pasadena has reviewed the maps and intends to provide comment at a later date.	10/20/2021	n/a
5.b.	Steve Allen	Other	The area east of Hazeltine south of Oxnard and north of Burbank and west of the Orange Line should be made part of District 3 because the Orange Line acts as a natural northern and eastern boundary. It would place this additional small area where it belongs both culturally and physically.	10/20/2021	n/a

			Redistricting map 2.5 rev 1 had this area included in District 3. We feel this makes sense and would still place Valley College in District 2 or 4. Use natural physical boundaries to establish District boundaries where it makes sense.		
5.c.	Steve Allen	Oppose	The area east of Hazeltine south of Oxnard and north of Burbank and west of the Orange Line should be made part of District 3 because the Orange Line acts as a natural northern and eastern boundary. It would place this additional small area where it belongs both culturally and physically.	10/20/2021	n/a
5.c.	Elida Mendez	Favor	I live CD9 in Green Meadows community this community is in 2 District 8 and 9 .Curren Price must represent this community at the Empowerment Congress Southeast neighborhood council. We need just 1 council member right now we have 2 and make hard the communication and the city services and economical opportunities.	10/20/2021	n/a