

Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Special Meeting (10/27/2021)

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
4	Tamaryn Byrne	Other	<p>We are unsure of the history (and possibly your team is too) as to why we were grouped into District 2 with other inland communities. Assuming this decision was made with good reason initially. Our community, unincorporated El Camino Village, is also known as the "South Bay's best kept secret". Although with the South Bay becoming more popular, not as much of a secret lately. This has a lot to do with our great sense of community made up of mostly single family homes. Many residents are very proactive in community safety and maintaining a great neighborhood for families to grow with. We are a diverse community that share a passion for living in a good (and small comparatively) community just 3 miles from the beach. We hear often that we do not get the attention we need (previously under Mark Ridley-Thomas) because we are the least worrisome or the least of concerns compared to the other surrounding communities within our district. Quite honestly, it is too soon to know if this will be different under Holly Mitchell. What I am long-windedly trying to explain is that our community just may be one of those that is an ideal dot on the map that should be reclassified into a better suited district. Look at our crime rates, look at our increasing home values.</p> <p>Pros - going by what residents say, many like to identify with the beach/ seaside communities. Our concerns are based on improvement of our community, safety and even beautification of our community. I don't have the socio-economic breakdown handy but our community is stepping towards improvement and positive change. If including El Camino Village in district 4 would help to amplify our voice to promote growth and change, then it seems to make sense.</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			<p>Cons - A few things that come to mind are... would property taxes be impacted, do services such as waste management and street sweeping change? Does it have any affect on law enforcement coverage? What are things that we should know of in advance that should be considered when a community is redistricted.</p>		
4	Angel C Carrillo	Other	The City of Covina asks that the attached letter be entered into the record.	10/27/2021	n/a
4	Elida Mendez	Oppose	<p>My name is Elida Mendez I live in the Green Meadows Community that is in CD9 and the CD8. This community is represented by Councilman Marqueece Harris-Dawson at the Empowerment Congress southeast neighborhood council. I opposed to this decision because I represent Area 1B from Empowerment Congress Southeast neighborhood council and Green Meadows Community that is from council district Curren D. Price Jr. Is represented by other Councilman. This situation has Green Meadows Community in disadvantage. Please make the redistricting in favor of Green Meadows Community for the good of the constituents. Give the representation of the Green Meadows Community to council Curren Price.</p>	10/27/2021	n/a
4	Kenneth Mazur	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, we respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones we submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps, particularly OP 012 from the People’s Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a</p>		n/a

			<p>narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission's criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p> <p>We are confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is both intuitive and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Kenneth Mazur Topanga Association for a Scenic Community Topanga, Ca 90290</p>		
4	Leah Culberg	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, we respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones we submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			<p>maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps, particularly OP 012 from the People’s Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission’s criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p> <p>We are confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is forward thinking, intuitive, and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Hopefully,</p> <p>Leah Culberg</p>		
4	Cynthia Maxwell	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, we respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones we submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps,</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			<p>particularly OP 012 from the People’s Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission’s criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p> <p>We are confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is both intuitive and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Cynthia Maxwell Cold Creek</p>		
4	Shannon Ggem	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Please give greater weight to maps like OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which have been drawn by local Los Angeles County residents.</p> <p>It’s critical to keep our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>National advocacy groups are garnering a lot of attention, and it seems that some talked about maps use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves topographical, ecological and physical communities.</p> <p>The Commission’s criteria, especially compactness and communities of interest, really matter, and do not seem to have been used, this could prove dangerous in the very high fire severity area and harmful to our ecology in the Santa Monica Mountains.</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			Shannon Ggem, Malibou Lake, Unincorporated LA County		
4	Susan Ellis	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, I respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps, particularly OP 012 from the People’s Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission’s criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p> <p>I am confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is both intuitive and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			Susan Ellis Calabasas, CA		
4	Nancy Rothenberg	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, we respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones we submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps, particularly OP 012 from the People’s Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission’s criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p> <p>We are confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is both intuitive and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Nancy Rothenberg, President</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			Calabasas Highlands Homeowners Assn. Member of the Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation		
4	Mollie Helfand	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, we respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones we submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps, particularly OP 012 from the People’s Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission’s criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p> <p>We are confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is both intuitive and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Mollie Helfand</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			Cornell Rd Home Owner Agoura		
4	Sherry Ferber	Other	Honorable Commissioners, Please do not risk the degradation of the quality of representation for all Angelenos. I oppose OP023 as it disenfranchises over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the SF Valley and West Los Angeles with a supervisor we did not vote for. I am optimistic that the Commission will produce a map that is respectful of all the people of the city of Los Angeles. Thank you. Sincerely Yours, Sherry Ferber, Liberty Canyon Townhomes, City of Agoura Hills	10/27/2021	n/a
4	Joan Yacovone	Other	Commissioners: Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/ Las Virgenes area/ Malibu COG COI together. The maps (OP 010, OP 027, and OP 013) drawn up by our local Los Angeles County residents, we hope, will be given the greater weight in your list of recommended supervisorial districts. Maps submitted by outside interests should not be given consideration. Thank you. Joan Yacovone Agoura Hills, CA 91301	10/27/2021	n/a
4	Kim P Lamorie	Other	Honorable Commissioners: Thank you for serving on this Commission -- and thank you once again for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together. As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, we respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones we submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise	10/27/2021	n/a

			<p>have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps, particularly OP 012 from the People’s Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission’s criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p> <p>We are confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is both intuitive and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kim Lamorie President Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation, Inc., of the Santa Monica Mountains</p>		
4	Melanie Winter	Other	<p>Technical addendum to The River Project's submitted comment: Where RDU blocks ignore the natural boundary created by the LA River watershed, ArcBridge should tweak submitted proposals so that maps that include valley districts follow this proposed geographic watershed boundary. The "Valley District" should extend east from Universal City, then south through the Elysian Valley to the Arroyo Seco confluence, ending on the southwestern end of the LA River channel.</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

4	Melanie Winter	Other	The River Project would highly encourage the commission to consider the natural geographic boundary formed by the Los Angeles River. The State and County have both invested significant resources in planning efforts based around watershed boundaries for climate resilience, water and natural resource management. The County's investments in the Integrated Regional Water Management Program and Measure W are organized around such boundaries. The County recently adopted the Upper LA River Tributaries (ULART) Plan. This territory includes the lands draining to the San Fernando Valley basin and extending down through the Elysian Valley to the 110 fwy. Op 004, OP 010, OP 027 and other maps that keep the San Fernando Valley whole also keep the ULART catchment area in one district, which will allow for better administration and stewardship of the river and its tributaries as a whole.	10/27/2021	n/a
4	Ruben Karapetian	Favor	Armenian Americans would like the Commission to consider maintaining the Tricities of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena in one district. The Armenian American community constitutes a significant population of the Tricity area, having contributed to the social, economic, cultural, and political life of the Tricities.	10/27/2021	n/a
4	Thomas Carey	Favor		10/27/2021	n/a
5.a.	Christine L Rowe	Other	#1 - You should look at the LA City Final map that will show you the population of LA City and the CVAP. Commissioner Holtzman has suggested divided the San Fernando Valley. The LA City Redistricting Commission. When they created a District - 4 or 2 down the middle of the San Fernando Valley - a Proposed Hispanic District - it turns out not to be a > than 50 percent Voting age population. I have drawn probably over 30 maps for the City of Los Angeles based on Neighborhood Councils. We use the Mullholland Highway as a San Fernando Valley southern boundary. The LA City population for the San Fernando Valley I calculated at 1,480,659. The total City of Los Angeles population came out to 3,911,737. The San Fernando Valley only had only 38% Hispanic population in that 1,480,659 population. Therefore, I greatly request that you keep the San Fernando Valley within the City of Los Angeles whole along with some of the other unincorporated areas or nearby communities which to me would be the unincorporated areas in the far West Valley, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura, Westlake Village, Topanga to about	10/27/2021	n/a

			the Pacific Palisades. I have also observed that if you look at CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Race Ethnicity map you will see more detail for the Asian and the Black, and the Hispanic Populations.		
5.a.	Hank Fung	Other	I suggest using Harvey balls rather than - like the speaker said about Consumer Reports. Please refer to my comments last week for explanation of OP 004, and OP 009 was a starting point for additional Latino districts and not intended as a map which should be adopted as is.	10/26/2021	n/a
5.a.	Lester C Kau	Other	Please keep Azusa with the other Foothill Cities. I find it strange that some maps continue to pull Azusa out of the Foothill Cities. Azusa is a Foothill City. Having Azusa separate from other foothill cities causes problems in dealing with issues that neighboring cities face together. It makes complicated issues even more complicated and really hard to solve issues.	10/27/2021	n/a
5.a.	VIC V FELEKIAN	Oppose		10/26/2021	n/a
5.b.	VIC V FELEKIAN	Oppose		10/26/2021	n/a
OP 004	Melanie Winter	Favor	The River Project would highly encourage the commission to consider the natural geographic boundary formed by the Los Angeles River. The State and County have both invested significant resources in planning efforts based around watershed boundaries for climate resilience, water and natural resource management. The County's investments in the Integrated Regional Water Management Program and Measure W are organized around such boundaries. The County recently adopted the Upper LA River Tributaries (ULART) Plan. This territory includes the lands draining to the San Fernando Valley basin and extending down through the Elysian Valley to the 110 fwy. Op 004, OP 010, OP 027 and other maps that keep the San Fernando Valley whole also keep the ULART catchment area in one district, which will allow for better administration and stewardship of the river and its tributaries as a whole.	10/27/2021	n/a
OP 010	Alexa Sidaris	Favor	In favor	10/27/2021	n/a
OP 010	Melanie Winter	Favor	The River Project would highly encourage the commission to consider the natural geographic boundary formed by the Los Angeles River. The State and County have both invested significant resources in planning efforts based around watershed boundaries for climate resilience, water and natural resource management. The County's investments in the Integrated Regional	10/27/2021	n/a

			<p>Water Management Program and Measure W are organized around such boundaries. The County recently adopted the Upper LA River Tributaries (ULART) Plan. This territory includes the lands draining to the San Fernando Valley basin and extending down through the Elysian Valley to the 110 fwy. Op 004, OP 010, OP 027 and other maps that keep the San Fernando Valley whole also keep the ULART catchment area in one district, which will allow for better administration and stewardship of the river and its tributaries as a whole.</p>		
OP 010	Mollie Helfand	Other	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for keeping our Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area/Las Virgenes/Malibu COG COI together.</p> <p>As you now contemplate your short list of supervisorial districts, we respectfully urge you to consider giving greater weight to maps like the ones we submitted OP 010 and OP 027 and other maps like OP 013 which likewise have been drawn by local community member Los Angeles County residents. We have striven to meet all of the criteria established by your Commission.</p> <p>Unfortunately, national advocacy groups with little understanding of the full diversity and character of the entire County of Los Angeles have submitted maps that seem to be garnering more attention over local input. These maps, particularly OP 012 from the People's Bloc, and OP 023 from MALDEF, use a narrow criteria for their work that cleaves communities and results in an outwardly gerrymandered map. By failing to incorporate all of the Commission's criteria, including compactness and communities of interest, these maps would degrade the quality of representation for all Angelenos.</p> <p>Finally, we particularly oppose OP 023 because it would effectively disenfranchise over 1.5 million people in the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, and West LA, by putting us under a Supervisor that none of us have had the opportunity to vote for -- and where we do not share communities of interest.</p>	10/27/2021	n/a

			We are confident that the Commission will produce a boundary map that is both intuitive and representative of the will of the people of the County of Los Angeles.		
OP 027	Melanie Winter	Favor	The River Project would highly encourage the commission to consider the natural geographic boundary formed by the Los Angeles River. The State and County have both invested significant resources in planning efforts based around watershed boundaries for climate resilience, water and natural resource management. The County's investments in the Integrated Regional Water Management Program and Measure W are organized around such boundaries. The County recently adopted the Upper LA River Tributaries (ULART) Plan. This territory includes the lands draining to the San Fernando Valley basin and extending down through the Elysian Valley to the 110 fwy. Op 004, OP 010, OP 027 and other maps that keep the San Fernando Valley whole also keep the ULART catchment area in one district, which will allow for better administration and stewardship of the river and its tributaries as a whole.	10/27/2021	n/a