

Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Regular Meeting (11/10/2021)

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
4	Alicia Godinez	Other		11/10/2021	n/a
4	Henry Fung	Other	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>With respect to the comments at the end of the November 3, 2021 meeting, which were allegedly "for the good of the order", rather than take up the commission's important time at this meeting I will make the following comments in writing instead.</p> <p>While the process of selecting the executive director may not have been ideal, the executive director and her assistant has done an outstanding job as a staff of two people trying to wrangle together 14 commissioners, deal with one commissioner who resigned prior to the process beginning, and try to synthesize hundreds of public comments, both in the community of interest phase and in the map drawing phase. The issues raised regarding pronouns, graphics, and honorifics seem to this member of the public as petty at best, and not "for the good of the order" in any instance.</p> <p>The attack on the executive director's spouse for being the president of the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council counts in my opinion as ad hominem. Neighborhood councils have extremely little power in Los Angeles. Their elections are run by the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment and not by the county, and voting qualifications are extremely relaxed compared to a duly elected body. Their budget is nominal and their only other power is advisory. Neighborhood council members have not had a good track record for election to city council or any official elected office. There is no indication nor has anyone provided evidence she either privileged or handicapped feedback from the Sherman Oaks community or any other portion of the Valley or the County.</p>	11/7/2021	n/a

		<p>I see no indication from the co-chairs that they would not have been willing to entertain placing the statements "for the good of the order" on the agenda for further discussion at a regular meeting. But, for a commissioner who is also an attorney to introduce an unprompted attack on the selection process of the executive director at a special meeting, when state law specifically only allows those items on the posted agenda to be considered may be the "self centered and narcissistic behavior" that the commissioner is decrying.</p> <p>While the personal attacks are not called for, the issue of using Redistricting Units rather than the more granular Census Blocks does deserves full consideration. Due to the compressed time frame from obtaining the incarcerated persons-adjusted data from the Statewide Database, only RDUs may have been able to be used. Unfortunately, it is too late to bring up this issue, although it should be noted the MALDEF and People's Bloc maps do break apart some RDUs when necessary to make their map work. It is an issue that should be noted for the 2030 cycle.</p> <p>The executive director could be selected independently, although it is unclear what mechanism would be used to create an initial budget without the independent commission having an open checkbook and wasting taxpayer funds without oversight; or not having sufficient funds to do the work. This is especially true given the limited county budget for Net County Cost activities. Regardless, these are broader issues which should be discussed after map selection and not be rolled in with a general critique of the executive director.</p> <p>The first priority must be meeting the state law and the unmovable deadline of December 15, 2021 for selecting a map and providing a report. The State Redistricting Commission in the 2011 cycle created a "lessons learned" report to the public and the legislature once the work was completed. It is hoped that in 2031, there will not be a global pandemic that both prohibits in person meetings and results in important census data to be delayed. The commission should take up further deliberation of future lessons learned and memorialize that into a report. In the meantime, I support the current executive director and hope that the commissioners do as well.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			Sincerely, Henry Fung		
4	Ismael Castro	Other		11/10/2021	n/a
4	Julia Bricklin	Oppose	How dare the County draw new boundaries for our council representation! I live in District 2, which voted for Paul Krekorian. Don't you dare follow through with this backroom dealing. KEEP THE DISTRICTS THE WAY THEY ARE. If you want to re-do them in the future, you need to follow your own rules and ask for transparent, community input.	11/10/2021	n/a
4	Justin Dickerson	Other	A cardinal rule of redistricting is that you do not separate communities. I do not support a City of Los Angeles city council district map that splits Studio City between 2 council districts. I live in part of Studio City that would go into Council District 4 with Sherman Oaks and Encino, while another part would be in Council District 2 with other neighborhoods. It would be fine to have Sherman Oaks and Encino in the same council district as Studio City, but Studio City should not be separated across 2 council districts. Please keep all of Studio City in 1 council district, whether that's Council District 5 or Council District 2. Thank you.	11/10/2021	n/a
4	Kimberly Fuentes	Favor	Presenting California LULAC's letter of support for Draft Map C	11/9/2021	View attachment
4	Sean Cazares	Other		11/7/2021	View attachment
4	Terri Tippit	Other	Per the attached letter filed tonight (11/8), the Westside Neighborhood Council is indicating its support for Option D and opposition to Option C. However if the boundary could be changed on Options A & Option B to keep the WNC whole and grouped with our historic neighbors to the north and west, both A & would be acceptable to us as well. Thank you for your consideration and service.	11/8/2021	View attachment
6.a.	Sean Cazares	Other	Map C is a perfect example of racial polarized voting.	11/7/2021	n/a
6.b.	Terri Tippit	Other	Per the attached letter filed tonight (11/8), the Westside Neighborhood Council is indicating its support for Option D and opposition to Option C. However if the boundary could be changed on Options A & Option B to keep the WNC whole and grouped with our historic neighbors to the north and west, both A & would be acceptable to us as well. Thank you for your consideration and service.	11/8/2021	View attachment

OPTION A	Alejandro Juarez-Ugalde	Favor		11/10/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Ana M Godoy	Favor		11/10/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Faraz Aqil	Oppose	I live in the City of Downey. If Option A goes through, then my home District 4 will stretch from Pomona to San Pedro. It's too snake-like, and has no regard to compactness/community of interests by region. There's also another similar snake like district (District 3) that stretches from the city of San Fernando to Rancho Palos Verdes.	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Henry Fung	Other	<p>I submitted a revised Option A which incorporates some commissioner and public comment and does not split the San Gabriel Valley into three pieces. The notes are in a text file attachment to the plan but for the record these are the changes and rationale:</p> <p>Dear Commissioners, please see Revised Map A-1 to address comments I heard from the members of the public and commissioners.</p> <p>"Benchmark" refers to the original Option A.</p> <p>SD 1: SD 1 keeps Azusa whole - there is no reason to split up Rosedale from the rest of Azusa Same with San Gabriel SD 1 connects middle income Asian community in SGV - high Asian population areas like Monterey Park, San Gabriel, Rosemead, Alhambra with Rowland Heights and Hacienda Heights (more affluent Asians in SD 5 in cities like San Marino, Arcadia, Temple City, Walnut share more common interests with Whites) Splits San Gabriel Valley into only two pieces - Montebello is part of SGVCOG and is moved to SD 1, Industry and Diamond Bar moved to SD 1 Unites Heights communities along Puente Hills Moves Pomona to SD 1 as requested by Mayor of Pomona Remains majority Latino (51.59% Latino CVAP compared to 54.52% benchmark map)</p>	11/9/2021	n/a

		<p>Asian representation improves - 25.52% Asian CVAP compared to 22.97% benchmark map</p> <p>SD 2: New SD 2 includes renter dominant communities on the Westside - Palms, Sawtelle Japantown, renter heavy portions of Brentwood, Westwood Bl corridor, UCLA campus Does not split Park La Brea Includes VA hospital property - many homeless veterans have origins in SD 2 Connects UCLA with many of its students who live in Palms Keeps the central part of Westchester with SD 2 Unites Japanese American communities in Gardena, Sawtelle Japantown (Little Osaka) and Little Tokyo SD 2 remains Black influence - 29.79% Black CVAP compared to 30.85% benchmark map</p> <p>SD 3: Cheviot Hills is moved to SD 3 due to high homeowner and affluent population to join other high income communities in the Hollywood Hills and Beverly Hills Keeps Lakeview Terrace in SD 3 while moving Kagel Canyon to SD 5 Cuts at Glenoaks Bl to extent possible to respect Shadow Hills community boundary SD 3/SD 5 boundary in rest of San Fernando Valley remains the same. Keeps El Segundo in SD 3 Remains predominantly White - 54.14% White CVAP compared to 54.73% benchmark. (Note due to technical limitations LAX is in SD 3 when it should be in SD 2)</p> <p>SD 4: SD 4 covers all Gateway Cities and SELA Keeps Long Beach whole Keeps Whittier whole Does not include finger to Torrance</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Excludes San Gabriel Valley Watts is moved to SD 4 for population balance and to connect with Florence Firestone - Watts is 62% Latino CVAP, 34% Black so putting it with Latino district helps improve Latino numbers More Latino - 55.77% Latino compared to 50.15% benchmark map.</p> <p>SD 5: SD 5 boundary in NE SFV changes to put Shadow Hills and Kagel Canyon in SD 5 and group more Latino communities in SD 3 with other cities in the Valley SD 3/5 boundary in rest of SFV remains the same Duarte is moved to SD 5 as a whole to join its other Foothill cities. Duarte is 44% Latino CVAP and so including it in SD 1 would slightly reduce the Latino percentage in SD 1. Compare with Azusa which is 57% Latino CVAP and should be included in a Latino district.</p> <p>The underpopulation should as much as possible be in VRA target districts 1, 2, and 4 to reflect the undercount of Latino population in census due to citizenship question uncertainty and lack of language assistance available due to the pandemic, as well as reduced access to technology for Blacks. This does this.</p>		
OPTION A	karen barnett	Oppose		11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Manuel Larry Gonzalez	Favor	I support keeping East Los Angeles and northeast L.A. together !	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Maria Brenes	Favor	<p>Thank you for your time and careful deliberation. I am the Executive Director for InnerCity Struggle based in the Eastside of Los Angeles. Our organization is a nearly 30 year community institution in the Eastside. We bring together intergenerational communities to advance opportunity and equity in education, affordable housing, civic engagement and mutual aid. Representation on the County Board of Supervisors matters greatly to our work and communities. The Eastside is composed of Boyle Heights, unincorporated East LA, El Sereno and Lincoln Heights. I am a resident and homeowner in El Sereno. My children attend a public school (4th and 6th grade) in the First District. I urge the Commission to keep the entire Eastside</p>	11/10/2021	n/a

			in the First District. This Community of Interest is important and the next most aligned COI (geographically and culturally) is Eastward. This is why I support MAP A. THANK YOU.		
OPTION A	Mary Ann Lutz	Favor	I support this map that has been drawn with much input from the community. It is a good base to start to finalize the boundaries. I currently live in District 5 and am a Citrus College Board Trustee and my district includes District 1. Both districts are represented well in this map. Thank you for your time and thank you for all you are doing to ensure our county is fairly represented in the future. This is a big job and I am grateful to all of you for stepping up to work on this for all of our futures!	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Sean Cazares	Favor	Map A, the People's Bloc, would be the second best choice if the Commission where to choose. Just remember, that the cities of Azusa, Covina, Duarte, and Claremont must be placed into one district.	11/7/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	I had hoped that this map could be modified to put more of the San Fernando Valley into one district, but the People's Bloc appears unwilling to make amendments. This map is a step back for the Valley. SFV residents only make up 58% of District 3 and 32% of District 5. This diminishes the Valley's influence in electing a representative by reducing the Valley population by 6%.	11/9/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Terri Tippit	Other	Per the attached letter filed tonight (11/8), the Westside Neighborhood Council is indicating its support for Option D and opposition to Option C. However if the boundary could be changed on Options A & Option B to keep the WNC whole and grouped with our historic neighbors to the north and west, both A & would be acceptable to us as well. Thank you for your consideration and service.	11/8/2021	View attachment
OPTION A	William M Kay	Favor	As a service provider and event producer serving many of the County's much-needed human resources organizations in and around the East L.A. area I want to document my full support of Option A. Supervisor Solis has done an excellent job in trying to keep our ELA communities represented and united and we do not want anything to weaken this effort. These organizations are part of our community and she is a part of US!	11/8/2021	n/a
Option B	Angela Karson	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley	11/9/2021	n/a

			residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence		
Option B	Carmen Madras	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Cathleen Madrigal	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Chris Veracruz	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Faraz Aqil	Favor	The 2nd best map in my opinion because of its compactness.	11/8/2021	n/a
Option B	Judy Vargas	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	karen barnett	Oppose		11/8/2021	n/a
Option B	Katie Durant	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley	11/9/2021	n/a

			residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence		
Option B	Marcelo Jauregui Volpe	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Marco Posada	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Michael Durant	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Raul Jauregui Volpe	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Raynald Pelletier	Favor		11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Roger J Pugliese	Favor	We think this is the best Option for our Community. In addition we think that District 1 can extend its borders north Up to the Freeway right above it. There was comment that Santa Monica had some of its border split. This should not be so we must make sure it is all in District 4.	11/10/2021	n/a

Option B	Sam Karson	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Sean Cazares	Favor	Option Map B would be the third best option. The only thing about this map that needs to change would be Pomona, that should be placed out of district 5 but other than that, it's still good.	11/7/2021	n/a
Option B	Sebastian Morales	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Sonya Blake	Favor	Although we strongly desire an alternative that provides for Valley districts located wholly in the valley, Plan B provides the best of the four alternative options. We strongly support this option.	11/8/2021	n/a
Option B	Stuart Waldman	Favor	This is the best option. It moves the San Fernando Valley forward instead of diluting the Valley's influence in a district. Suggested changes: Keep Burbank and Glendale whole in District 5 while also adding the community of Chatsworth. The goal is to keep cities whole. Also, Chatsworth has a lot of the same issues as Porter Ranch like fire issues and they have a shared Chamber of Commerce. Add Sylmar, Lake View Terrace and the Granada Hills South NC to District 3.	11/9/2021	n/a
Option B	Terri Tippit	Other	Per the attached letter filed tonight (11/8), the Westside Neighborhood Council is indicating its support for Option D and opposition to Option C. However if the boundary could be changed on Options A & Option B to keep the WNC whole and grouped with our historic neighbors to the north and west, both A & would be acceptable to us as well. Thank you for your consideration and service.	11/8/2021	View attachment
Option B	Victor Hernandez	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher's suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3	11/9/2021	n/a

			Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence		
Option B	Yolanda Villanueva	Favor	Please consider Commissioner Stecher’s suggestion to move Beverly Hills + the west side south of Mulholland to district 4 to empower NE Valley residents in new district 3 Additionally, please direct ArcBridge to follow the natural boundary of the LA River in creating the final boundary. The RDUs currently split the river in multiple places in the valley all the way to the Arroyo Seco confluence	11/9/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Caroline Y Menjivar	Favor	Dear LA County Redistricting Commission, As a resident of the East San Fernando Valley I am writing in support of Map Option C. I am a queer woman of color, Marine Corps veteran and Map Option C is the only proposed draft that enfranchises working-class communities and communities of color. Given the growth of the Latino and API communities over the last decade, this Commission can make history by drawing 2 Latino majority CVAP Districts, and giving voters of color an opportunity for a coalition District. I ask that you adopt Option C.	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Faraz Aqil	Oppose	Option C also contains snake-like districts. District 4 stretches from Granada Hills (LA) to Long Beach (it also splits Long Beach in half between left-side LB and right-side LB). And as a resident of Downey, my home District 1 stretches from Long Beach all the way to La Verne. Even though Option C is a better map than Option A (by giving minority voters racial representatives), it however ends up stretching/packing regions to the point of gerrymander (no regard to compactness/community of interests by region).	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Henry Fung	Favor	I continue to favor Option C, though, as a thoughtful way to ensure Latinos have a second district now, in a map configuration very similar to that of the 2011 redistricting. The SD 4 has a community of interest along the San Gabriel River Watershed. I suggest that SD 1 be extended south to Cal State Long Beach, a federally designated Hispanic Serving Institution, and include the mouth of the San Gabriel River. This can be done by extending the district along the San Gabriel River, Willow Street, Studebaker, Atherton, Bellflower, 7th, and the Los Cerritos Channel to Alamitos Bay. This will further cement SD	11/9/2021	n/a

			1 as the "San Gabriel River Watershed District" and will reduce deviation in SD 1.		
OPTION C	karen barnett	Favor	This map represents the common interest of LA River communities. It also puts them under district 3 which is the current elected district leader for most the communities.	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Kimberly Fuentes	Favor		11/9/2021	View attachment
OPTION C	Raynald Pelletier	Oppose		11/9/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Sean Cazares	Oppose	I urge the Commission to totally disregard this map seeing how it maintains a Latino supremacy in three districts. If we care about proportionality and equity then this map must be disregarded. We, the members of the Foothill Communities, urgently call on the Commission to totally oppose Map C, as it places us in the Gateway Cities community of interest, which we don't share in common.	11/7/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Sonya Blake	Oppose	This option destroys the character and influence of Valley communities. We strenuously object to this option.	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	This is a map that splits the San Fernando Valley into 3 districts.	11/9/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Terri Tippit	Oppose	Per the attached letter filed tonight (11/8), the Westside Neighborhood Council is indicating its support for Option D and opposition to Option C. However if the boundary could be changed on Options A & Option B to keep the WNC whole and grouped with our historic neighbors to the north and west, both A & would be acceptable to us as well. Thank you for your consideration and service.	11/8/2021	View attachment
OPTION D	Faraz Aqil	Favor	I love the compactness & how Option D map has sorted each district by their regions (example: San Gabriel Valley, Gateway Cities). This is my favorite map of all the other options. Just one thing, do make sure you keep each of the non-LA cities together and not separated (examples: Bell, Maywood) and I also ask Commissioners to not split Watts (LA) since it's a minority (historically underrepresented) community. From the 11/7 meeting, I want to thank so much the Commissioners for voting to keep Downey (my home city) and Bell Gardens compact (and not split) in the map. May you all continue to keep the other cities together and not split.	11/8/2021	n/a

			With that said, it's still a better map than Option A & Option C because it avoids making snake-like/gerrymandered districts.		
OPTION D	karen barnett	Oppose	This map doesn't provide for common interests of communities.	11/8/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Sean Cazares	Favor	Map D is a map the Foothill Communities 100% support. It places most of the Foothill Communities together, with the exception of Azusa, Covina and Duarte (which can be modified) and adds our long lost brother of a community, Claremont, with us in this new district. Please, Commissioners, consider Map D!	11/7/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Terri Tippit	Favor	Per the attached letter filed tonight (11/8), the Westside Neighborhood Council is indicating its support for Option D and opposition to Option C. However if the boundary could be changed on Options A & Option B to keep the WNC whole and grouped with our historic neighbors to the north and west, both A & would be acceptable to us as well. Thank you for your consideration and service.	11/8/2021	View attachment
-	Corinne Sanchez	-	<p>Dear Los Angeles County Redistricting Commission,</p> <p>I was on the Public Hearing on Sunday, November 7, 2021 and was unable to wait after four hour to testify.</p> <p>I am forwarding in an attachment my testimony. I understand the Commission's interest to hear from the public and they read all comments. Please kindly accept my testimony and I plan to participate in the future in this most important endeavor.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Corinne Sanchez, Esq. President/CEO El Proyecto del Barrio, Inc.</p>	11/10/2021	View attachment