

## Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Special Meeting (11/22/2021)

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
6.a.	Chris Sun	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
6.a.	David S Fang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
6.a.	Dennis Piotrowski	Other	Torrance, the hub of the South Bay, should be kept together and be in the same district. This is common sense.	11/20/2021	n/a
6.a.	Devon Williams	Other	-	11/22/2021	n/a
6.a.	Edward Movsessian	Other	Please see our attached recommendations for all considered maps. Thank you!	11/22/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
6.a.	Helen Haig	Other	-	11/22/2021	n/a
6.a.	Henry Fung	Other	When fine tuning all maps, please make sure that Cal Poly Pomona and the City of Pomona are grouped together. There is a small section of unincorporated area west of the City of Pomona where half of Cal Poly Pomona sits. The other half of the university is in the City limits. This creates confusion for students and faculty when lobbying for elected representatives and frustrates get out of the vote efforts. Just because one student lives in a dorm in the city and one in the unincorporated area doesn't mean their interests are different. They both live on the university campus. As a Cal Poly Pomona alum (graduate school), please don't split Cal Poly Pomona. Thank you.	11/18/2021	n/a
6.a.	Hsing C Ma	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
6.a.	Janice Yen	Favor	-	11/19/2021	n/a
6.a.	Jerry Rivers	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
6.a.	joan chan	Other	By keeping the SGV COI together, the representative can be our champion for progressive policies to protect and grow the economic development of our diverse community. SGV COI is a	11/22/2021	n/a

			community that is uniquely characterized by residential properties, small businesses, excellent schools, state-of-the-art medical centers such as the City of Hope (Duarte), libraries, and museums with unique historical collections, devoted cultural and religious centers that serve as important healing and community gathering places. As SVG communities grow, so too have their contributions to SGV and LA county as well as our American economy. Marked by mom-and-pop businesses, employing many workers, and generating significant revenue, SGV has become a gathering place for all who seek out regional authentic Asian cuisines and enjoy its rich culture and traditions. The SVG is where you will see and hear Asian-only languages written and spoken at retail shops, restaurants, and ethnic supermarkets. We believe it makes sense to keep SVG together to maintain the economic and social integrity of this community that enriches life for everyone in the community and county.		
<b>6.a.</b>	John Hsu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>6.a.</b>	Lezlie Campeggi	Other	I'd prefer the County not having to re-district at all. If there's a reason we must do so at this particular point in time, it should be done with as little change to the District boundaries as possible. We won't have an option to vote on County Supervisor representation for newly-changed Districts until perhaps late 2022 or later. Promoting and implementing major change without the voters registering their voices at the ballot box disenfranchises us all.	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>6.a.</b>	Michelle Freridge	Other	The entire San Gabriel Valley is not one big community of interest. Please look at specific demographics of communities and keep the majority AAPI communities of the West San Gabriel Valley (Monterey Park, Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, Temple City, and together please so their voice can be heard.	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>6.a.</b>	Rob Chan	Other	Dear Los Angeles County Redistricting Commission:  I am a San Gabriel Valley resident and I encourage the Commission to consider keeping the San Gabriel Valley as one Community of	11/22/2021	n/a

		<p>Interest, otherwise, it cuts at the heart of the most ethnically diverse region in the country. The San Gabriel Valley (SGV) cities such as Alhambra, Arcadia, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, San Marino, Temple City, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Walnut and Diamond Bar share characteristics that make them a SGV Community of Interest (SGV COI).</p> <p>Dividing the SGV COI creates unnecessary obstacles to continue to foster a symbiotic relationship between government and its constituents. The SGV community is one of the most ethnically diverse regions in the country that shares common cultural, social, familial, economic, and quality of life interests that should not be divided into separate districts.</p> <p>By keeping the SGV COI together, the representative can be our champion for progressive policies to protect and grow the economic development of our diverse community. SGV COI is a community that is uniquely characterized by residential properties, small businesses, excellent schools, state-of-the-art medical centers, libraries and museums with unique historical collections, devoted cultural and religious centers that serve as important healing and community gathering places. As SGV communities grow, so too have their contributions to the American economy. Marked by mom-and-pop businesses, employing many workers, and generating significant revenue, SGV has become a gathering place for all who seek out regional authentic Asian cuisines and enjoy its rich culture and traditions. The SGV is where you will see and hear Asian-only languages written and spoken at retail shops, restaurants and ethnic supermarkets. We believe it makes sense to keep SGV together to maintain the economic and social integrity of this community that enriches life for everyone in the community.</p> <p>Splitting the SGV COI into separate districts dilutes the SGV community's political voice. The SGV community already faces</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>challenges from becoming citizens, registering to vote, and voicing concerns at the ballot box. As one of the most linguistically isolated communities, SGV's residents rely on community-based organizations for access to resources and to meaningfully participate in government processes. Splitting the SGV dilutes minority voting power and muffles the ability for its residents to voice their concerns.</p> <p>SGV has been deeply impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and the rise of anti-Asian violence even before March 2020. A walk through some of the neighborhood's main thoroughfares reveal this impact as many businesses have been shuttered.</p> <p>COVID-19 has exacerbated the racially charged tension that many in the communities experienced. The SGV community has been a safe haven for Asian Americans when anti-Asian hate crimes were being perpetuated against them for looking "Chinese." When anti-Asian hate sentiments were pervasive, candlelight vigils were organized across the SGV community by grassroots supporters from the community to express "enough is enough!"</p> <p>We would like to keep our communities under one district so we can overcome obstacles together and claim victory as one district.</p>		
6.a.	Sean Cazares	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
6.a.	Sean Lin	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
6.a.	Stuart Waldman	Other	The San Fernando Valley deserves representation. Currently, there is one district that is made up of 64.7% Valley residents. In the new maps there should be at least one district that has more than 64.7% Valley residents. Anything less is a step backward.	11/21/2021	n/a
6.a.	Vinh Truong	Other	-	11/22/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
6.a.	Yunju Wang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Abraham Cheung	Oppose	This option dilutes the voice of predominantly Asian communities in the east of LA. It separates one group of Asians (District 1 - San	11/21/2021	n/a

			Gabriel, Rosemead), from another (District 5 - Monrovia, Arcadia), and from another (District 4 - Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar). This separation will dilute the representation of Asians in LA.		
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Alicia Nyein	Favor	-	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Alvin Yang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Arlene Chang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Brie Childers	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Carrie Carrier	Oppose	see attached letter for reasoning	11/20/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Chris Sun	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Christine L Rowe	Oppose	Map A gerrymanders the San Fernando Valley even more than it is today. Residents of Canoga Park at your San Fernando meeting commented on living in Canoga Park and not having anything in common with - I believe they said Malibu. But there is actually a bus down Topanga Canyon to Malibu to serve that community of interest and to take them to the beach.	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	chuck sun	Oppose	This A-1 map is separating culturally Asian community! It is not acceptable!	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	David S Fang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Gail Salem	Favor	-	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	George Shaw	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Hue Huynh	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Irene Chin	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Jamie Friedman	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Janice Yen	Favor	-	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Jaymie Park	Favor	Hello! My name is Jaymie Park and I am a resident of Westwood and Koreatown, currently pursuing my MPP at UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs. I have lived in Los Angeles for 17 years I would like to urge the commission to adopt map A-1 as it keeps communities that I care about united and thereby gives them a stronger voice. Thank you!	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Jenny Ma	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Jenny Tsai	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Jerry Rivers	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	John Hsu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	John Mendoza	Oppose	Make publoposeic comment	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Joseph Lu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Katarina Garcia	Favor	Good evening Commissioners, my name is Katarina Garcia. Thank you so much for taking time to listen to residents of San Gabriel Valley.  I'm a lifelong resident of San Gabriel valley. I am also a local high school teacher and volunteer as a mentor for local teachers to be. One thing I can say for sure, is San Gabriel Valley communities are diverse and have different needs and should be represented accordingly. Maps C, D, and E lump us all together.  We saw this very clearly during the height of the pandemic, where our area experienced higher COVID infection rates than our	11/22/2021	n/a

			<p>neighbors in more affluent communities.</p> <p>That is why I think it is important that we have a map like map A1 that gives the SGV multiple representatives.</p> <p>Please do not lump the San Gabriel Valley into only one district. Thank you</p>		
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Kitty K Twu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Lauren Dunlap	Favor	<p>I support this map (map A-1, from the People’s Block) because it prevents several communities of color from being divided and their voices being weakened. For example:</p> <p>Keeps Eastside communities united (Boyle Heights to Pico Rivera to SGV and El Monte) Keeps SouthEast LA whole (Bell, Bellgarden to South Gate) Maintains Black District by keeping South LA whole (Leimert Park, Park Mesa, Hyde Park) Keeps AAPI Communities whole (Little Tokyo, Chinatown, Thai-town, Filipino Town, Koreatown)</p> <p>This map helps most underserved communities in the county have a stronger political voice.</p>	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	<p>Logistical NIGHTMARE for any Supervisor to physically cover this geography. The freeway system in this proposed area is the most heavily congested in the County, and within the top 10 heavily trafficked freeway interchanges in the entire country as well! We already have a governing body that oversees significant "coastal issues," (the California Coastal Commission). Further, splitting Long Beach into two separate districts poses a huge problem for local governance; extremely cumbersome for a City that size to have to deal with two, separate County Supervisors for issues within their City borders!</p>	11/21/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Marikit V Mendiola	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Mario Dominguez Jr	Other	I'm not sure if this is the correct map for my city. I live in South Gate. I need to see the map before I can say whether or not I am in favor of it.	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Meg Thornton	Favor	-	11/20/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Michael Ho	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Ngee Kon	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Paul C Chang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Polly Chu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Rich Pinder	Favor	Map A1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we requested in our certified letter and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A1, B1, C1, and D1, POSO has ranked Map A1 as the least acceptable (fourth choice) because it extends too far south into the Marina del Rey area.	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Sara Rohani	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Sean Cazares	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Sean Lin	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Shikha Bhatnagar	Favor	-	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	sonny shang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a



<b>OPTION A-1</b>	stacy procter	Favor	Map A-1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we requested in our certified letter and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A-1, B-1, C-1, and D-1, POSO has ranked Map A-1 as the least acceptable (fourth choice) because it extends too far south into the Marina del Rey area	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	The People Bloc map is not a true coalition map as they only spoke to one person from the San Fernando Valley. They did not reach out to groups in the Valley. In fact VICA, reached out to them and had not had a response. Option A-1 splits the Valley into two districts, wherein one district Valley residents make up 58% of the population and slightly more than one-third in the other. This is step backward.	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Ting Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Ting Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Tzujung Chen	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Victor Yang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Wenko Chen	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	YongKang Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION A-1</b>	Yunju Wang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Abraham Cheung	Oppose	-	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Alvin Yang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Arlene Chang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Brie Childers	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Bruce M Rowe	Favor	Santa Monica and the area South of Sunset Blvd should not be in the San Fernando Valley and Los Virgenes COI.	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Carrie Carrier	Favor	see attached letter for reasoning	11/20/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Chris Sun	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Christine L Rowe	Favor	I prefer the original Option B-1 to Commissioner Stecher's modified B-1 OP 58. My goal has always been to give a voice to the 1.8 million residents of the San Fernando Valley and the adjacent Las Virgenes Community of Interest(COI). What other maps do is divide the San Fernando Valley so that our community could be represented by someone who lives in Santa Monica (OP 58) or Beverly Hills. Beverly Hills could be divided above Sunset; in other words, as I said before, draw the line at Sunset from the coast to pick up the mountains. Sunset Blvd. is a exit from the 405 freeway that navigating systems frequently show as an alternative route. Sunset Blvd on Map B-1 should go north on Laurel Canyon Blvd. based upon census tracts to meet Franklin Ave to the east. The cutoff should be north of Hollywood Blvd based upon testimony for that area that I have heard at the LA City hearings. It should continue east to Los Feliz Ave, and include all of Griffith Park. Please put the north San Fernando Valley communities of Chatsworth, Porter Ranch, and Granada Hills into the San Fernando Valley District to balance the population. Please allow the San Fernando Valley to elect a Supervisor to represent us. Thank you.	11/21/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Christine L Rowe	Favor	Map B-1 by Commissioner Stecher is the best map. It keeps the vast majority of the San Fernando Valley (SFV) and the Las Virgenes Community of Interest (COI) whole. I have been giving a lot of thought to comments from people in East LA who rely on their Supervisor - Supervisor Solis - for help with their issues. I believe that one thing you need to understand is that if we can keep the 1.4 million people of the City of Los Angeles with the other San	11/22/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>

		<p>Fernando Valley communities which includes the Las Virgenes COI (1.8 million total), maybe you could recommend to the Supervisors that they provide more services in what is known as SPA 2 to the San Fernando Valley. This would include providing public health clinics so that residents of Canoga Park and other communities near by in the West San Fernando Valley would not have to go all the way to Pacoima for public health services. We need a Supervisor who lives within the San Fernando Valley who will attend our meetings, attend our parades which are usually in Canoga Park, and hold Town Halls in our San Fernando Valley communities. Today I drove through Beverly Hills to appointment on what we call "the other side of the hill". In other words, over the Santa Monica Mountain range. Due to traffic, I traveled canyon roads to Sunset. Sunset is the dividing line between the "Hills of Beverly" and the flat portion of Beverly Hills that joins Westwood to the west, and Hollywood and parts of Los Angeles to the east. In the community testimony for Los Angeles Redistricting, the people that live in those hillsides were vehement about keeping areas such as Laurel Canyon, the Hollywood Hills, Universal Studios, Griffith Park, all together as high fire areas that they all fight to defend. Also, the more LA City residents that you have in a Supervisorial District - we share water, electric through LADWP, we share cable services for tv and internet; we share other services like LAFD and the LAPD. Some of these high fire areas are overlapped with the LA County Fire Department and the LA County Sheriff's Department. We are fighting with the LAUSD Redistricting to keep the San Fernando Valley together and to not gerrymander it over the hill so that we have equal representation for our public schools in the SFV. We heard testimony from 3 USC physicians who spoke about supporting another map. But do they know about the other maps? Do they only want to keep East LA in one service District that they serve? We do have hospitals that serve the San Fernando Valley. I have worked at three of them - West Hills, Tarzana, and Northridge. We have Kaiser Woodland Hills, and there are Valley</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			Pres in Van Nuys as well as Sherman Oaks Hospital. There are other hospitals that serve more of the north San Fernando Valley. I was trying to add other hospitals such as Mission Hospital to my list of hospitals that serve the Northern and Eastern San Fernando Valley.		
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	chuck sun	Favor	This is a good and acceptable map	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	David S Fang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Gail Salem	Favor	-	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	George Shaw	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Henry Fung	Other	<p>Here is an idea that may make Option B better for the San Gabriel Valley - add Pomona to SD 1, and take Covina, Temple City, and their surrounding unincorporated areas (i.e. Charter Oak and East San Gabriel) out of SD 1 and into SD 5.</p> <p>Add Commerce and Bell Gardens to SD 2 (keep SELA whole).</p> <p>Add Paramount, Bellflower, Cerritos, Artesia to SD 4 (community of interest with Lakewood Sheriff).</p> <p>Have SD 2 include all of View Park/Ladera Heights, Alondra Park, Carson, Hawthorne, Lawndale</p> <p>This does not resolve the perceived Black-Latino conflict in SD 2 but should help create better communities of interest.</p>	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Henry Fung	Other	<p>Here is an idea that may make Option B better for the San Gabriel Valley - add Pomona to SD 1, and take Covina, Temple City, and their surrounding unincorporated areas (i.e. Charter Oak and East San Gabriel) out of SD 1 and into SD 5. Add Commerce and Bell Gardens to SD 2 (keep SELA whole). Add Paramount, Bellflower, Cerritos, Artesia to SD 4 (community of interest with Lakewood Sheriff). Have SD 2 include all of View Park/Ladera Heights, Alondra Park, Carson, Hawthorne, Lawndale This does not resolve the</p>	11/21/2021	n/a

			perceived Black-Latino conflict in SD 2 but should help create better communities of interest.		
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Hsing C Ma	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Hue Huynh	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Irene Chin	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Jamie Friedman	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Jenny Ma	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Jenny Tsai	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Jerry Rivers	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	John Hsu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	John Mendoza	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Joseph Lu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Katarina Garcia	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Kitty K Twu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Lezlie Campeggi	Favor	Option B-1 makes the most sense for redistricting from a logistical perspective. County Supervisors spend a great deal of time making personal appearances within the Districts they represent. In option A-1, the proposed "coastal" district covers far too much geography with the worst traffic in the entire County, and no mass public transit available to navigate commuting, even if a Supervisor were to live centrally within this proposed District. To serve their respective Districts well, a Supervisor must be able to quickly get to	11/21/2021	n/a

			their constituents, in person when needed. This is the best option to allow for maximum outreach and County Supervisor representation.		
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Michael Ho	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Ngee Kon	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Paul C Chang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Polly Chu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Rich Pinder	Favor	Map B1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we requested in our certified letter and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A1, B1, C1, and D1, POSO has ranked Map B1 as the second most acceptable (second choice) because it includes most major part of the San Fernando Valley.	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Sean Cazares	Oppose	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	sonny shang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	stacy procter	Favor	Map B-1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we requested in our certified letter and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A-1, B-1, C-1, and D-1, POSO has ranked Map B-1 as the second most acceptable (second choice) because it includes most major part of the San Fernando Valley	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Stuart Waldman	Favor	Option B-1 also splits in the Valley into two districts but keeps one of the districts at 71% make-up of Valley residents. This option is the most conducive to the interests of the Valley and can further	11/21/2021	n/a

			be improved with a few changes. We believe that a combination of Maps A1 and B1 can be a workable solution.		
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Ting Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Ting Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Tzujung Chen	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Victor Yang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Wenko Chen	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	YongKang Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION B-1</b>	Yunju Wang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Abraham Cheung	Oppose	-	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Alvin Yang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Andrew C Aleman	Oppose	<p>Good evening Commissioners, my name is Andrew Aleman and I am a resident of Covina.</p> <p>I am here today to express my concerns about Maps: C, D, and E. As someone who has lived here my whole life, I can tell you that the communities in the SGV are very different and require different representation. Maps C, D, and E don't account for this.</p> <p>I have worked with students in both Covina and West Covina and I think having representatives who can focus on open space and environment would benefit our communities. In addition, the San Gabriel Valley has distinct features. Communities above the 210 have concerns about fire risks and the communities along the 10 are concerned with pollution and environmental issues.</p>	11/22/2021	n/a

			<p>Keeping the SGV in one district limits our voice, and we prefer to have diversity in our representation while keeping Covina and West Covina whole.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Andrew Aleman</p>		
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Arlene Chang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Brie Childers	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Carrie Carrier	Oppose	see attached letter for reasoning	11/20/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Chris Sun	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Christine L Rowe	Oppose	Option A also cuts off the north and eastern parts of the San Fernando Valley. The SFV should not be drawn into a flat lands of Beverly Hills District. Santa Monica should not be with the San Fernando Valley. Map C draws the salamander southwest from north of Sylmar all of the way to Lynwood. I believe that all of the Commissioners should recognize that these downtown and southern communities belong in contiguous compact districts with their Communities of Interest.	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	chuck sun	Oppose	This A-1 map is separating culturally Asian community! It is not acceptable!	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	David S Fang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Gail Salem	Favor	-	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	George Shaw	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Hsing C Ma	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a



<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Hue Huynh	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Irene Chin	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Jamie Friedman	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Jenny Ma	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Jenny Tsai	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Jerry Rivers	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	John Hsu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	John Mendoza	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Joseph Lu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Katarina Garcia	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Kitty K Twu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Michael Ho	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Ngee Kon	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Paul C Chang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Polly Chu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Rich Pinder	Favor	Map C1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we requested in our certified letter	11/19/2021	n/a

			and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A1, B1, C1, and D1, POSO has ranked Map C1 as the second least acceptable (third choice) because it extends too far south into the Marina del Rey area.		
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Sean Cazares	Oppose	Racist map promoting Latino Supremacy.	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	sonny shang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	stacy procter	Favor	Map C-1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we requested in our certified letter and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A-1, B-1, C-1, and D-1, POSO has ranked Map C-1 as the second least acceptable (third choice) because it extends too far south into the Marina del Rey area	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Option C-1 splits up the Valley into three districts, none of which have a majority make-up of Valley residents. This option destroys the Valley's population and voice, making it the worst choice and the worst possible outcome.	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Ting Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Ting Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Tzujung Chen	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Victor Yang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Wenko Chen	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	YongKang Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION C-1</b>	Yunju Wang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Abraham Cheung	Oppose	-	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Alvin Yang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Andrew C Aleman	Oppose	<p>Good evening Commissioners, my name is Andrew Aleman and I am a resident of Covina.</p> <p>I am here today to express my concerns about Maps: C, D, and E. As someone who has lived here my whole life, I can tell you that the communities in the SGV are very different and require different representation. Maps C, D, and E don't account for this.</p> <p>I have worked with students in both Covina and West Covina and I think having representatives who can focus on open space and environment would benefit our communities. In addition, the San Gabriel Valley has distinct features. Communities above the 210 have concerns about fire risks and the communities along the 10 are concerned with pollution and environmental issues.</p> <p>Keeping the SGV in one district limits our voice, and we prefer to have diversity in our representation while keeping Covina and West Covina whole.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Andrew Aleman</p>	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Arlene Chang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Brie Childers	Favor	Best option. Keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community whole in a single supervisor district.	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Carrie Carrier	Favor	see attached letter for reasoning	11/20/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Chris Sun	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Christine L Rowe	Other	Map D 1 would be my second choice for the San Fernando and the Las Virgenes Communities of Interest. I have had family that lived in Culver City and we used to frequent Santa Monica when my in-laws lived in West Los Angeles. Culver City and Santa Monica belong with communities like Mar Vista, Santa Monica, Del Rey, etc. Please see the attached Neighborhood Council map for their adjacent communities.	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	chuck sun	Favor	This is a good and acceptable map	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Dan Hanrahan	Favor	I ask the commission to support PLAN D. It is by far the best plan, for not only the area in which I live (Topanga), but also for so many of the areas that share a common interest. For the past 30 years, plans most similar to our current District 3 plan have worked well for us all. It takes time and effort to create relationships and partnerships. Selecting any other plan, dissolves or dilutes all or a lot of the work we have done over the years. Plan D has minimal change yet still represents commonality, compactness, equity, fairness and less deviation.  Thank you for your time and consideration.  Dan Hanrahan	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	David S Fang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Gail Salem	Favor	-	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	George Shaw	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Hsing C Ma	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Hue Huynh	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Irene Chin	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Jamie Friedman	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Jenny Ma	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Jenny Tsai	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Jerry Rivers	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	John Hsu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	John Mendoza	Oppose	Public comment	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Joseph Lu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Katarina Garcia	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Kitty K Twu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Michael Ho	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Ngee Kon	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Paul C Chang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Polly Chu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Rich Pinder	Favor	Map D1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we described in our certified letter and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A1, B1, C1, and D1, POSO has ranked Map D1 as the most acceptable (first choice) because it effectively includes most major parts of the San Fernando Valley in the best	11/19/2021	n/a

			pattern possible.		
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Sean Cazares	Favor	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	sonny shang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	stacy procter	Favor	Map D-1 is acceptable to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks) because it keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO, whole in a single supervisor district as we described in our certified letter and testimony to the Commission. However, of Maps A-1, B-1, C-1, and D-1, POSO has ranked Map D-1 as the most acceptable (first choice) because it effectively includes most major parts of the San Fernando Valley in the best pattern possible.	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Option D-1 splits the Valley into two districts, where San Fernando Valley residents make up 57% of the population in one district and 34% in the other.	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Ting Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Ting Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Tzujung Chen	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Victor Yang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Wenko Chen	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	YongKang Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION D-1</b>	Yunju Wang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Abraham Cheung	Oppose	This option dilutes the voice of the San Fernando Valley. It ignores their unique needs and racial, economic, and social demographics.	11/21/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION E</b>	Alvin Yang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Andrew C Aleman	Oppose	<p>Good evening Commissioners, my name is Andrew Aleman and I am a resident of Covina.</p> <p>I am here today to express my concerns about Maps: C, D, and E. As someone who has lived here my whole life, I can tell you that the communities in the SGV are very different and require different representation. Maps C, D, and E don't account for this.</p> <p>I have worked with students in both Covina and West Covina and I think having representatives who can focus on open space and environment would benefit our communities. In addition, the San Gabriel Valley has distinct features. Communities above the 210 have concerns about fire risks and the communities along the 10 are concerned with pollution and environmental issues.</p> <p>Keeping the SGV in one district limits our voice, and we prefer to have diversity in our representation while keeping Covina and West Covina whole.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Andrew Aleman</p>	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Arlene Chang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Brie Childers	Oppose	Does not keep the entire Sherman Oaks community whole in a single supervisor district. There is a strange cut-out south of Oxnard St and just east of the 405 freeway. This area should be kept with the rest of Sherman Oaks.	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Carrie Carrier	Oppose	see attached letter for reasoning	11/20/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION E</b>	Chris Sun	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION E</b>	Christine L Rowe	Oppose	Option E - this is one of the most gerrymandered maps there is of the six being presented. It draws the San Fernando Valley with its Las Virgenes neighboring COI south to the Palos Verdes peninsula. It separates the West San Fernando Valley where it divides West Hills from Canoga Park. It breaks up a number of San Fernando Valley communities and then goes east all the way to Arcadia which is a San Gabriel Valley community.	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	chuck sun	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	David S Fang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Gail Salem	Oppose	-	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	George Shaw	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Hsing C Ma	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Hue Huynh	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Irene Chin	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Jamie Friedman	Oppose	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Jenny Ma	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Jenny Tsai	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Jerry Rivers	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	John Hsu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Joseph Lu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a



<b>OPTION E</b>	Katarina Garcia	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Kitty K Twu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Michael Ho	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Ngee Kon	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Paul C Chang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Polly Chu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Rich Pinder	Oppose	<p>New Map E is COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE. First, it does not keep the entire Sherman Oaks community whole in a single supervisor district, which is POSOs (Part of Sherman Oaks) basic goal and was communicated to the Commission by certified letter from POSO and our testimony, as well as through multiple people and organizations, including our Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association. We cannot understand why the Commission would remove a section of POSO between the 405 freeway, Oxnard St, Noble Av, and Burbank Blvd, and place it in another district. Please do not do this, we want to be kept whole with Sherman Oaks! The 2011 Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission made a "de facto" policy decision to keep POSO united with Sherman Oaks based on its Los Angeles Renaming Policy. Second, the district with most of Sherman Oaks extends from Malibu east to Arcadia and south the Rancho Palos Verdes. It splits the San Fernando Valley in half. This concept makes no sense and should be deleted.</p> <p>OPTION E OPPOSE</p>	11/19/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION E</b>	Rigoberto Garcia	Favor	The City of Whittier City Council with the attached letter is in favor of Option E. Thank you for your consideration.	11/22/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION E</b>	Sean Cazares	Oppose	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	sonny shang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	stacy procter	Oppose	New Map E is COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE. First, it does not keep the entire Sherman Oaks community whole in a single supervisor district, which is POSOs (Part of Sherman Oaks) basic goal and was communicated to the Commission by certified letter from POSO and our testimony, as well as through multiple people and organizations, including our Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association. We cannot understand why the Commission would remove a section of POSO between the 405 freeway, Oxnard St, Noble Av, and Burbank Blvd, and place it in another district. Please do not do this, we want to be kept whole with Sherman Oaks! The 2011 Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission made a “de facto” policy decision to keep POSO united with Sherman Oaks based on its Los Angeles Renaming Policy. Second, the district with most of Sherman Oaks extends from Malibu east to Arcadia and south the Rancho Palos Verdes. It splits the San Fernando Valley in half. This concept makes no sense and should be deleted. OPTION E OPPOSE	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Stuart Waldman	Favor	Option E is a variation of Option A-1. This map splits the Valley into two districts, where San Fernando Valley residents make up 63% of the population in one of the districts. While we prefer B1, E could be adjusted.	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Ting Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Ting Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Tzujung Chen	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION E</b>	Victor Yang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Wenko Chen	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	YongKang Yu	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION E</b>	Yunju Wang	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Abraham Cheung	Favor	Option F proposes the most balanced demographics. All racial groups retain equal representation. Additionally, this option is the only one that unifies UCLA with its residents in Palms and Culver City, which will amplify their voice in support of student needs.	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Alvin Yang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Arlene Chang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Brie Childers	Oppose	The district with Sherman Oaks extends from Malibu east to Burbank and south to Rancho Palos Verdes. It also does not include major portions of the San Fernando Valley -- which is our real Community of Interest.	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Carrie Carrier	Oppose	see attached letter for reasoning	11/20/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
<b>OPTION F</b>	Chris Sun	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Christine L Rowe	Oppose	Divides the SFV and the Armenian Community. Support starting with map 50	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	chuck sun	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	David S Fang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	George Shaw	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Henry Fung	Favor	Dear Commissioners,	11/20/2021	n/a

		<p>Rather than submit another map which will seek to confuse everyone, following are a list of changes which I support the commission making, and rationale.</p> <p>At the November 18 San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments meeting (<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J_uJAF_CB78">youtube.com/watch?v=J_uJAF_CB78</a>) there were statements of support of Map F, but the members ultimately chose not to because San Gabriel Valley cities were moved from existing districts.</p> <p>I would not object to moving existing SGV cities to match their current districts as follows: Covina in SD 5, Walnut in SD 1. The representative from Alhambra wanted to be in SD 1 and I did not hear comment from San Gabriel. San Gabriel is better suited to be in SD 1 because it shares more in common with middle income Rosemead and Alhambra rather than higher income San Marino and Arcadia. When cutting up the Covina area I would ensure that the unincorporated area to the west, north, and south need to be in SD 1. Charter Oak can stay with SD 5 like San Dimas and Glendora. I am ambivalent about Claremont as historically it was with SD 5 but moved to SD 1 in 2011. Claremont shares more in common with other foothill communities than Pomona. The state legislative districts have been drawn with the 210 corridor in mind. Claremont is less Latino and higher income and so should be with SD 5, but I would defer to the city in the case of a tie.</p> <p>I object with Diamond Bar staying with SD 4 as this splits up the San Gabriel Valley into three pieces and would necessarily place the Puente Hills and Heights communities in SD 4. The San Gabriel Valley should not be in three pieces.</p> <p>With regards to Watts, I am indifferent as to whether Watts is in SD 2 or SD 4. I draw Watts in SD 4 due to high Latino population and connection with Florence-Firestone while recognizing that Watts</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>has historically been African American and has a tremendous Black history dating back to before the 1965 Watts uprising, so it could fit with SD 2.</p> <p>I am fine with the Westside Neighborhood Council not wishing to be split. Although I created a community of interest based on renters and higher density housing adjacent to the 405 between Palms and UCLA, if the WNC wants to keep themselves whole I have no issue.</p> <p>I agree with moving Hidden Hills with SD 3 to keep them with the Las Virgenes communities as a community of interest. I am indifferent if the San Fernando Valley community wants to split themselves between SD 3 and SD 5 in a different way. I am from the San Gabriel Valley and have not spent that much time in the SFV, especially the sections away from the freeways.</p> <p>Although this may reduce the Black CVAP, if there is a need to add population in the underpopulated SD 2 I would consider adding Hollywood, West Hollywood, and maybe even the multi family sections of Beverly Hills (south of Wilshire Boulevard) into SD 2 from SD 3. The renters form a community of interest and are lower income than the homeowners in the Hollywood Hills, although they are more affluent than the renters in South LA or Inglewood.</p> <p>I would consider moving Lomita out of SD 3 to SD 2 or SD 4. Lomita is a working class community and shares less in common with the Palos Verdes Peninsula and Torrance to the west. If it were in SD 2, it would be a community of interest with Gardena, another historically Asian American community, as well as with the school district since Lomita is with LAUSD. If it were in SD 4, it would be in communion to the ports, as traditionally many port workers lived in Lomita for affordability and convenience.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			The commission has a difficult task and I can't thank you enough for considering my comments to make Map F work better.  Sincerely, Henry Fung		
<b>OPTION F</b>	Hsing C Ma	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Hue Huynh	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Irene Chin	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Jamie Friedman	Oppose	-	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Jenny Ma	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Jenny Tsai	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Jerry Rivers	Favor	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	John Hsu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Joseph Lu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Katarina Garcia	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Kitty K Twu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Michael Ho	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Ngee Kon	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Paul C Chang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Polly Chu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a

<b>OPTION F</b>	Rich Pinder	Oppose	New Map F is UNACCEPTABLE to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks). The district with Sherman Oaks extends from Malibu east to Burbank and south to Rancho Palos Verdes. It also does not include major portions of the San Fernando Valley which is our real Community of Interest. OPTION F OPPOSE	11/19/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Sean Cazares	Favor	Another good map for the Foothill Communities.	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	sonny shang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	stacy procter	Oppose	New Map F is UNACCEPTABLE to POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks). The district with Sherman Oaks extends from Malibu east to Burbank and south to Rancho Palos Verdes. It also does not include major portions of the San Fernando Valley -- which is our real Community of Interest. OPTION F OPPOSE	11/18/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Option F is also a variation of Option A-1. This map splits the Valley into two districts, where San Fernando Valley residents make up 54% of the population in one of the districts.	11/21/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Ting Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Ting Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Tzujung Chen	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Victor Yang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Wenko Chen	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	YongKang Yu	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
<b>OPTION F</b>	Yunju Wang	Oppose	-	11/22/2021	n/a
-	David Leger / Jackie Bacharach	-	-	11/18/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>

-	Chris Rowe	-	-	11/19/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
-	Sho Tay	-	-	11/20/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>