

**Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Special Meeting (11/3/2021)**

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
5.a.	Andrew Westall	Other	<p>Options B and D should not be considered by the Commission without significant work to District 2 to ensure the Equal Protection rights of the African-American community are protected as afforded to all residents under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution. Placing the African-American community in a racially polarized Latino majority district violates those rights, while pitting two communities against each other.</p> <p>Please go back to the drawing board and ensure all communities are not disadvantaged under new Board of Supervisor boundaries.</p>	10/29/2021	n/a
5.a.	Christine L Rowe	Other	<p>Chris Rowe (You) 08:20 PM You should be able to unmute the people who are testifying without promoting them to panelists. This happens at Neighborhood Council meetings all of the time.</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 08:26 PM Agree with Cm. Morales re breaks. I have been on the State "We Draw the Lines" meetings - they take full lunches or dinner breaks, as well as regular 15 minute breaks.</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 08:36 PM Thank you Cm. Soto - at the LA City meetings a number of people called in by phone. Sorry I am bad about not copying my comments into the form. Respectfully, Chris Rowe</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 08:43 PM There have been more than 500 people on calls for the LA City Council Redistricting meetings. They have limited the public comment to sometimes as little as 25 minutes - sometimes as much as an hour? The rest of the time they would spend on redrawing their final map.</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 08:48 PM One problem that you have is that your meetings often overlap</p>	11/3/2021	n/a

			<p>Neighborhood Council Board meetings. For example, your meetings on the second Wednesday of every month overlap the Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council Board meetings.</p> <p>Thank you for all that you do.</p> <p>Can you please display the maps where we can see Neighborhood Council boundaries, mountains, the LA River, streets, etc. Thank you.</p>		
5.a.	Fred Mandel	Other	<p>I think you went too far. I liked how the SFV was represented in the earlier version. What I am against is why my City of Encino was split in half. The District 3 Map that was made was great except for the elimination of half of Encino. I liked how Sherman Oaks, Encino, Tarzana and Woodland Hills were combined and would love to see that again. That's great SFV representation, but DON'T cut in half Encino. We are one WHOLE community.If these others are accepted then as long as Encino is one then I am for it.</p>	11/1/2021	n/a
5.a.	JOSE CORNEJO	Other	<p>SEE Attached memo from a survey of 600 San Fernando Valley residents. WE want to be united in ONE district. the 1.5 million people of the San Fernando Valley have always been denied the ability to elect a person who lives in the valley. Please keep our communities together!!</p>	11/1/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
5.a.	Mark D Davis	Favor	<p>Favor OP 004 and OP 008</p>	10/30/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
n/a	Christine L Rowe	Other	<p>I want the document made available to me please. Thank you.</p> <p>Commissioner Holtzman's statement.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
n/a	Lester Kau	Favor	<p>I respectfully request that you support Option B. This map is the only map that keeps the Foothill cities together. All of the Foothill cities are against the Angeles National Forest, and we face similar concerns. When cities are working together on common issues, having different supervisors makes it difficult to work on issues together.</p> <p>One example of this is the forest fires and fires in the San Gabriel Riverbed. The homeless have started over 140 fires in the riverbed, fires that sometimes spread into the forest. It creates a constant threat to lives and homes. Duarte lives against the riverbed but currently has a different Supervisor than the riverbed area. Because of this, their Supervisor has not been able to help them with getting housing for the homeless in the riverbed. In 2020, the Dam Fire/Ranch2 Fire (caused by a homeless person arguing about a bike)/Bobcat fire (these fires happened one right after another</p>	10/29/2021	n/a

			without any break) burned behind Azusa, Glendora, Bradbury, Duarte, Monrovia, Arcadia, Pasadena, Altadena, as well as cities in the desert. Fires in the riverbed are a potential threat to all these cities. Please make it so that it is easier for the Foothill cities to work together in decreasing this risk as well as helping to get these people housing. Please help us protect human lives and wildlife together. Thank you for considering my request.		
OPTION A	Alex Ugrik	Favor	<p>The entire San Fernando Valley is not one community of interest. The commission has broken up much smaller areas into communities of interest, the SFV should be treated in a similar way.</p> <p>Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The Sunland/Tujunga/Kagel Canyon/Shadow Hills communities are an extension of the Tri-Cities Communities (Burbank/Glendale/Pasadena) and should be in district 5 along with the unincorporated areas of Twin Lakes and Lake Manor.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year round fire concern.</p> <p>Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities including the City of Hidden Hills.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Bob Anderson	Oppose	UNACCEPTABLE – The Option A map keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks), whole in a single District 3. However, the map fails to include communities in the western and northwestern San Fernando Valley. The map instead goes too far south into Marina del Rey.	11/1/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
OPTION A	Cynthia A Sternquist	Oppose	Please keep the Sam Gabriel Valley cities together as they currently are.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Dayna DeVito-Fleck	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than	11/2/2021	n/a

			<p>Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.</p>		
OPTION A	Diego Munoz Flores	Oppose	<p>The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.</p>	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Geovanna Arcia	Oppose	<p>I oppose this map option A, as it dilutes the Latino community and gives an illusion of an ineffective second Latino district.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION A	John c Luker	Favor	<p>We would request of the redistricting Commission that the areas of Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills be included in the new District 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The entire San Fernando Valley is not one community of interest. The Redistricting Commission previously had broken up much smaller areas into communities of interest, the SFV should be treated as such.</li> <li>• The communities in the central San Fernando Valley do not reflect our wildfire concerns. The communities of the northwest and east have year round fire danger. This is our most major issue. All the areas of unincorporated county are more related to Santa Clarita by fire danger than we are to the Reseda, Van Nuys or Encino Communities.</li> </ul> <p>We have witnessed in our hills, the explosive nature of wildfire and the threat it makes to our communities. With all these areas in one district, it should save time and money when it comes to coordinating firefighting efforts. Even a 5 minute delay because of bureaucratic kinks in the hose, could mean the difference between losing your home or preserving it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</li> </ul>	11/2/2021	n/a

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities</li> </ul>		
OPTION A	JOSE CORNEJO	Oppose	<p>Strongly opposed!! This district makes it easier for special interests to control election outcomes by breaking up geographic adjacent communities. Please see attached memo of a survey of San Fernando Valley residents.</p> <p>The researcher concluded that "Voters in East San Fernando Valley strongly prefer that the County Supervisorial District in their area remain largely the same, essentially giving the San Fernando Valley its own representative on the Board of Supervisors. By a more than 5:1 margin, East San Fernando Valley voters prefer a district that geographically aligns with the Valley over a district that would be combined with East Los Angeles."</p>	11/1/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
OPTION A	Larry Fleck	Oppose	<p>The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City. The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.</p>	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Monisha Parker	Favor	-	10/29/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Paula Devine	Oppose	<p>I would request that glendale, Burbank and Pasadena remain in the same district as we are woven together by many factors. The three cities share economic, transit and public safety resources. We are currently involved in many projects that will impact our respective communities, such as the Airport Replacement Terminal Project, BRT (Bus Rapid Transit system). These projects are reliant on our ability to work together, as one entity, for the betterment of our communities and our residents. We are making progress on these and other projects, but it is important that we continue to work on them together. I request that you do NOT separate this district. Bus Rapid Transit )</p>	11/2/2021	n/a

OPTION A	Richard Fisk	Favor	<p>There is much discussion and emphasis placed on “communities of interest” and keeping them together as an objective of redrawing District maps. The San Fernando Valley with a population exceeding 1.5 million people could hardly be called a community. If it was a city, it would rank as one of the larger cities in the United States. Therefore, with the many different groups and “communities of interest” making up the entire Valley, it would make more sense to have at least 2 Supervisors represent the San Fernando Valley so that those diverse communities would have a better chance of having a representative that understands their interests and concerns.</p> <p>As an example, the communities of the West SF Valley have more of a rural aspect that is in line with the communities of Santa Clarita and parts of the south Antelope Valley than the Central and South East San Fernando Valley.</p> <p>Please do not make the San Fernando Valley a single Supervisorial District.</p> <p>Richard Fisk Granada Hills</p> <p>(The opinion expressed above is my own. Solely for Identifying: I have lived in the SF Valley for 61 years, currently the Chair of Government Affairs for United Chambers of Commerce and a volunteer for the Los Angeles Police Department)</p>	11/1/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Robert Chang	Favor	<p>Option A is unacceptable for Pomona. It connects Pomona with Torrance and does not create a community of interest. Pomona is a 85% minority community that was little in common with the rich communities in future SD 4. I don't know if this so-called "People's Bloc" ever included anyone representing Pomona. Please reject Option A.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Sharon A Springer	Favor	<p>Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena are communities of common interest and should be in one district. We share overlapping County service needs and economic, transit and public safety resources. For example, representatives of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena serve together on the Hollywood Burbank Airport Authority, Arroyo Verdugo Communities Joint Powers Authority (Measure M) and other Boards and Authorities. Thank you. Burbank Council</p>	11/2/2021	n/a

			Member Sharon Springer		
OPTION A	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Option A splits the San Fernando Valley into two districts, wherein one district Valley residents make up 58% of the population and slightly more than one-third in the other.	10/30/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Teri Malkin	Oppose	Does not give adequate representation to the large Asian population in Rowland Heights.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Victoria A Paul	Oppose	-	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Viviana Garzon	Favor	The Burbank City Council strongly advocates for the classification of the tri-city area of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena. The three cities share common social and economic interests including: a historic connection, demographic similarities, economic objectives, legislative goals, and joint coordination of public service and safety programs. We urge you to keep the tri-cities within the same County supervisorial district.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION A	Wendi Gladstone	Favor	<p>The Santa Susana Mountain Park Association, a 50 year old advocate for protecting local and regional wildlands and open space, fully supports keeping District 5 as is.</p> <p>This District has been committed to keeping our neighborhoods and communities safe, has helped implement vital public safety initiatives and environmental safeguards. We would request of the redistricting Commission that the communities of Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/ Granada Hills continue to be included in the same District as their needs are, in many ways, quite a bit different than the center portions of the San Fernando Valley.</p> <p>The communities in the interior of the San Fernando Valley do not reflect wildfire concerns. The previously mentioned Communities, which lie on the western, northern and eastern edges of the Valley, have year round fire concerns. All these areas of the unincorporated county are more related to Santa Clarita by fire danger than, for example: Winnetka, Reseda or Panorama City.</p> <p>Efforts to preserve open space/wildlands have been made as well as the enhancement of parks, trails and recreational programs. The interior portions of the Valley tend advocate for development. Added to this is the fact that</p>	11/2/2021	n/a

			<p>many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities if they are merged into the greater San Fernando Valley district. We need our resource protected and a strong voice advocating for the safety and well being of the Western, Northern and Eastern most communities of the San Fernando Valley. We feel strongly that keeping these areas in the current configuration will provide that.</p>		
OPTION B	Alex Ugrik	Other	<p>The entire San Fernando Valley is not one community of interest. The commission has broken up much smaller areas into communities of interest, the SFV should be treated in a similar way.</p> <p>Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The Sunland/Tujunga/Kagel Canyon/Shadow Hills communities are an extension of the Tri-Cities Communities (Burbank/Glendale/Pasadena) and should be in district 5 along with the unincorporated areas of Twin Lakes and Lake Manor.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year round fire concern.</p> <p>Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities including the City of Hidden Hills.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Ara najarian	Favor	<p>It is essential that the city of Glendale remain in one entire district and that we remain with our sister cities of Burbank and Pasadena. We three cities share public safety resources transportation resources, library and parks. We should remain in the same supervisorial district.</p>	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Bob Anderson	Favor	<p>ACCEPTABLE – The Option B map keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks), whole in a single District 3. It fairly includes the entire southern, western, and northern portions of the San Fernando Valley, although we cannot understand why Granada Hills was carved out of the district. The district’s southern border is fairly located.</p>	11/1/2021	n/a



OPTION B	Christine L Rowe	Favor	I will submit future comments on how I would like to see this map changed.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Cynthia A Sternquist	Oppose	-	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Dayna DeVito-Fleck	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City. The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Diego Munoz Flores	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City. The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Geovanna Arcia	Oppose	I oppose this map option B because I believe no Commissioner should be submitting their own district map. Commissioners were appointed with the expectation to "be impartial." Submitting own maps is no different than elected officials doing the same thing, which defies the point of having an "INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Jennifer Kennedy	Oppose	-	11/1/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
OPTION B	JOSE CORNEJO	Favor	This is the better of the four options. PLEASE add the entire keep the entire San Fernando Valley in one district including the communities of porter ranch, sylmar, and Grenada hills.  See attached meme from a research firm that concluded that constituencies across the East San Fernando Valley strongly prefer that geographic boundaries for their County Supervisorial District remain within the SFV	11/1/2021	n/a

			including among voters over the age of 65 (82%), Hispanic/Latino voters (65%), and renters (74%)		
OPTION B	Ken Ude	Favor	As the Mayor of San Marino, I feel it is important to keep San Marino, South Pasadena, La Canada, Altadena and Pasadena in the same district.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Larry Fleck	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City. The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Nancy Coleman	Favor	Dear Commissioners,  The North of Montana Association (NOMA) is one of the nonprofit city-designated neighborhood associations of the city of Santa Monica. We represent the residents -- homeowners, renters, and businesses alike -- residing in the area of Santa Monica north of Montana Avenue to its western and eastern city-limits and have done so since our founding in 1989.  We strongly oppose Draft Option B and any other redistricting proposal that would divide our community into different supervisorial districts. The proposal not only divides our neighborhood, but also divides half of NOMA from the rest of Santa Monica. We, as a Santa Monica and NOMA community, are facing numerous ongoing significant problems. These include impacts of climate change, including fires, Covid-19, homelessness. Going forward we urgently need unified representation on a county level. This proposal would weaken that by splitting the representation of our long-standing community down the middle. To do so would be unnecessarily damaging to our neighborhood's sense of community, as well as to NOMA's mission to represent all of our residents fairly and equally.  Sincerely, For the NOMA Board:	11/2/2021	n/a

			Nancy Coleman, Chair		
OPTION B	Robert Chang	Favor	B is not a bad option for Pomona.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Stuart Waldman	Favor	Option B also splits in the San Fernando 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 be improved with a few changes.	10/30/2021	n/a
OPTION B	TEENA A TAKATA	Favor	This option keeps the northern part of the San Fernando together, so I chose that. We have similar issues with fire danger and Aliso Canyon contamination, as well as are joined geographically in the San Fernando Valley.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Teri Malkin	Oppose	Does not give adequate representation to the large Asian population in Rowland Heights.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B	Victoria A Paul	Favor		11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Alex Ugrik	Other	<p>The entire San Fernando Valley is not one community of interest. The commission has broken up much smaller areas into communities of interest, the SFV should be treated in a similar way.</p> <p>Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The Sunland/Tujunga/Kagel Canyon/Shadow Hills communities are an extension of the Tri-Cities Communities (Burbank/Glendale/Pasadena) and should be in district 5 along with the unincorporated areas of Twin Lakes and Lake Manor.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year round fire concern.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a

			Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities including the City of Hidden Hills.		
OPTION C	Bob Anderson	Oppose	VERY UNACCEPTABLE – The Option C map DOES NOT keep the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks), whole in a single District 3. POSO is bounded by Oxnard Street (north), Hazeltine Avenue (east), Burbank Boulevard (south), and the 405 Freeway (west). POSO was official added to the Sherman Oaks community in 2009 by a City Council Renaming Action. The map fairly includes the entire southern, western, and northern portions of the San Fernando Valley. However, the map extends too far south into Marina del Rey and unfairly excludes major portions of the eastern San Fernando Valley, e.g., Van Nuys and Panorama City. This separates local adjacent Communities of Interest, such as Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys.	11/1/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Chris Constantin	Oppose	San Gabriel Valley cities should not be separated from each other, nor should San Gabriel Valley cities, like San Dimas, be included with areas as far south as Long Beach which is the case in this Option C map. I strongly oppose this map which would not ensure our San Gabriel Valley cities are treated fairly. Either options A, B, or D are better as it leaves San Dimas with more of the San Gabriel Valley. Further, in any scenario, San Gabriel Cities should not be grouped with any part of Central Los Angeles, as we already believe our voice is not fully heard and considered.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Cynthia A Sternquist	Oppose		11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Dayna DeVito-Fleck	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City. The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Diego Munoz Flores	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than	11/2/2021	n/a

			<p>Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.</p>		
OPTION C	Geovanna Arcia	Favor	<p>I am in favor of map option C. This map accurately captures the CVAP and clearly identifies and supports the growing Latino population in LA County. It is the only map that is following the VRA and U.S. Constitution.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION C	JOSE CORNEJO	Oppose	<p>Breaks up the San Fernando Valley. Porter Ranch to Long Beach wow No!!</p>	11/1/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Larry Fleck	Oppose	<p>The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.</p>	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Robert Chang	Favor	<p>If you were going to adopt a public map, I would pick option C. C at least connects Pomona with more of the rest of the San Gabriel Valley rather than leaving it as an orphan dominated by the richer coastal cities like Option A. The San Gabriel River watershed is an interesting boundary and it could extend to the coast.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Ruben Karapetian	Oppose	<p>District 3 divides up the Tricity Area of Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena, which should be considered one unit in any deviation of future county maps. The Tricity area is the central hub for the Armenian community. Having the core of the Armenian community divided will pose negative consequences for access to vital community services and the representation of our community's voice at the County level.</p>	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	<p>This is a horrible map. Option C splits up the San Fernando 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.</p>	10/30/2021	n/a

OPTION C	Teri Malkin	Oppose	Does not give adequate representation to the large Asian population in Rowland Heights.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION C	Victoria A Paul	Oppose		11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Alex Ugrik	Other	<p>The entire San Fernando Valley is not one community of interest. The commission has broken up much smaller areas into communities of interest, the SFV should be treated in a similar way.</p> <p>Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The Sunland/Tujunga/Kagel Canyon/Shadow Hills communities are an extension of the Tri-Cities Communities (Burbank/Glendale/Pasadena) and should be in district 5 along with the unincorporated areas of Twin Lakes and Lake Manor.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year round fire concern.</p> <p>Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities including the City of Hidden Hills.</p>	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Bob Anderson	Favor	VERY ACCEPTABLE – The Option D map keeps the entire Sherman Oaks community, including POSO (Part of Sherman Oaks), whole in a single District 3. It fairly includes the entire southern, western, and northern portions of the San Fernando Valley, and reasonable portions of the east Valley. The district's southern border is fairly located.	11/1/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Cynthia A Sternquist	Oppose		11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Dayna DeVito-Fleck	Oppose	<p>The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City.</p> <p>The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the</p>	11/2/2021	n/a

			communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.		
OPTION D	Diego Munoz Flores	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City. The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Geovanna Arcia	Oppose	I oppose this map option D because I believe no Commissioner should be submitting their own district map. Commissioners were appointed with the expectation to "be impartial." Submitting own maps is no different than elected officials doing the same thing, which defies the point of having an "INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION D	JOSE CORNEJO	Other	PLEASE add the entire keep the entire San Fernando Valley in one district including the communities of porter ranch, sylmar, and Grenada hills.  See attached meme from a research firm that concluded that constituencies across the East San Fernando Valley strongly prefer that geographic boundaries for their County Supervisorial District remain within the SFV including among voters over the age of 65 (82%), Hispanic/Latino voters (65%), and renters (74%)	11/1/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Larry Fleck	Oppose	The northwest San Fernando Valley communities should stay together. Chatsworth Lake Manor/Chatsworth/Porter Ranch/Twin Lakes/Granada Hills are closer in economic and cultural ties to the Santa Clarita Valley than Sherman Oaks/Studio City. The current communities do not reflect our wildfire concerns, the communities of the northwest and east have year-round fire concern. Many equestrian communities are being separated from other equestrian communities.	11/2/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Robert Chang	Favor	I think D is best for Pomona and the San Gabriel Valley.	11/3/2021	n/a

OPTION D	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Option D splits the San Fernando Valley into two districts, where San Fernando Valley residents make up 57% of the population in one district and 34% in the other.	10/30/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Teri Malkin	Oppose	Does not give adequate representation to the large Asian population in Rowland Heights.	11/3/2021	n/a
OPTION D	Victoria A Paul	Favor	-	11/2/2021	n/a
-	Bob Anderson	-	-	10/29/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
-	Charles Evan	-	-	10/29/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>
-	Ann O' Connor	-	-	10/31/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a> <a href="#">View attachment</a>
-	Viviana Garzon	-	-	11/2/2021	<a href="#">View attachment</a>