

Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Special Meeting (12/15/2021)

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
5.a.	A S Albert	Oppose	<p>I OPPOSE MAP 5B under consideration this evening. I SUPPORT MAP F4, which has received more robust analysis and public comment. I OPPOSE MAP 5B because it splits Studio City into two districts — a neighborhood and community of interest — without justification. I also OPPOSE MAP 5B because significant county cultural assets have been removed from SD 3 for no good reason! PLEASE RECONSIDER - and SUPPORT MAP F4.</p> <p>Amy S. Albert, Studio City</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Andrew F Kratzer	Favor	<p>The changes to the Valley portion of District 3 seem to have been done without community input and weren't made in the interests of the people the commission is charged to represent. Why did these changes happen? I live in District 3 and am severely impacted by the Hollywood Bowl, which is in a different district. These last minute moves don't seem to be in the best interests of the people who are represented in District 3. Please go back to Map F-4 for District 3. The population counts and data make more sense in F-4. Please go back to map F-4.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Artesha Thomas	Other	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Bernice Clarke	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Bradley J Klimovitch	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	View attachment
5.a.	charles southey	Oppose	<p>Why would the South Bay (Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo etc) be lumped in with Downtown LA? They have nothing in common, totally different demographics and needs. One area is city living and another is beach living. Keep the coastal cities united. While your at it can you add the South Bay to Orange County?</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

5.a.	christian trigueros	Oppose	as far as the constitution of providing a census is constitutional but drawing maps and segregating people and american communities by race or color is a violation of the first amendment for government or any organization to do so. as a result these maps and data are misrepresented by voters which is also a violation of voting rights. also your committiee is violating its own bylaws which states that members are not only qualified or highly trained in every level of government and organizations in all levels of resident social and economic interest.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Daniel M Freedman	Oppose	<p>To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Dina Mills	Oppose	-	12/13/2021	n/a
5.a.	elaine loring	Oppose	I strongly oppose North Hollywood and Studio City being included in District 5. The communities and concerns in the east San Fernando Valley differ sharply from Santa Clarita, Palmdale and Lancaster. The commission should redraw this map in order to achieve a district that more fairly represents the San Fernando Valley. In addition, the commission needs to act to increase the number of Supervisors. L.A. County is far too large, complex and diverse to be well represented by just 5 Supervisors.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Jennifer Slusser	Other	-	12/14/2021	n/a

5.a.	Jerri Rousseau	Oppose	I oppose the final map. Manhattan beach has far more in common with other beach cities than with downtown and Inglewood.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.a.	John Damico	Other	I am not in favor of any map that separates West Hollywood from the other Westside cities. Our ability to influence local govt policy depends on working in consortium across districts.	12/13/2021	n/a
5.a.	John Luker	Oppose	<p>The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'</p> <p>Why was this new map adopted on a Sunday afternoon, without ANY public outreach, and 48 hours later, is the last time to comment?</p> <p>Where is there a "Entertainment Industry Community of Concern", here in the unincorporated land in the hills of the west valley?</p> <p>Who formulated this idea?</p> <p>Does that person have a connection to the unincorporated lands in the western SF Valley?</p> <p>Does that person have a connection with the Entertainment Industry?</p>	12/14/2021	n/a
5.a.	Karo Torossian	Other	Since your Maps have not been able to unify the SFV+ Burbank+ Glendale, Please keep the Armenian Communities together. The Attached map moves the population from SD3 to SD5 Unifying all of North Hollywood into SD5 and also moving Valley Glen into SD5 to unite the dense Armenian Communities together into SD5. This is a Shift of 109K people but since SD5 was underpopulated by 115K and SD3 was Overpopulated by 55K it will bring SD5 to an almost perfect population and SD3 will be under by 54K. Bringing the total deviations way down.	12/13/2021	View attachment
5.a.	Kimberly Clarke	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Krista Michaels	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Laura Kastner	Other	Keep South Bay cities in District 4, move Southeast cities back to District 2	12/13/2021	n/a

5.a.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Oppose	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Favor	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>		
5.a.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Oppose	<p>12/15/2021</p> <p>To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Lee Phillips	Oppose	<p>Move the beach cities back into District 4 and exchange for more traditional areas closer to downtown for District 2. The beach cities have much more in common with Torrance, PV Peninsula and Long Beach than parts of downtown.</p>	12/14/2021	n/a

			Communities of District 2 have much more in common with the areas closer to downtown than the beach cities. This is rather obvious and a simple change that will greatly enhance the goal of matching common communities of interest and greatly improve this map, as well as minimize changes from the current District lines.		
5.a.	Lena Fraser	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Lisa Mazzocco	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	NAOMI A KOBIN	Oppose	<p>I was astounded to hear of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5. Im the president of our Neighborhood association, the HHWNC Area 4 chair and a resident of Hollywood Heights for 15 years. We are directly significantly involved with the Hollywood Bowl and the Ford Theatre. What takes place season after season literally transforms our lives from a quiet residential neighborhood to a community stressed by traffic, noise and the impact of thousands upon thousands of people entering our neighborhood nightly to attend concerts and events at these venues. The impact has worsened over the years as the season expands and larger acts attend the venues.</p> <p>The listening and support we get from our District deputies on multiple issues including traffic , crime, litter homelessness etc specific to these venues is imperative. They understand the history and know the issues our community faces and frankly listen.</p> <p>Removing these assets and placing them into District 5 simply comes across as no less than corruption and an unconscionable asset grab.. It makes no good sense. This is a bad plan.</p> <p>The window of time for community comment has been shockingly minimal. Given a reasonable amount of time you would hear a resounding NO from the constituents of these areas.</p> <p>I implore this committee to return the prior map leaving these assets within the District along with the communities they directly impact.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	NAOMI KOBIN	Favor	<p>I was astounded to hear of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5. Im the president of our Neighborhood association, the HHWNC Area 4 chair and a resident of Hollywood Heights for 15 years. We are directly significantly involved with the Hollywood Bowl and the Ford Theatre. What takes place season after</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>season literally transforms our lives from a quiet residential neighborhood to a community stressed by traffic, noise and the impact of thousands upon thousands of people entering our neighborhood nightly to attend concerts and events at these venues. The impact has worsened over the years as the season expands and larger acts attend the venues.</p> <p>The listening and support we get from our District deputies on multiple issues including traffic , crime, litter homelessness etc specific to these venues is imperative. They understand the history and know the issues our community faces and frankly listen.</p> <p>Removing these assets and placing them into District 5 simply comes across as no less than corruption and an unconscionable asset grab.. It makes no good sense. This is a bad plan.</p> <p>The window of time for community comment has been shockingly minimal. Given a reasonable amount of time you would hear a resounding NO from the constituents of these areas.</p> <p>I implore this committee to return the prior map leaving these assets within the District along with the communities they directly impact.</p>		
5.a.	Norma Hamilton	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Ray Panek	Oppose	No	12/15/2021	n/a
5.a.	Steve Braudo	Oppose	<p>What possible rationale is there for including the Beach Cities with Los Angeles instead of keeping them as is with Palis Verdes, San Pedro. Our cities have much more in common with the towns adjacent to us than to the city of Los AngelesThe city of LA should be a district unto itself because it's massive size means any cities lumped in with it will not have their needs met.</p>	12/14/2021	n/a
5.a.	Tim Hepburn	Oppose	<p>I want to thank all of the Commissioners for all of your hard work and dedication to this process. Up until a few days ago La Verne was in District 5 completely. But with this new map the south part of La Verne [Fairplex] was put into District 1. La Verne has established an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District EIFD. The Proposed redistricting will split La Verne as a community of interest [which no other surrounding City is split between two districts] but would place the EIFD in Supervisor Solis's district. Supervisor Barger has been instrumental in supporting the formation of the district, which benefits the County, La Verne and the Fairplex. Supervisor Barger is a Voting Member of the Public Financing Authority Board for</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>the EIFD, and here staff are well versed in the purpose of the district and has participated in all of the meetings since the district was formed. The infrastructure projects identified in the EIFD are essential for the development of La Verne both inside and outside the district boundaries, impacting development across Supervisors districts. normally not done. We request that this carveout be put back in so all of La Verne is in district 5. As we have in the past and will in the future work closely with Supervisor Solis and the Fairplex and the surrounding Cities to make any of our endeavors a Success, Thanks You Tim Hepburn Mayor of La Verne.</p>		
5.a.	Todd Henricks	Oppose	<p>I'm shocked to learn of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5. I'm Vice President of our neighborhood association (Hollywood Heights), and neighborhood resident for the past 18-years. Having direct communication with the Hollywood Bowl is important since we sit directly next to the bowl and are impacted season after season, it literally transforms our lives from a quiet residential neighborhood to a community stressed by traffic, noise and the impact of thousands upon thousands of people entering our neighborhood nightly to attend concerts and events at this venue. The impact has worsened over the years as the season expands and larger acts perform at the Bowl.</p> <p>The listening and support we get from our District deputies on multiple issues including traffic, crime, litter, and homelessness specific to this venue is imperative. They understand the history and know the issues our community faces and frankly listen.</p> <p>Removing these assets and placing them into District 5 simply comes across as no less than corruption and an unconscionable asset grab. It makes no good sense. This is a bad plan.</p> <p>The window of time for community comment has been shockingly minimal. Given a reasonable amount of time you would hear a resounding NO from the constituents of these areas.</p> <p>I implore this committee to return the prior map leaving these assets within the District along with the communities they directly impact. I was astounded to hear</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5.		
5.a.	Yvette Deans	Oppose	No	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	A S Albert	Oppose	I OPPOSE MAP 5B under consideration this evening. I SUPPORT MAP F4, which has received more robust analysis and public comment. I OPPOSE MAP 5B because it splits Studio City into two districts — a neighborhood and community of interest — without justification. I also OPPOSE MAP 5B because significant county cultural assets have been removed from SD 3 for no good reason! PLEASE RECONSIDER - and SUPPORT MAP F4. Amy S. Albert, Studio City	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Abbe S Land	Oppose	I am writing in favor of the F-4 map that was proposed at the beginning of the 12/12/21 meeting. F-4 represented the work of the Commission, use of population data sources and input from community members and groups. It ensured communities of interest were grouped together, representation for African Americans and Latinos, as well as population distribution. Though the new option does have West Hollywood in SD3, and kept it whole, i don't understand why the other changes to SD3 are being proposed. This new for option for SD3 does not make sense to me. You have Hollywood Bowl in SD5 but all the area around it is in SD3. Not clear why Universal City was moved as well. And the areas of Porter Ranch, Granada Hills and Chatsworth are more aligned with SD5. This new proposed map takes the process back, not forward and seems to disregard a lot of the public comments received. Please approve SD3 as it was presented in the F-4.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Alexandra Hornor	Oppose	With all the problems we're facing in Los Angeles, I'm deeply disturbed by the current plan for redistricting in the 3rd district. As a homeowner, a small business owner, and a mother of 2 small children I'm invested in the future of our County and am outraged at what seems to be a local effort to mimic a national gerrymandering problem. By doing this, you will undermine the voices of thousands of families working in community to improve the conditions in our County, and will further empower the privileged few who benefit. MY FAMILY OPPOSES 5B. PLEASE VOTE NO.	12/15/2021	n/a

5.b.	Amy Gustincic	Oppose	I was alarmed to see that Los Feliz was split into multiple districts at the most recent public meeting. Los Feliz is a distinct community of interest and it is unbelievable that it will now be split so that neighbors will be in different county districts. One need only look at the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council boundaries to see where the lines should be. In a county where the districts are large by population and area, especially district 5, it is all the more important that Los Feliz be kept whole in one district, otherwise we may never receive proper representation.	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Amy Wong	Favor	<p>I'd like to thank you for your work so far. I support how the San Gabriel Valley is kept together in SD1 in the final map, from El Monte to Pomona.</p> <p>I just have 1 request: please add Peck Road Water Conservation Park into SD1. It does not belong in SD5, where foothill residents have more access to open spaces like the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument.</p> <p>Our San Gabriel Valley Community of Interest in SD1 is park-poor due to historic disinvestment and inequitable land use. El Monte ranks in the worst category, as "very high need". Residents don't have access to parks, so we value the few parks we do have, which includes Peck Park. Many families from El Monte use Peck Road Park- for fishing, picnicking, biking, walking, and enjoying nature. As frequent park users, we deserve a say in how the park is managed. The park should be under SD1's jurisdiction, not SD5. This ensures our voices are included in the management process. This is a quick and easy fix that doesn't affect the County's CVAP percentages, because there aren't any residents at the park. Please add Peck Road Park in SD1.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Anastasia R Mann	Other	Request you Adopt Map F-4 to keep Hollywood Bowl, The Ford, Griffith Park and Universal Studios in District 3.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Anastasia R Mann	Other	The stunning news of this Commissions last minute plan to switch the prime community assets of the Hollywood area from District 3 to 5 borders on a back room deal for who knows what underhanded purpose. I'm the Président of Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council and 1) The Hollywood Bowl Is in our Area 4; The Ford & our portion of Griffith Park are in Area 1; 3) Universal Studios/City Walk is in our Area 2. These neighborhood communities are DEEPLY and SIGNIFICANTLY INVOLVED in these venues on a daily basis. There are literally	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>thousands of residents and businesses that will be impacted should this folly be allowed to proceed. NO SIGNIFICANT notice has gone out to those of us in this area - all within my HHWNC Borders. Why not??? Our Board is not meeting and tonight, I'm told is the last opportunity for public comment?? How can you not formally advise a NC that includes 4 major monumental assets to our stakeholders. We currently work hand in hand with District 3 deputies on multiple issues affecting safety, traffic, crime, homelessness, infrastructure, environment etc pertaining to these specific venues.</p> <p>PLEASE reconsider this inexplicable poor idea and go back to the prior map leaving these locations, in tact, in District 3 WITH the communities they directly impact. Thank you for your valuable consideration.</p>		
5.b.	Andrew F Kratzer	Favor	<p>The changes to the Valley portion of District 3 seem to have been done without community input and weren't made in the interests of the people the commission is charged to represent. Why did these changes happen? I live in District 3 and am severely impacted by the Hollywood Bowl, which is in a different district. These last minute moves don't seem to be in the best interests of the people who are represented in District 3. Please go back to Map F-4 for District 3. The population counts and data make more sense in F-4. Please go back to map F-4.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Andrew S Menor	Oppose	<p>I work for the Thai Community Development Center and I represent the Thai community and the AAPI community and would like to urge the commission to keep Thai Town whole and intact by making the following revisions to the Final Map Pending Formal Resolution. First, please ensure that the area bounded by Hollywood Blvd., N. Western Ave., W. Sunset Blvd., and N. Serrano Ave is shifted from District 3 to District 1 so that it will be incorporated with the rest of Thai Town. Secondly, we ask that the Commission shift the area bound by Franklin, Hollywood Blvd/Prospect Ave, Vermont, and Normandie from District 5 to District 1 so that it will remain intact with the rest of Thai Town. It is critical that these changes be made in order to preserve Thai Town's boundaries and keep our community together under the same district. We need to keep Thai Town unified as we are a community that faces many shared challenges. Many of our residents have limited English proficiency and are low-income and undocumented workers and renters vulnerable to gentrification and displacement. As a result, Thai Town residents rely on funding to community organizations that provide in-language and culturally-competent health care, business support, and affordable housing.</p>	12/14/2021	n/a

			Dividing Thai Town will effectively dilute the collective voice of our Thai Town residents and could jeopardize critical funding to community programs and projects that provide vital assistance to residents in need. For all these reasons, the aforementioned revisions must be made to the current map. Thank you.		
5.b.	Andrew Silver	Oppose	I strongly oppose North Hollywood being included in District 5. I am horrified by the prospect of being represented by the lone Republican on the BoS. The Communities of Interest in the east San Fernando Valley could not be more disparate from Santa Clarita, Palmdale and Lancaster. The commission should redraw this map in order to achieve a district that more fairly represents the San Fernando Valley. The commission must formally recommend and the BoS must take action to increase the number of Supervisors that represent Los Angeles County. L.A. County is far too large in population, diversity, Col's, and Geography to be represented by just 5 districts.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Ann M LaManna	Oppose	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the fifth district. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the fifth district, and attached to the North County in northeast San Fernando Valley foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Artesha Thomas	Other	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Ashley Orona	Favor	Hello, my name is Ashley Orona and I am a resident of unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2. I urge the CRC to keep Florence-Firestone in the Second District under Supervisor Mitchell's district. As an unincorporated community we lack proper political representation and heavily rely on the Supervisor as our sole representative and so redistricting Florence-Firestone away from SD2 will only cause further confusion for residents living here and further disenfranchise our community. Florence-Firestone should remain with the Supervisor they voted for in 2020. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD2. Thank you.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Barbara Malin	Oppose	Please revert back to MAP F4	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Bernice Clarke	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Briana Dorner-Warner	Favor	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these	12/15/2021	n/a

			communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.		
5.b.	Bryant Edwards	Favor	Commissioner Wong, please do not abstain. Please vote in opposition to the motion. Your comments on the actions of the Commission and the changes that occurred Sunday are spot on. Thank you!	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Bryant Edwards	Favor	I strongly encourage the commission to OPPOSE adoption of the map that was developed on 12/12/2021. After several meetings discussing various iterations of maps, and carefully refining versions and amendments toward a cohesive map, the actions over the weekend were akin to carving a turkey with a baseball bat. Several last minute changes occurred in such a haphazard way that we have several communities split between two districts. For example, both Los Feliz and Silver Lake have been split between different districts. Los Feliz, previously in SD3, is now placed partially in SD5 and partially in SD1, splitting a community of approximately 35,000 people into two disparate districts. The changes over the weekend were so drastic and done in a manner that undermined the transparency for community awareness and involvement, while intentionally severing some communities between two districts. As an independent commission, I expect this body (irrespective of their personal investment in this process) to take a pause, examine how this map has come to be, the negative impacts of this proposal, and to OPPOSE this map.	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Bryant Edwards	Favor	Please be aware of all of the options for tonight's vote. It is not obligatory to adopt this map and report. You can vote to OPPOSE given how quickly and haphazardly many changes were made over the weekend.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Bryant Edwards	Favor	Tonight's comments by Commissioner Holtzman that people were reading from the same script is both offensive and hypocritical given how many changes were made to the map by the Commission based upon comments by people reading scripts. The insinuation that points made by anyone who uses a script for public comment is less valid than others is wildly inappropriate. Anyone who spends the time to attend these meetings, offer comment, and be engaged in their community should be commended.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Candice Cho	Other	I appreciate the Commission's efforts to keep Thai Town whole in its final map, Map F-4, which includes the summary description "Please note that the area bounded by Hollywood Blvd., N. Western Ave., W. Sunset Blvd., and N. Serrano Ave is to be in District 1 with the rest of Thai Town." In order to keep Thai Town	12/14/2021	View attachment

			<p>whole, please note that the area bound by Normandie, Franklin, Vermont, and Prospect/Hollywood should also be included in SD1 as a part of Thai Town. I am attaching the Thai Town COI and a screenshot of the final map with red markings indicating the missing part. Thank you for your consideration.</p>		View attachment
5.b.	carrie ungerman	Oppose	<p>I am a constituent of District 3 and found out earlier today that this past Sunday after the commission closed public comment, significant changes were made in districts 3 and 5 without regards to neighborhoods or cultural institutions. I find this move very unsettling for several reasons.</p> <p>The implications of the new changes have not been adequately considered and they were made without public comment. I cannot access a map that clearly shows the changes and proposed new boundaries and names the cities and neighborhoods within them.</p> <p>The only opportunity for public comment will be today, just a few hours before the commission needs to vote on a final map. After a year of work it is disappointing to know that this decision will feel hasty and thoroughly unvetted.</p> <p>As a voting constituent this news is disconcerting especially as I've now been impacted in the redistricting process twice, the first with LA City Council Districts 2 and 4.</p> <p>It feels like Los Angeles City and County's redistricting are following a disturbing pattern that is much more overt across the country.</p> <p>If there must be a decision today why not adopt an earlier map also discussed last weekend, map F4, which has received more robust analysis and public comment?</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Carter Moon	Oppose	<p>I do not support adopting this map and instead support adopting the earlier map, F4. All power to the people.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Catherine Safley	Oppose	<p>The implications of this new map have not been adequately considered and were made without input from public comment before today. Further consideration must be given to any districting changes before adopting them. If any map is to be adopted, it should be map F4, which received far more analysis and public comment. The communities affected must have as much input into districting changes as possible. Making changes that the public has had little to no say in is</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>unethical to say the least.</p> <p>The most recent map proposed would redraw SD3 in a way that would favor the destructive status quo of incarceration, jeopardize the full funding for Measure J/Care First Community Investment and undermine the alternatives to incarceration implementation process in favor of continuing to waste County funds on the violence of LASD.</p> <p>We must hold fast in our commitment to a Care First future for the good of L.A. residents and communities at large. We cannot afford to go backwards and drag out the damaging policies and practices that have led to so much of the suffering in our county. I urge the Board to reject the latest districting map and instead adopt map F4.</p>		
5.b.	charles southey	Oppose	<p>Why would the South Bay (Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo etc) be lumped in with Downtown LA? They have nothing in common, totally different demographics and needs. One area is city living and another is beach living. Keep the coastal cities united. While your at it can you add the South Bay to Orange County?</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Chris Darby	Oppose	<p>The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'</p>	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Chris Kelleher	Oppose	<p>Citizens Redistricting Commission</p> <p>Many thanks for the Commission's hard work this far. I conditionally approve of this new map, F-4, if and only if the Beach Cities are moved back to District 4, and areas in Southeast LA are moved back into District 2.</p> <p>The Beach Cities have few common interests or concerns with District 2 - primarily a South LA and downtown district. I've been advised that District 2 residents have expressed concern with being included into the Beach Cities, as they do not feel properly aligned with the Beach Cities concerns. To me, this appears to be one of the few shortcomings of this final map under consideration.</p>	12/13/2021	n/a

			<p>In exchange for Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach being moved back into District 4, one proposal that that appears would balance the population shift and reduce the deviation is to move Florence, Walnut Park and Lynwood back into District 2. These areas seem much better aligned with the downtown areas directly adjacent than the rest of District 4.</p> <p>Moving the Beach Cities of Redondo, Hermosa and Manhattan back into District 4 in exchange for these or similarly sized Southeast LA areas being moved back into District 2 will greatly improve map F-4.</p> <p>Appreciate serious consideration, thanks!</p>		
5.b.	christian trigueros	Oppose	<p>also to prove this action if passed or approved will be unconstitutional and void because thru the census of my Community of Interest spread out thru the LA COUNTY of 10,000,000 population within 5 regions there are 4.5 million members of LA Catholics in the La county redistricting citizens committee do not have at least 4 catholics that represent the diversity of the county then its a violation of your bylaws and is void.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Christina M Dirkes	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose North Hollywood being included in District 5. I do not want to be represented by the only Republican on the Board of Supervisors, and beyond that, Santa Clarita, Palmdale, and Lancaster do not share the same interests or needs as North Hollywood!The commission should redraw this map in order to achieve a district that more fairly represents the San Fernando Valley. The commission must formally recommend and the BoS must take action to increase the number of Supervisors that represent Los Angeles County. L.A. County is far too large in population, diversity, Col's, and Geography to be represented by just 5 districts. It's really absurd. Please do this!</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Christine L Rowe	Other	<p>This is from Comments in the chat that I made because of misinformed public comments. I have done outreach to hundreds of people both in the West San Fernando Valley as well as people in the Las Virgenes Community of Interest who first suggested the "Rim of the Valley" project. Chris Rowe (You) 06:35 PM Chris Rowe - I would like to point out that VICA has also asked to keep the San Fernando Valley whole.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>Chris Rowe (You) 06:36 PM The Entertainment Corridor Concept came out from the LA City Council members.</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 06:38 PM To all of the members of the SSMPA and that area - I submitted the discussion of the Rim of the Valley as the way to bound the San Fernando Valley. The SSMPA supports the the Rim of the Valley project per their website.</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 06:40 PM SSMPA: ssmpa.com/ SSMPA supports the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act as it works its way through U.S. Congress</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 06:40 PM govtrack.us/congress/bills/115/hr4086</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 06:40 PM rimofthevalleycoalition.com/</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 06:41 PM ssmpa.com/resources/SSMPA%20supports%20ROTV.pdf</p> <p>Chris Rowe (You) 06:42 PM I know that at least one person that spoke on the 5th District has been appointed to a Commission I believe by the 5th District. I believe they have also gotten funding I believe from the Supervisor for their projects?"</p> <p>I want to make it clear that my comments, articles I have written in CityWatchLA, and I have submitted PowerPoints and lengthy letters to the Commissioners directly which have been captured in public comments.</p> <p>Thank you to the Commissioners who did hear more from the people over the hill - from East LA, SELA, the Harbors, etc., who have been there regularly, and less from people in the San Fernando Valley. I recognize that you are not supposed to be considering the interests of the existing Commissioners in your decisions.</p> <p>I appreciate what you were able to combine much of the San Fernando Valley in the 3rd Supervisorial District with the Las Virgenes COI.</p> <p>And finally, in reference to something I said, I do not know of any City Councilmembers from the other side of the Hill who are running for the 3rd District.</p>		
5.b.	Corina Post	Oppose	This new map is problematic, insufficiently discussed, and splits critical cultural institutions. The Commission should alternatively approve Map F4.	12/15/2021	n/a

5.b.	Dana Bagdasarian	Oppose	The Beach Cities do not have enough in common with DTLA, in terms of day to day logistics, needs, businesses, etc. The Beach Cities should remain in their own similar communities with Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach. I appreciate that boundary lines need to be changed form time to time but it ought to be what is best in the area's interests, meaning being grouped with similar business, goals, needs, etc and not simply redrawn for political purposes. I appreciate you taking the time to read my input, I love living in a democracy where people get to voice our opinions.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Daniel L Bernstein	Oppose	Our community and its neighbor council is being split into district 3 and 5. It did not happen until the last change. This map also puts NBCUniversal, the Hollywood Bowl, the Ford Theater in District 5 while many of the homes that are effected by its activities into District 3. Thus the Supervisor we elect will not have any control of these county areas. That is a serious problem and smells of politics.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Daniel M Freedman	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	DANIEL SAVAGE	Other	<p>I am the Area 1 Chair of the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council (HHWNC) and the President of the Hollywood Knolls Community Club (HKCC), the residents association covering 850 homes in the Hollywood Knolls, the Hollywood Manor and Lakeridge Estates.</p> <p>I am completely flummoxed by the news that the Redistricting Commission has, at the very last minute, and therefore with no public input, decided to pull key community assets, specifically, the Hollywood Bowl, Universal Studios and the Ford Theatre along with that part of Griffith park (which is in my HHWNC Area 1) out of District 3 and move them to District 5. There is no logical explanation for this move which will disenfranchise thousands of residents (bizarrely, the institutions are being moved but NOT the neighborhoods around them).</p> <p>Given that this move was made late Sunday and now we're told that because of deadlines that have been imposed on the Commission, that the ONLY opportunity for comment will be tonight (Wednesday the 15th), just a few hours before the commission needs to have a final vote, it is literally impossible that these changes have been given adequate study. Further, even at this late date, there has been no outreach to District 3 stakeholders, including people like me who serve on</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>Neighborhood Council and deal directly with the staff at District 3.</p> <p>We recognize that the Redistricting Commission has worked all year on this project, and for this to be the final outcome would be a tragic final product to all the work that's been done up do now.</p> <p>Given the shortness of time, I sincerely urge you to shelve this terrible and ill conceived idea and instead go back to the prior map which would keep these institutions, along with the neighborhoods which surround them in District 3.</p>		
5.b.	David Benz	Oppose	<p>Fire safety: All the residential neighborhoods in the Hollywood hills should be in the same district as they share the same concerns about fire safety, emergency vehicle access, environmental protection and management of tourism while having substandard streets.</p> <p>HOLLYWOOD BOWL As it stands, the final map moves all of the County-owned cultural institutions out of District 3. The Hollywood Bowl has been in district 3 for more than 70 years, and now will be moved to a new district that is represented by someone different than the Supervisor for people who live around the Bowl. This will cause great difficulty in constituent services, dealing with related impacts, and aligning interests to support and preserve this great cultural institution. Please keep the Hollywood Bowl in District 3.</p> <p>Alternative Map F-4 Map F-4 was the last map approved by the Commission that had the opportunity for public input. I agree with Lindsay Horvath in not understanding why the Commission made the changes to the Valley portion of District 3. These changes did not receive any community input and were not made in the interest of the people the commission is charged to represent. Why did these changes happen? These last-minute moves don't pass the smell test, and have potentially devastating consequences for arts & cultural resources in the County. Please</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			reconsider. One option is to approve Map F-4 for District 3. You have the population counts & data that allow you to meet your obligations tonight.		
5.b.	David Diaz	Other	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	David Hartmire	Oppose	The commission acted did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. Our YMCA has enjoyed a very positive relationship with the District 5 office. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Diego Munoz-Flores	Oppose	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire Northeast San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Dina L Fisher	Oppose	I must say I have heard no convincing comment to explain the legitimacy of the map change brought in at the last moment Sunday night, after public comment was over. If one was going to set up a pre-arranged deal, it would have played out exactly as it occurred on Sunday night. We citizens have spent weeks diligently calling in for public comment and submitting comments online. The number of comments for keeping the Northwest Valley communities in the 5th district far outweighed the number of public comments opposing. The voice of residents was loud and clear. The new map was inserted at the eleventh hour. The commissioners had weeks to make such a motion. As a dedicated advocate for my community, who has spent years working to build relationships with other rural communities in the 5th district, I am saddened, angry and frustrated by the way things went down. At the very least, this is a massive failure on the commissioners parts to understand the unique needs of rural communities. At worst, it is political favors for candidates running for office.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Dina Mills	Oppose	-	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Don Larson	Oppose	Commission was not honest about maps. Overwhelming support for the original F-4 map.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Donna C Shockley	Oppose	I am a long time Redondo Beach resident and want to stay in District 4 with our South Bay neighboring cities. It just doesn't make since to be in the same district as Downtown, Lynwood, San Fernando Valley our wherever. We don't have	12/14/2021	n/a

			common interests and issues with those areas. I don't want my city to be part of District 2. Thank you for your attention.		
5.b.	Edwina Smith	Oppose	'The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	elaine loring	Oppose	I strongly oppose North Hollywood and Studio City being included in District 5. The communities and concerns in the east San Fernando Valley differ sharply from Santa Clarita, Palmdale and Lancaster. The commission should redraw this map in order to achieve a district that more fairly represents the San Fernando Valley. In addition, the commission needs to act to increase the number of Supervisors. L.A. County is far too large, complex and diverse to be well represented by just 5 Supervisors.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Former Los Feliz Neighborhood Council President	Oppose	<p>As a former President of the Los Feliz Neighborhood Council, I write to offer my firm opposition to a change made on the fly by this commission over the weekend that would sever Los Feliz into two Supervisorial Districts, with no justification.</p> <p>Map F-3, which was the subject of your Saturday, December 11 meeting, held Los Feliz together. But then, presumably for purposes of population leveling across districts, our neighborhood was severed, to give half to District 5 and half to District 1. Currently Los Feliz sits completely in District 3.</p> <p>For a community of only 35,000 residents, this action by your commission is appalling. It's enough that Los Feliz is being moved out of the only Supervisorial District we have known; but to then divide us along narrow residential streets into two districts that could hardly be more different from each other, is a sucker punch to a close-knit community.</p> <p>I question the competence of this commission, to make a decision like this, without so much as a second thought. If you understood the first thing about our central Los Angeles communities, and our reliance on the County for public and mental health services, perhaps you would not have been so reckless in this action.</p>	12/13/2021	n/a

			Unless you are able to make Los Feliz whole again, in either District 1 or District 5, this map is not worth approving in its current form.		
5.b.	Greg Irwin	Oppose	Don't adopt this harmful, misrepresentative map that was hastily constructed without space for public comment. Adopt map F4 instead!!	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Harold N Bass	Oppose	-	12/14/2021	View attachment
5.b.	Henry Fung	Favor	Dear commissioners, congratulations on the map. I hope someone has spoken to the City of La Verne to make sure that they are aware of, and have been given the opportunity to give feedback on, the move of the portion of their city south of Bonita Avenue into SD 1. It appears that Commissioner Mendoza, who lives in La Verne, felt that their lack of comment was a vote in the affirmative. I do not think this is the case and they should be given a chance to make an objection. If such a change were made it would not be a significant impact in population deviation and only a minor modification in the legal description, so this could be done at the meeting. Although I objected in public comment at the last meeting, I of course do not live in or work for La Verne and cannot speak for them. But they should be outreached to and given an opportunity to speak for themselves.	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Issam Najm	Favor	I don't know how this last map got injected into the system with no meaningful public input, and there is a mountain of public comments asking the commission to keep the northwest San Fernando Valley in the 5th District. The Community of Porter Ranch has far more common goals and aspirations with the foothill communities of the current 5th District than the rest of the San Fernando Valley. There is nothing geographically, socially, or politically common between our community and the rest of the Valley. We ask that you revert back to map F-4 so we can continue to be with the communities with whom we share most interests.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	James R Bozajian	Favor	On behalf of the City of Calabasas, I thank you for considering our input and testimony, and for crafting District 3 with the notions that all areas within the Conejo Valley be kept together, and that our district remain geographically compact. We truly appreciate these accommodations.	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jane Stanton	Oppose	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the fifth district. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these	12/14/2021	n/a

			communities in the Fifth District and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4		
5.b.	Jane Velez-Mitchell	Favor	Thank you for hearing us and for placing everything South of Washington Blvd into the Second District. The various parts of the wetlands, including the Oxford Lagon, Ballona Creek and the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve belong together! I live here and see the wildlife on a daily basis. Don't let powerful, monied interest bulldoze the Ballona Wetlands, home to 1,700 species, including threatened and endangered species! Thank you!	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jelena Csanyi	Oppose	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jennifer Slusser	Other	Move the beach cities back into District 4 and exchange for more traditional areas closer to downtown for District 2. The beach cities have much more in common with Torrance, PV Peninsula and Long Beach than parts of downtown. Communities of District 2 have much more in common with the areas closer to downtown than the beach cities. This is rather obvious and a simple change that will greatly enhance the goal of matching common communities of interest and greatly improve this map, as well as minimize changes from the current District lines.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jennifer Tooley	Oppose	Adopt map F4. There was more discussion/analysis and particularly public comment on F4!	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jerri Rousseau	Oppose	I oppose the final map. Manhattan beach has far more in common with other beach cities than with downtown and Inglewood.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jill Mather	Favor	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	John Mendoza	Other	-	12/13/2021	View attachment

5.b.	John Mendoza	Other	Balloons Basin? Description questionable as comment by one commission member .see attached for information	12/13/2021	View attachment
5.b.	John Mendoza	Other	Please download the present pdf. Map adopted by committee should be coherent with New City Council Districts election in La Vern. Current map considered splits La Vern City Council area at Wheeler Street new Supervisor District 1. The adoption of extended are along Arrow Highway in close proximity to FAIRPLEX to address environmental issues as traffic will undermine community of Interest in La Vern City Hall. Minimal population would be part of change because the sites are vacant.	12/14/2021	View attachment
5.b.	John Mendoza	Favor	Public Comment	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Jonathan Pacheco Bell	Favor	Hello, my name is Jonathan Pacheco Bell. I am a longtime community member in unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2 and co-author of the book, "A Paseo Through Time in Florence-Firestone." I am in favor of the final map because it keeps Florence-Firestone in the Second District under Supervisor Mitchell's Office. As an unincorporated community, Florence-Firestone lacks proper political representation and heavily relies on the Supervisor's Office as the sole representative. Redistricting Florence-Firestone away from SD2 would only cause further confusion for residents and local business owners, and would disenfranchise our community. Florence-Firestone should remain with the Supervisor they voted for in 2020. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD2. Thank you.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Judith D Trimble	Favor	My recommendation and vote is IN FAVOR of MAP F-1.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Kara L Morgan	Oppose	I recommend adoption of an earlier map also discussed last weekend, map F4, which has received more robust analysis and public comment.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Karen Barnett	Oppose	Atwater Village has historically been represented by District 3 with a bit of District one. We have a working relationship with Kuehls office. We have little relationship with 1 and none with 5. Beyond the change in our elected representation. The new boundaries are not representative of our community and it's interests or shared interests. Our community - Atwater Village, is a riverfront community. The boundary as shown does not include the LA River. According to the LA Countys own LA River	12/15/2021	View attachment

			<p>Masterplan, we have little to no flood protection, as low as 4% to a high of 25%. 100 Year is FEMA base rating. As we address climate change and its impacts our need for a boundary that includes the LA River is of utmost importance for survival.</p> <p>Please move our boundary to include the LA River</p>		
5.b.	Karen Barnett	Oppose	Atwater Village is isolated by the proposed boundaries - see our certified City of L.A. Neighborhood Council map (attached) along with a snapshot of the proposed boundary in North Atwater.	12/15/2021	View attachment
5.b.	Karen S Suter	Oppose	When I testified before the state Redistricting Commission 10 years ago, they agreed with my statement that La Canada and all of La Crescenta should be in the same "district of interest". La Canada Flintridge, Montrose and Tujunga area all along Foothill Blvd in the rural foothills. It makes sense to me to keep the Glendale Unified School District together along with our commercial/social and educational connection with Glendale. I strongly urge that you maintain our "same districts of interest".	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Keren C Waters	Oppose	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take public input on removing the entire Northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record, advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and Northeast San Fernando Valley foothills. As a 33 year insurance veteran specializing in insurance for the entertainment industry, creating an "Entertainment Industry Community Interest" for the Northwest San Fernando Valley is inaccurate. Entertainment industry studios are located and many entertainment individuals reside in Universal City, Toluca Lake, Hollywood Hills, Burbank and Culver City. 80% of the entertainment industry, resides in Beverly Hills, Bel Air, Brentwood, Hollywood and Hills, Malibu, Pacific Palisades, Encino, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Tarzana, Woodland Hills, West Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Agoura Hills, Thousand Oaks, Santa Barbara, Montecito, Ventura, Westlake Village. I recommend consulting SAG, AFTRA and the insurance companies who paid multi-billion dollar claims for total losses of high valued homes, owned by individuals in the entertainment industry including but not limited to AIG, Chubb, Cincinnati, PURE and State Farm. We ask that you revert back to map F-4. Please contact me should you have questions.	12/15/2021	n/a

5.b.	Kimberly Clarke	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Krista Michaels	Oppose	Why at the final hour has the map been changed to arbitrarily remove valuable and important assets like the Hollywood Bowl and Universal Studios, etc., from the current County district and shove them into a farther-away district? This is objectionable to all of the residents of the nearby and adjoining districts who use those assets regularly. It is important to keep local assets in the district where they have been for many years and where they are accessible to the residents who appreciate them and utilize them most. Also it is highly objectionable that these changes were made at the final hour of the last day where there was no public announcement and no opportunity for the general public to weigh in on whether these changes were acceptable or beneficial to the County. Why these last-minute under-cover changes? To what purpose? And to whose benefit?	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Kristina Miller	Oppose	Move the beach cities back into District 4 and exchange for more traditional areas closer to downtown for District 2. The beach cities have much more in common with Torrance, PV Peninsula and Long Beach than parts of downtown. Communities of District 2 have much more in common with the areas closer to downtown than the beach cities. This is rather obvious and a simple change that will greatly enhance the goal of matching common communities of interest and greatly improve this map, as well as minimize changes from the current District lines.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Laura Kastner	Other	Keep South Bay cities in District 4, move Southeast cities back to District	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Laura Oczachowski	Oppose	I would only approve Map F4 with the following changes. Move the beach cities back into District 4. The beach cities have much more in common with Torrance, PV Peninsula and Long Beach than parts of downtown. Move Lynwood, Florence, and Walnut Park back into District 2 (they are there now) from the proposed District 4 map under consideration. This simple change will correct the current problems with Map F-4.	12/13/2021	n/a

5.b.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Favor	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Oppose	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>		
5.b.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Oppose	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Lee Phillips	Oppose	<p>Move the beach cities back into District 4 and exchange for more traditional areas closer to downtown for District 2. The beach cities have much more in common</p>	12/14/2021	n/a

			with Torrance, PV Peninsula and Long Beach than parts of downtown. Communities of District 2 have much more in common with the areas closer to downtown than the beach cities. This is rather obvious and a simple change that will greatly enhance the goal of matching common communities of interest and greatly improve this map, as well as minimize changes from the current District lines.		
5.b.	Lena Fraser	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Leni Boorstin	Oppose	I OPPOSE MAP 5B under consideration this evening. I SUPPORT MAP F4 (also) discussed last weekend, and that has received more robust analysis and public comment. I OPPOSE MAP 5B because it splits Studio City into two districts — a neighborhood and community of interest - without adequate justification. I also OPPOSE MAP 5B because significant county cultural assets have been removed from SD 3 for no good reason! PLEASE RECONSIDER - and SUPPORT MAP F4.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Linda Nicklas	Oppose	The City of Montebello will be taken out of the San Gabriel COG which we depend on for support on like items concerning our communities. Please do not remove us from the 32 Senate District. It will be a disservice to our City and residents.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Lisa Mazzocco	Oppose	Please do not approve the final map that includes moving parts of North Hollywood into District 5. The San Fernando Valley has nothing in common with Lancaster, Palmdale and Santa Clarita. The Commission should also recommend increasing the number of Districts to get better representation for constituents.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Marcia Hanscom	Favor	Thank you for listening to the public and for placing everything south of Washington Blvd, into the Second District (2nd) where other parts of the lower Ballona watershed area already were in your previous map. Marina del Rey, Del Rey Lagoon, Ballona Lagoon, Oxford Lagoon, Grand Canal Lagoon and the Ballona Wetlands all belong together with Ballona Creek. We appreciate your listening, and we ask that you adopt the final map as published prior to this meeting.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Margarita Sandoval	Other	Hello, my name is Margarita Sandoval and I am a resident of unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2. I am in favor of the final map because it keeps Florence-Firestone in the Second District under Supervisor Mitchell's district. As an unincorporated community, we lack proper political representation and heavily rely on the Supervisor as our sole representative and so redistricting Florence-Firestone away from SD2 will only cause further confusion for residents living here and further disenfranchise our community. Florence-Firestone should remain with	12/14/2021	n/a

			the Supervisor they voted for in 2020. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD2. Thank you		
5.b.	Marie Mazzone	Other	This map choice was not analyzed as robustly and with the amount of public comment as F4. To preserve our faith in the the process and not be swayed by political pressures, I urge you to vote for map F4	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Marlene Buenrostro	Other	My name is Marlene Buenrostro. I work at Active San Gabriel Valley, a community-based organization dedicated to creating a more sustainable, equitable, and livable region. I'd like to thank you for your work so far. I support how the San Gabriel Valley is kept together in SD1 in the final map, from El Monte to Pomona. I just have 1 request: please add Peck Road Water Conservation Park into SD1. It does not belong in SD5, where foothill residents have more access to open spaces like the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument. Our San Gabriel Valley Community of Interest in SD1 is park-poor due to historic disinvestment and inequitable land use. El Monte ranks in the worst category, as "very high need". Residents don't have access to parks, so we value the few parks we do have, which includes Peck Park. Many families from El Monte use Peck Road Park- for fishing, picnicking, biking, walking, and enjoying nature. As frequent park users, we deserve a say in how the park is managed. The park should be under SD1's jurisdiction, not SD5. This ensures our voices are included in the management process. This is a quick and easy fix that doesn't affect the County's CVAP percentages, because there aren't any residents at the park. Please add Peck Road Park in SD1. Thank you.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Marty Woll	Oppose	See attached comment letter. In short, representation of the North San Fernando Valley should be kept together, as would have been the case with Map F.	12/14/2021	View attachment
5.b.	Mary b Trautwein	Favor	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Mary Gallo	Oppose	As a concerned citizen, I am writing to voice my strong opposition to adoption of the map as it is proposed today.	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>On Sunday, after the commission closed public comment, significant changes were made in districts Three and Five without regards to neighborhoods or cultural institutions.</p> <p>The implications of the new changes have not been adequately considered and these changes were made without public comment.</p> <p>It would be a disservice to the Redistricting Commission’s year-long work to adopt this latest map without further consideration.</p> <p>Given the shortness of time, I urge you to adopt an earlier map also discussed last weekend, Map F4, which has received more robust analysis and public comment.</p>		
5.b.	Michael M Horton	Oppose	<p>'The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'</p>	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Michel Dory	Oppose	<p>As a resident of District 2 whose district would change if this map is approved, I object to being push out of District 2. District 2 is more representative of my housing and transportation needs. Being in a district largely comprised on The Valley will disenfranchise me.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	NAOMI A KOBWIN	Oppose	<p>I was astounded to hear of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5. Im the president of our Neighborhood association, the HHWNC Area 4 chair and a resident of Hollywood Heights for 15 years. We are directly significantly involved with the Hollywood Bowl and the Ford Theatre. What takes place season after season literally transforms our lives from a quiet residential neighborhood to a community stressed by traffic, noise and the impact of thousands upon thousands of people entering our neighborhood nightly to attend concerts and events at these venues. The impact has worsened over the years as the season expands and larger acts attend the venues.</p> <p>The listening and support we get from our District deputies on multiple issues including traffic , crime, litter homelessness etc specific to these venues is imperative. They understand the history and know the issues our community</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>faces and frankly listen. Removing these assets and placing them into District 5 simply comes across as no less than corruption and an unconscionable asset grab.. It makes no good sense. This is a bad plan. The window of time for community comment has been shockingly minimal. Given a reasonable amount of time you would hear a resounding NO from the constituents of these areas. I implore this committee to return the prior map leaving these assets within the District along with the communities they directly impact.</p>		
5.b.	NAOMI KOBRIN	Favor	<p>I was astounded to hear of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5. Im the president of our Neighborhood association, the HHWNC Area 4 chair and a resident of Hollywood Heights for 15 years. We are directly significantly involved with the Hollywood Bowl and the Ford Theatre. What takes place season after season literally transforms our lives from a quiet residential neighborhood to a community stressed by traffic, noise and the impact of thousands upon thousands of people entering our neighborhood nightly to attend concerts and events at these venues. The impact has worsened over the years as the season expands and larger acts attend the venues. The listening and support we get from our District deputies on multiple issues including traffic , crime, litter homelessness etc specific to these venues is imperative. They understand the history and know the issues our community faces and frankly listen. Removing these assets and placing them into District 5 simply comes across as no less than corruption and an unconscionable asset grab.. It makes no good sense. This is a bad plan. The window of time for community comment has been shockingly minimal. Given a reasonable amount of time you would hear a resounding NO from the constituents of these areas. I implore this committee to return the prior map leaving these assets within the District along with the communities they directly impact.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Nelson J Sanesi	Oppose	<p>The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these</p>	12/14/2021	n/a

			communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. I ask that you revert back to map F-4.		
5.b.	Norma Hamilton	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Pamm Fair	Oppose	This process is geared towards potential candidates not stakeholders. Go back to the pre Sunday maps. Transparency please!	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Patricia Allinson	Favor	See Attached Comment	12/14/2021	View attachment
5.b.	Paula Cracium	Oppose	I am greatly concerned that the commission acted without taking any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Ray Panek	Oppose	No	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Richard Fisk	Favor	What has transpired since comments of acceptance for map F-4 prompted the removal of significant parts of the San Fernando Valley from the 5th district? With a population of approximately 1.8 million people, the Valley, can hardly be classified as a homogenous community of interest. The Valley as a whole should have at least 2 Supervisors representing the large diverse area. The Final Map as presented, removing areas of the San Fernando Valley is dated December 12, which the same date as map F-4. One can only conclude that there was no public input and that behind the scenes political favors or influences were the reason for this dramatic change. Vote and finalize map F-4. Richard Fisk Solely for ID purposes: Chair of Government Affairs for United Chambers of Commerce	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Robert LoPresti	Oppose	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando valley from the 5th district. There is overwhelming public comment on the record advocating to keep these communities in the 5th District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4. Any change will result in my	12/15/2021	n/a

			previous vote being nullified and I will be represented by someone I did not vote for, or ever would.		
5.b.	Sandra Minasian	Oppose	I'm just hearing about this change in districting now. How is that ok? As for my opinion on the proposed change, I think it makes far better sense to adopt map F-4. That version keeps us with other areas with similar topography (think fire zones) and location.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Sandra Shlapak	Oppose	I have written comments regarding the selection of maps indicating that my community needs to be included with the unincorporated county areas north of the 118 freeway because of common community interests however the commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Sheila Kuehl	Oppose	“Redistricting is always a challenging and disruptive process, but this go-round has been truly disappointing with the final map thoroughly gutting the heart of what has been the Third District at the eleventh hour while providing no time for comment or review. For many decades, Universal City, LACMA, the Tar Pits, the Ford Theatres and the Hollywood Bowl have been a part of the Third District family of public venues where we have been fierce advocates of the arts and improving accessibility. Dividing them up in two other districts and severing them from their surrounding communities has little impact on the population, but has a profound impact on the critical longstanding partnerships that have sustained these venues which provide so much to so many County residents. Divide the Hollywood Bowl from Hollywood? I will, of course, continue to represent all the constituents in my district, and warmly welcome those who are about to become residents of the County’s Third District, as well as work with any Supervisors who suddenly find these incredible venues in their newly-drawn district, but I remain concerned about these inexplicably rushed changes that may thoroughly alter the historical connections of these artistic and cultural treasures.” -Los Angeles County 3rd District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl	12/13/2021	n/a
5.b.	Steve Braudo	Favor	-	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Susanne Cumming	Other	Thank you for including the ecosystem of Ballona Wetlands, Playa del Rey and Marina del Rey all together in District 2. It will be much easier to advocate for	12/14/2021	n/a

			heron-cams, eagle nest-cams, and access/opportunities in nature for young people, especially at risk children. Members of defendballonawetlands.org look forward to working with Supervisor Mitchell.		
5.b.	Teena A Takata	Oppose	The commission acted WITHOUT any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4. Keep us with similar areas in the San Fernando valley!	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Terry Tanner	Oppose	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. I ask that you revert back to map F-4.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Tim Hepburn	Oppose	I want to thank all of the Commissioners for all of your hard work and dedication to this process. Up until a few days ago La Verne was in District 5 completely. But with this new map the south part of La Verne [Fairplex] was put into District 1. La Verne has established an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District EIFD. The Proposed redistricting will split La Verne as a community of interest [which no other surrounding City is split between two districts] but would place the EIFD in Supervisor Solis's district. Supervisor Barger has been instrumental in supporting the formation of the district, which benefits the County, La Verne and the Fairplex. Supervisor Barger is a Voting Member of the Public Financing Authority Board for the EIFD, and here staff are well versed in the purpose of the district and has participated in all of the meetings since the district was formed. The infrastructure projects identified in the EIFD are essential for the development of La Verne both inside and outside the district boundaries, impacting development across Supervisors districts. normally not done. We request that this carveout be put back in so all of La Verne is in district 5. As we have in the past and will in the future work closely with Supervisor Solis and the Fairplex and the surrounding Cities to make any of our endeavors a Success, Thanks You Tim Hepburn Mayor of La Verne.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Timothy Hornor	Oppose	MY FAMILY OPPOSES 5B. PLEASE VOTE NO. The current plan for redistricting in the 3rd district is egregious, especially in the	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>wake of the clear mandate from the people with Measure J's win in last year's election.</p> <p>You will undermine the voices of thousands of families working in community to improve the conditions in our County, and I urge you to vote no on 5B.</p>		
5.b.	Todd Henricks	Oppose	<p>I'm shocked to learn of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5. I'm Vice President of our neighborhood association (Hollywood Heights), and neighborhood resident for the past 18-years. Having direct communication with the Hollywood Bowl is important since we sit directly next to the bowl and are impacted season after season, it literally transforms our lives from a quiet residential neighborhood to a community stressed by traffic, noise and the impact of thousands upon thousands of people entering our neighborhood nightly to attend concerts and events at this venue. The impact has worsened over the years as the season expands and larger acts perform at the Bowl.</p> <p>The listening and support we get from our District deputies on multiple issues including traffic, crime, litter, and homelessness specific to this venue is imperative. They understand the history and know the issues our community faces and frankly listen.</p> <p>Removing these assets and placing them into District 5 simply comes across as no less than corruption and an unconscionable asset grab. It makes no good sense. This is a bad plan.</p> <p>The window of time for community comment has been shockingly minimal. Given a reasonable amount of time you would hear a resounding NO from the constituents of these areas.</p> <p>I implore this committee to return the prior map leaving these assets within the District along with the communities they directly impact. I was astounded to hear of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Valerie Ayers	Other	<p>We are requesting that Ladera, CA 90056 children not be excluded from LAUSD because we are a very diverse community that lives, plays sports and works within the city of Los Angeles. There is massive community involvement. In addition, We have quite a few of teachers, firefighters, policemen and government personnel</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			that live in the city. Inglewood school district has been taken over by the state and doesn't offer our children the curriculum, multiple languages and Special education one on one that LAUSD has offered. Therefore, there should be inclusivity and not exclusion. We are in district 11.		
5.b.	Van T Moore	Oppose	As a resident of District 2 and whose district would be changed if this redistricting map is approved, I object to being forced out of District 2. District 2 is a better representative of my transportation and housing requirements. Being consumed into The Valley will most definitely disenfranchise me.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Vicki Briskman	Oppose	'The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.'	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Victoria Hochberg	Oppose	I am opposed to this re-districting. I have lived in Hollywood for over forty years. This change smacks of Banana Republic machinations. Who forced this through after the initial plan was complete? Why is there no transparency? Why weren't neighborhoods who are directly affected by this change allowed to have their say? My street abuts the Bowl Parking Lot. Can you tell me that I live in a different district than a venue that is fifty feet from my home? Nonsense. Why must citizens have to spend thousands of dollars on lawsuits because a commissioner wants some favor from a corrupt politician? Shame on you for allowing this.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Wendi C Gladstone	Oppose	It is our desire to keep the areas of Chatsworth, Porter Ranch, Northridge and Granada Hills in County Supervisor District 5. This District has served our communities well and redistricting just stirs a pot that does not need stirring. It appears the Commission removed the northwest San Fernando Valley (SFV) from the Fifth District. There has been extensive comment from the Community and requests to keep the above mentioned communities as is, currently in County Supervisor District 5. We are extremely distressed by this sudden action to remove the Northwest SFV from District 5! Please follow your previous work and revert to map F-4, retaining the boundaries of District 5 as is... to include the Northwest portion of the San Fernando Valley	12/14/2021	n/a

			<p>foothill communities. The foothill Communities have areas of common/mutual interest -ie: common foothills, horse properties, open space and wildfire concerns that the Valley floor does not have.</p> <p>The Districting should be about the people who live there and what they want! Why change it if it has been working well... and it has been working well!!!</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		
5.b.	WENDY ZACUTO	Favor	<p>Thank you to the Citizens Redistricting Commissioners for your open-minded listening to our pleas as we support our community with the robust continuation of care of our wetlands. I strongly urge you to adopt the Final Map that keeps the entirety of its boundaries together so that we can ensure flora, fauna, and protection for local environments are sustained: Marina del Rey, the Ballona Wetlands, Ballona Creek, and lagoons in District 2.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Wesley Reutimann	Other	<p>As a resident of Pasadena and co-founder of Active San Gabriel Valley, a place-based, non-profit organization focused on realizing more sustainable and equitable communities, I would like to thank the Commission's work to honor the very unique community of interest that is the San Gabriel Valley.</p> <p>The final map does a good job at keeping most of the San Gabriel Valley together as part of SD1, from El Monte to Pomona.</p> <p>I just have one minor request: please add Peck Road Water Conservation Park to SD1.</p> <p>Our San Gabriel Valley Community of Interest in SD1 is park-poor due to historic disinvestment and inequitable land use. El Monte residents don't have access to enough park space, making the few parks residents do have easy access to, such as Peck Park, even more important. Many families from El Monte use Peck Road Park- for fishing, picnicking, biking, walking, and enjoying nature. As frequent park users, these residents deserve a direct say in how the park is managed. The park should be under SD1's jurisdiction, not SD5's. This ensures our voices are included in the management process.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>This edit is a quick and easy fix that will not affect the County's CVAP percentages, because there aren't any housed residents at the park. Please add Peck Road Park to SD1.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration!</p>		
5.b.	William R Slocum	Oppose	I am disappointed by the Commission's decision to remove the Northwest SFV communities from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to check them in the fifth district. I ask that you revert back to Map F-4, before the surprise changes to the SFV were made.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.b.	Willie Davis-Willis	Favor	Hello, my name is Ms. Willie Willis, and I am a resident of unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2. I am in favor of the final map because it keeps Florence-Firestone in the Second District under Supervisor Mitchell's district. As an unincorporated community, we lack proper political representation and heavily rely on the Supervisor as our sole representative and so redistricting Florence-Firestone away from SD2 will only cause further confusion for residents living here and further disenfranchise our community. Florence-Firestone should remain with the Supervisor they voted for in 2020. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD2. Thank you.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Yanel Saenz	Favor	Hello, my name is Yanel Saenz and I am a resident of unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2. I am in favor of the final map because it keeps Florence-Firestone in the Second District under Supervisor Mitchell's district. As an unincorporated community, we lack proper political representation and heavily rely on the Supervisor as our sole representative and so redistricting Florence-Firestone away from SD2 will only cause further confusion for residents living here and further disenfranchise our community. Florence-Firestone should remain with the Supervisor they voted for in 2020. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD2. Thank you.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.b.	Yvette Deans	Oppose	No	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	A S Albert	Oppose	I OPPOSE MAP 5B under consideration this evening. I SUPPORT MAP F4, which has received more robust analysis and public comment. I OPPOSE MAP 5B because it splits Studio City into two districts — a neighborhood and community of interest — without justification. I also OPPOSE MAP 5B because significant county cultural assets have been removed from SD 3 for no good reason! PLEASE RECONSIDER -	12/15/2021	n/a

			and SUPPORT MAP F4. Amy S. Albert, Studio City		
5.c.	Alex U Ugrik	Favor	The commission acted in the shadows and did not take any public input on removing the entire northwest San Fernando Valley from the Fifth District. There is overwhelming public comment on record advocating to keep these communities in the Fifth District, and attached to the North County and northeast SFV foothills. We ask that you revert back to map F-4.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.c.	Alexander Fineman	Favor	Please keep in Lesson 12 - the recommendation that the county should explore ballot measures/legislation to increase the number of LA County Supervisors.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Anastasia R Mann	Other	Opposing the late entry map removing Hollywood Bowl, The Ford, Griffith Park and Universal Studios from District 3 to 5.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Andrew F Kratzer	Favor	The changes to the Valley portion of District 3 seem to have been done without community input and weren't made in the interests of the people the commission is charged to represent. Why did these changes happen? I live in District 3 and am severely impacted by the Hollywood Bowl, which is in a different district. These last minute moves don't seem to be in the best interests of the people who are represented in District 3. Please go back to Map F-4 for District 3. The population counts and data make more sense in F-4. Please go back to map F-4.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Artesha Thomas	Other	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Barbara M Motz	Oppose	Valley Village, North Hollywood and Studio City do NOT belong in the same supervisorial district as Santa Clarita, Palmdale and Lancaster. The southeast San Fernando Valley is a region that shares common interests, community group and infrastructure. Do not split us up and dilute our votes.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Benina S	Favor	I am in favor of the report's recommendations, especially Lesson 12, that calls for the exploration of a ballot measure to increase the Board of Supervisors. Five supervisors governing over a county of 10 million people is extremely inadequate and does not provide fair representation to the people of Los Angeles County.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Bernice Clarke	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	charles southey	Oppose	Why would the South Bay (Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo etc) be lumped in with Downtown LA? They have nothing in common, totally different demographics and needs. One area is city living and another is beach living. While your at it can you add the South Bay to Orange County?	12/15/2021	n/a

5.c.	christian trigueros	Oppose	We all our part of the entire LA COUNTY this is segregation and misrepresentation and discrimination because of the entire scope of map was done by color and race and is also a violation of international human rights. and once again a attempt a discrimination of the hispanic mexican american voters citizens and residents. We are all ONE nation! under God with Liberty and Justice for All!!!	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	DANIEL SAVAGE	Other	I oppose this last-minute plan to remove Hollywood Bowl, Ford Theatre/Griffith Park and Universal Studios from District 3 and moving to District 5.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Dina Mills	Oppose	This map does not take in consideration the the beach cities are not at all similar to downtown LA. Different people and different problems. It will cause a lot of problems for residents, being lumped with LA. Beach cities have a lor more in common with PV, Torrance and even long beach. This map is a disgrace and so is this meeting apparently.	12/13/2021	n/a
5.c.	elaine loring	Favor	I strongly oppose North Hollywood and Studio City being included in District 5. The communities and concerns in the east San Fernando Valley differ sharply from Santa Clarita, Palmdale and Lancaster. The commission should redraw this map in order to achieve a district that more fairly represents the San Fernando Valley. In addition, the commission needs to act to increase the number of Supervisors. L.A. County is far too large, complex and diverse to be well represented by just 5 Supervisors.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Erich Bollmann	Favor	Strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to keep the recommendation to "increase the number of Board of Supervisors" in the final report. It is simply impossible for the handful of Supervisors to adequately represent the 10 million residents of LA County. We desperately need expanded representation, so that everyone in LA County has the opportunity to truly be represented by their Supervisor. This would also help alleviate the immense pressure our current Supervisors must feel, since they are routinely unable to stand up for the needs and priorities of their many constituents.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Jennifer Slusser	Other	-	12/14/2021	n/a
5.c.	Jerri Rousseau	Oppose	I oppose the final map. Manhattan beach has far more in common with other beach cities than with downtown and Inglewood.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.c.	John Damico	Other	I am not in favor of any map that separates West Hollywood from the other Westside cities. Our ability to influence local govt policy depends on working in consortium across districts.	12/13/2021	n/a

5.c.	Kimberly Clarke	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Laura Kastner	Other	Keep South Bay cities in District 4, move Southeast cities back to District	12/13/2021	n/a
5.c.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Favor	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Oppose	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>		
5.c.	Lawrence Teitelbaum	Oppose	<p>12/15/2021 To the redistricting commission:</p> <p>I understand there is a redistricting proposal to incorporate the Beach Cities into the Downtown LA supervisorial district and separate them from parts of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>I am opposed to this. The needs of the Beach Cities have little in common with Downtown LA and are much more aligned with those of Torrance, PV Peninsula, San Pedro, and Long Beach.</p> <p>Where are the similarities between the Beach Cities and Downtown LA on such needs as transportation, housing, law enforcement, fire services, traffic, street cleaning, refuse collection, etc?</p> <p>Why create a situation where one supervisor has to be responsible to two dramatically different constituencies?</p> <p>Sincerely, Lawrence Teitelbaum Manhattan Beach CA 90266</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

5.c.	Lee Phillips	Oppose	<p>Move the beach cities back into District 4 and exchange for more traditional areas closer to downtown for District 2. The beach cities have much more in common with Torrance, PV Peninsula and Long Beach than parts of downtown.</p> <p>Communities of District 2 have much more in common with the areas closer to downtown than the beach cities. This is rather obvious and a simple change that will greatly enhance the goal of matching common communities of interest and greatly improve this map, as well as minimize changes from the current District lines.</p>	12/14/2021	n/a
5.c.	Lena Fraser	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	lex roman	Other	We need more supervisors!!!! 5 people representing 10 million is absurd	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Lisa Mazzocco	Oppose	Please do not approve the final map that includes moving parts of North Hollywood into the District 5. The San Fernando Valley has nothing in common with Lancaster, Palmdale and Santa Clarita. The Commission should also recommend increasing the number of Districts to get better representation for constituents.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Michel Dory	Oppose	This needs greater review and should not be moved forward.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	NAOMI A KOBIN	Oppose	I oppose the late entry map removing key assets from District 3 and placing them in District 5	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	NAOMI KOBIN	Favor	I oppose the late entry map removing the Hollywood Bowl, The Ford , Griffith Park and Universal from District 3 to 5	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Nicolas Montano	Oppose	<p>* Hello, my name is _Nicolas_____ and I am a resident of _Chatsworth_____.</p> <p>* I am shocked and disappointed by the Commission's unprecedented decision to remove the northwest SFV communities from the Fifth District.</p> <p>* When will our leaders start takeing consideration of the needs of their constituents and stop voting for their on agendas and political careers?</p> <p>* For years the rampant nepotism and cronyism has made decisions for the good their careers and not for the good of the public</p> <p>* With this redistricting that was shoved down our throats the northvalley will be represented by a person that doesn't know our needs. Our future representative has a record of making some very bad decision and was backed by Rigley Thomas, And we saw how that ended up.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>* This calls to question the Commissioner's intentions for introducing this new "community of interest", and appears that the commissioner who introduced this change has a hidden agenda</p> <p>* We ask that you revert back to map F-4, before the surprise changes to the SFV were made</p>		
5.c.	Norma Hamilton	Oppose	-	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Ray Panek	Oppose	No	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Steve Braudo	Favor	-	12/14/2021	n/a
5.c.	Tim Hepburn	Oppose	<p>I want to thank all of the Commissioners for all of your hard work and dedication to this process. Up until a few days ago La Verne was in District 5 completely. But with this new map the south part of La Verne [Fairplex] was put into District 1. La Verne has established an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District EIFD. The Proposed redistricting will split La Verne as a community of interest [which no other surrounding City is split between two districts] but would place the EIFD in Supervisor Solis's district. Supervisor Barger has been instrumental in supporting the formation of the district, which benefits the County, La Verne and the Fairplex. Supervisor Barger is a Voting Member of the Public Financing Authority Board for the EIFD, and here staff are well versed in the purpose of the district and has participated in all of the meetings since the district was formed. The infrastructure projects identified in the EIFD are essential for the development of La Verne both inside and outside the district boundaries, impacting development across Supervisors districts. normally not done. We request that this carveout be put back in so all of La Verne is in district 5. As we have in the past and will in the future work closely with Supervisor Solis and the Fairplex and the surrounding Cities to make any of our endeavors a Success, Thanks You Tim Hepburn Mayor of La Verne.</p>	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Todd Henricks	Oppose	<p>I'm shocked to learn of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5. I'm Vice President of our neighborhood association (Hollywood Heights), and neighborhood resident for the past 18-years. Having direct communication with the Hollywood Bowl is important since we sit directly next to the bowl and are impacted season after season, it literally transforms our lives from a quiet</p>	12/15/2021	n/a

			<p>residential neighborhood to a community stressed by traffic, noise and the impact of thousands upon thousands of people entering our neighborhood nightly to attend concerts and events at this venue. The impact has worsened over the years as the season expands and larger acts perform at the Bowl.</p> <p>The listening and support we get from our District deputies on multiple issues including traffic, crime, litter, and homelessness specific to this venue is imperative. They understand the history and know the issues our community faces and frankly listen.</p> <p>Removing these assets and placing them into District 5 simply comes across as no less than corruption and an unconscionable asset grab. It makes no good sense. This is a bad plan.</p> <p>The window of time for community comment has been shockingly minimal. Given a reasonable amount of time you would hear a resounding NO from the constituents of these areas.</p> <p>I implore this committee to return the prior map leaving these assets within the District along with the communities they directly impact. I was astounded to hear of these last minutes changes to the redistricting map switching out prime community assets from District 3 to District 5.</p>		
5.c.	Valerie Ayers	Other	Same. Read other...	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Van T Moore	Oppose	A greater review of this is desperately needed and should not be allowed to move forward until completed.	12/15/2021	n/a
5.c.	Willie Davis-Willis	Favor	Hello, my name is Ms. Willie Willis, and I am a resident of unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2. I am in favor of the final map because it keeps Florence-Firestone in the Second District under Supervisor Mitchell's district. As an unincorporated community, we lack proper political representation and heavily rely on the Supervisor as our sole representative and so redistricting Florence-Firestone away from SD2 will only cause further confusion for residents living here and further disenfranchise our community. Florence-Firestone should remain with the Supervisor they voted for in 2020. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD2. Thank you.	12/14/2021	n/a
5.c.	Yvette Deans	Oppose	No	12/15/2021	n/a

-	Bret Polish	-	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing to you to please be guided by equity and racial justice as you make your final redistricting decisions. We ask that you support modified Map F-1 (OP Map 81) submitted by the People’s Bloc. This is the only map that does not dilute the voices of the Black community.</p> <p>The commission is making history as being the first independent commission to draw new district lines for the county. However, it is very disappointing to see the voices of Black residents being overlooked at the expense of more affluent areas. South LA has historically been a place of residence for the Black community and it is the last place in the county where the majority reside. In the last decade the demographics of LA County show that the Black population has declined by 7.3% according to the US Census. This is a worrisome trend that has occurred as a result of the community being driven out through racist policies, economic disinvestments, and gentrification. This trend will not improve in the next decade which is why it is important to draw a district that maintains the highest percentage of Black CVAP as seen in modified Map F-1.</p> <p>Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to communities in South LA by pairing more affluent parts of the coast with South LA. The issues and priorities of these two areas are vastly different. South LA has fought for racial justice, affordable housing, and has been one of the communities most impacted by COVID-19. When looking at the Redistricting Equity Index , you can see how these communities are on the complete opposite spectrums and the opportunities for powerbuilding are not there. Historic SD2 cities share similar economic hardships. 74.4% of Watts residents live under 200% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), this figure is 55.6% in Compton, 48.7% in Koreatown, 46.9% in Hawthorne, 42.5 % in Hyde Park, and 38.6% in Inglewood. Just across the 405 Freeway, residents experience very different economic realities. For example, 8.2% of Manhattan Beach residents live below 200% of the FPL, a figure mirrored in other coastal cities (Rolling Hills Estates 8.5%, Palos Verdes Estates 9.7%, Hermosa Beach 10.3%, Rancho Palos Verdes 10.4%, and Redondo Beach 11.4%). Being paired with communities with more wealth and opposite interests will lead</p>	12/12/2021	n/a
---	-------------	---	--	------------	-----

			<p>to political representation that compromises the needs and interests of South LA in favor of the coastal cities. These differences stretch far beyond economic interests. In the midst of the pandemic, the average number of COVID-19 cases per 100,000 residents was as much as four to five times higher in historic SD2 cities east of the 405 than neighboring coastal cities, highlighting some of the health and economic factors leading to very different lived experiences. The disparities in home ownership, denied mortgage applications, subprime mortgage rates, uninsured population, drinking water contaminants, and voter turnout are also stark when comparing communities east of the 405 and on the coast. It is crucial for communities of color to have political representation that understands black histories, cultures, and values. All of this will be diluted by pairing South LA with affluent cities on the coast. The pairing of these communities is in no way, shape or form a type of reparations, bringing in assets like the LAX airport is what the community needs.</p> <p>Map B-2 is also unacceptable as it reduces the representation of communities of color to only elect a candidate of choice in two districts instead of 3 like in the modified Map F-1. It does this by packing Black and Brown communities in District 2. The remaining 3 district would have the highest white CVAP. This is concerning given the demographics of LA County, where the white population only makes up 30% of the county and where minority communities are the majority.</p> <p>I urge the commission to not be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise black communities and that will take a decade to fix. Please move forward with the modified Map F-1 (OP 81) submitted by the People’s Bloc.</p> <p>Respectfully, Bret Polish</p>		
-	Mary Buttice	-	Please see attached letter from Arcadia Mayor Sho Tay.	12/14/2021	View attachment
-	Erin Friedman	-	Please see the attached letter from City of La Verne Mayor, Tim Hepburn, regarding the redistricting map under consideration tonight.	12/15/2021	View attachment